TPM®

CONCEPTUAL, METHODOLOGICAL, AND CONTEXTUAL CHALLENGES IN STUDYING COLLECTIVE ACTION: RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

ÖZDEN MELIS ULUĞ
UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

MARIA CHAYINSKA
PONTIFICAL CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF CHILE
UNIVERSITY OF MESSINA

LINDA R. TROPP
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

The global rise in social protest movements has forced collective action scholars in various disciplines to think about theoretical models that can comprehensively explain phenomena related to protest participation and mobilization. Despite recent advances in collective action literature, we argue that collective action scholars in social psychology still face a) conceptual challenges, associated with lack of attention to content and multiplicity of identities, b) methodological challenges, such as overreliance on self-reports and limited qualitative and mixed-method studies on collective action, and c) contextual challenges, related to an insufficient emphasis on structural and political contexts in which protest movements emerge. In this review article, we discuss each of these challenges in detail and suggest recommendations for how each challenge can be addressed in future research. We hope this paper will provide a roadmap for future research by offering critical reflections regarding how collective action is typically studied in social psychology.

Keywords: Collective action; Conceptual challenges; Methodological challenges; Contextual challenges; Multiple identities.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to to Özden Melis Uluğ, School of Psychology, University of Sussex, Pevensey 1 Building, Falmer, BN1 9QH, United Kingdom. Email: omu20@sussex.ac.uk

The last two decades have witnessed a rise in collective protests and social movements that have attempted to challenge the status quo, address economic justices, and provide a political voice to the disenfranchised across the globe. Beginning with the 2009 Green Revolution in Iran and the 2011 Arab Spring protests in Egypt that further expanded to the other countries in the Middle East and North Africa, there have been nationwide pro-equality and anti-dominance uprisings in nearly every corner of the world. These protests include, but not are limited to, the Tahrir Square protests in Egypt (2011), Gezi Park protests in Turkey (2013), Euromaidan revolution in Ukraine (2013–2014), French Yellow Vests protests (2018), Armenia's Velvet Revolution (2018), the Sudanese Revolution (2018–2019), the Hong Kong anti-extradition protests (2019–2020), the Chile Despertó social movement (2019–2020), the Black Lives Matters protests in the United States (2013–2020), and Poland's mass protests for abortion rights (2020). These movements have appeared to play crucial roles in local, national, and international politics, mobilizing a diverse range of groups and interests. Moreover, the intersection of protest mobilization and participation both offline

(e.g., gatherings in strategic and public physical spaces) and online (e.g., connections through the Internet and social media) has become a regular feature of contemporary social movements (Greijdanus et al., 2021).

As collective action scholars, we have often found ourselves wondering whether there are theoretical models capable of capturing the ecology and multifaceted nature of phenomena related to political participation and mobilization. So far, researchers in political science (e.g., Esteban & Ray, 2001; Kostelka & Rovny, 2019; Olson, 1965), sociology (e.g., Baldassarri, 2009; Goodwin & Jasper, 2006; Snow et al., 2019; Tarrow, 1994; van Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2010), and international relations (e.g., Kapucu & Beaudet, 2020) have suggested a variety of factors that underlie political participation and mobilization, leading to the development of distinct approaches in each of these disciplines. In their effort to bridge and integrate perspectives, Chenoweth and Stephan (2011) brought together insights from political science and social policy while also combining statistical analysis with case studies of specific countries, including Iran, Burma, the Philippines, and Palestine. In so doing, they comprehensively examined macro-level factors that help social movements to succeed or fail, an analytic approach that may be seen as a notable exception rather than the general trend, and one that is largely missing from social psychology.

In current social psychological research, one of the most cited explanatory frameworks for collective protests and social movement participation is the Social Identity Model of Collective Action (SIMCA; van Zomeren et al., 2008). This model was derived from a meta-analysis of the existing social psychological research literature. It identified three core motivations that drive individuals to engage in collective action to achieve social change: 1) their identification with social groups, 2) their experience of and/or anger about injustice, and 3) their beliefs in the collective efficacy of social change efforts (van Zomeren et al., 2008). Later, this model has been extended (e.g., Agostini & van Zomeren, 2021; Rees & Bamberg, 2014; Tabri & Conway, 2011; van Zomeren et al., 2012; van Zomeren et al., 2018) and tested in different contexts as well (e.g., Cakal et al., 2011). Other collective action models — such as the Encapsulated Model of Social Identity in Collective Action (EMSICA; Thomas et al., 2009), the Elaborated Social Identity Model (ESIM; Drury & Reicher, 2000), and the Disidentify, Innovate, Moralization and Energization Model (DIME; Louis et al., 2020) — have also been presented in the literature to explain collective action dynamics at the individual and group levels both before, during, and after protests occur. While EMSICA (e.g., group formation; Thomas et al., 2015) and ESIM (e.g., radicalization of group members; Drury & Reicher, 2000) have been proposed to explain group dynamics during the protests such as how identities are formed based on shared grievances and how these identities may change based on the clashes with the police, DIME has been proposed to explain what happens after the protests especially if the protests do not achieve its aims. Louis et al. (2020) introduced four possible outcomes among collective actors: disidentification, innovation, moralization, and energization.

A decade-long global trend in social unrest has urged the need for more comprehensive approaches that would enable collective action scholars to develop new and broader theoretical insights beyond those advanced by earlier models. We contend that emerging research and theory-building on collective action should (ideally) be based on three fundamental principles. First, it should be both *inductive* and *deductive* — that is, grounded in robust empirical studies as well as informed by less well-studied perspectives highlighting a variety of factors and concepts that may be relevant to collective action. The combination of both is crucial to make progress in collective action research because whilst deductive research typically uses a confirmatory approach to test a single preferred hypothesis, inductive research is data-driven and thus can help to look at previously researched phenomena from a novel perspective. Second, it should be *cross-functional* in that it can account for the dynamic interdependence between bottom-up (i.e., individual-level antecedents of protest behaviors) and top-down processes (i.e., macro-level socio-structural

conditions that may affect protest behaviors) that may shape collective action. Third, it should be *versatile* (i.e., flexible and adaptive) by being applicable to studying collective action across a multitude of socio-political contexts. Taking full awareness of the macro-level differences in socio-political contexts, collective action research should aim to explain whether and how seemingly universal mechanisms can be applied to different realities. While we ardently believe these are worthwhile goals, we also recognize that there are many practical challenges that present barriers to progress in fostering conceptual complexity, methodological variability, and contextual sensitivity.

Thus, the purpose of this review is to identify key conceptual, methodological, and contextual challenges that collective action researchers should continually consider to augment the richness of our scholarship in this area. We first discuss *conceptual challenges* with particular attention to the ways in which the multiplicity and intersectionality of social identities have been largely understudied and undertheorized. Second, we discuss *methodological challenges* by highlighting the limitations of self-reports and examining ways in which a range of research methods can potentially complement each other. Third, we explore *contextual challenges* by considering how the macro-level features of the broader societal context can shape individual-level variables such as willingness to engage in collective action. We conclude this review by providing several recommendations that may facilitate the development of more comprehensive predictive frameworks that researchers may use to study collective action within diverse socio-political contexts.

Conceptual Challenges

Given the complexities of collective action motivations and behaviors, there are some conceptual challenges that must be considered. To be sure, envisioning models that do justice to the multifaceted nature of collective action is a daunting task. Existing collective action models have grown from and generated a great deal of valuable scholarship that can be useful for explaining many aspects individuals' collective action behavior. Nonetheless, to the extent that scholars rely only on variables identified in existing models, the scope of collection action research will necessarily be limited.

Two major challenges to existing models are that they do not sufficiently (a) specify the content of identities or (b) consider the multiplicity of identities that individuals have, and which may motivate collective action behavior. As one example, one's identity as a woman may have different, and potentially opposite, meanings for women who adopt traditional gender roles or feminist views (Becker & Wagner, 2009). Understanding and conceptualizing identities based on identity content is particularly important because it is this content that drives members of any group to choose to take action for the benefit of their own group.

Similarly, the inherent complexity of individuals' identifications with social groups, and their intersectionality, have not been addressed adequately in existing models of collective action in social psychology. To date, collective action research has overwhelmingly used a singular identity framework for investigating how strength of commitment to a particular social group predicts willingness to engage in protest on behalf of that group (van Zomeren et al., 2008). For instance, it is very common for collective action researchers to ask respondents questions such as "to what extent do you identify with the X group?" However, this singular identity framework presents a major risk of overlooking the effects of multiple salient identities — that is, their sense of the multiplicity of belonging (e.g., Gaither, 2018; Kang & Bodenhausen, 2015; Louis et al., 2016) and how this may feed into motivations for collective action. For example, a woman who attended the 2017 Women's March might have been motivated to participate both be-

cause she is a woman and because she identifies with liberal social and political issues (see, e.g., Tropp & Uluğ, 2019). Similarly, a Black woman might have attended the Women's March not only because she is a woman, but also because she identifies as Black (see, e.g., Fisher et al., 2017) and wants to ensure that Black women's voices are represented as part of any movement associated with women's liberation (see, e.g., Isoke, 2013). However, when examining why women are motivated to participate in collective action, researchers tend to ignore the intersectionality of motives and focus only on gender identity.

Relatedly, other perspectives on collective action have begun to emphasize *activist identity* as its own group membership, whereby people experience a sense of belonging to an overarching category of individuals who face "shared grievances" (Simon & Klandermans, 2001, p. 324). In so doing, a binary conception of identities is presented as embroiled in an intergroup power struggle (i.e., "us vs. them"; see Dixon et al., 2020), with the activist identity ("us") operationalized as a singular social category (see, e.g., superordinate identity; Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). In our view, a drawback to this approach is that it appears to neglect the complex relationality of intergroup dynamics within any protest movement. Members of social groups that are lower in status or power may feel concerned that their voices will be subsumed by or lost within a larger activist group (see, e.g., Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). Thus, while the psychological importance of activist identity may in part propel collective action efforts, we must still attend to how it intersects with social and political systems of inequalities within collective action scholarship.

In sum, whether conceived of in terms of activist intentions or social categories, existing social psychology models of collective action have not adequately contended with how people simultaneously belong to and identify with multiple groups and how these multiple group identities are meaningfully connected. The intersectional approach, instead, provides a theoretical tool for understanding how people's propensities to engage in collective action are informed simultaneously by multiple social identities. Fortunately, emerging research in the collective action literature has begun to consider the intersection of multiple group identities embedded within unequal status relations in social systems (e.g., Curtin et al., 2016; Fisher et al., 2017; Greenwood, 2012; Horowitz, 2017; Kang & Bodenhausen, 2015; Louis et al., 2016; Tropp & Uluğ, 2019). While some advancements toward an intersectional model of collective action have been made, we still need to develop valid and reliable ways of measuring and analyzing how different constellations of identities may motivate collective action behavior.

Methodological Challenges

Constraints of existing conceptual models that have guided most studies of collective action may have also limited researchers' ability to envision alternate measures or methods that could be used to address the questions they seek to answer. Reliance on commonly used approaches may confound or obscure deeper and more accurate understandings of the perspectives, motivations, and experiences people have as they engage in collective action.

Limitations of Self-Report Measures

To date, collective action researchers have mostly relied on self-reports to assess support for or intentions to engage in collective action. For example, in the collective action literature, it is common practice to use self-report measures to assess *attitudes toward collective action* (see van Zomeren & Iyer, 2009), *intentions to participate in collective action* (e.g., Chayinska & McGarty, 2021; Lantos et al., 2020;

Odağ et al., 2016), *willingness to engage in collective action* (e.g., Tropp & Uluğ, 2019), or sometimes even more general *support for protest or collective action* (e.g., Osborne et al., 2019; Selvanathan et al., 2018; Thomas & Louis, 2014). These measures are often used as proxies for social-psychological variables that represent people's future collective action intentions or participation.

Some research has suggested that self-reported intentions to participate in collective action are indeed good predictors of actual collective action participation in the future (e.g., De Weerd & Klandermans, 1999). Yet other studies have shown differences in estimates and predictors of reported willingness and participation in collective action behavior. As one example, Tropp and Brown (2004) observed in studies with both undergraduate students (Study 1) and community members (Study 2) that people typically report greater interest in collective action than actual involvement in collective action behaviors. Some studies have also shown that these two variables may also be predicted by distinct psychological concepts (see Tropp & Brown, 2004; Tropp & Uluğ, 2019).

One natural inclination would be to think that this observed discrepancy involves self-presentational concerns, such that people may want to show they are willing to engage in collective action, even if they have not actually done so. However, existing collective action research suggests that this is not the case (e.g., Becker & Wright, 2011; Gram et al., 2020; Vilar et al., 2020). Rather, it may be that discrepancies in predictors of willingness and participation in collective action correspond with the meanings associated with certain social identities and how the role of collective action is construed to promote group interests (e.g., Polletta & Jasper, 2001; Simon & Klandermans, 2001). For instance, although participation in protests may be seen as a more natural instrument for members of left-wing groups who desire progressive social change (see Meyer, 2014), there may be other motivations and factors that drive participation in protests among members of right-wing groups (see Blee & Creasap, 2010). Moreover, there are numerous considerations associated with collective action participation, such as perceived cost and perceived risk (see Klandermans, 1997; van Bezouw et al., 2019), which may not be at play when people are simply asked about their willingness to engage in collective action. Thus, care should be taken to distinguish between willingness and participation in collective action if and when self-report measures are used.

More broadly, however, it is crucial for our field to recognize the value of supplementing individuals' self-report responses with more direct observations of the dynamics that occur during collective action and across time and space as social movements unfold. Although often informative and intentionally designed to be consistent with existing theory, overreliance on self-reports may ultimately tell us little about how individuals actually behave in the contexts in which they are being studied (see Baumeister et al., 2007).

Some advances have been made toward more ecological studies of collective action in real-time and longitudinally (e.g., Adam-Troian, Bonetto, & Arciszewski, 2021; Jost et al., 2018; Morselli et al., 2021). For instance, Morselli et al. (2021) analyzed Twitter conversations that transformed overtime — before, during, and after critical events, as part of the 2017 anti-regime protests that occurred in Venezuela. These authors used correspondence analysis (D'Enza & Greenacre, 2012) in combination with sentiment analysis (Feldman, 2013) and structural change analysis (Zeileis et al., 2003) to examine whether themes expressed online by Twitter users in response to the suppression of protest by Venezuelan authorities was associated with radicalization during street protests over time. Morselli et al.'s (2021) study compellingly showed that opinions expressed online became more extreme and one-sided in response to overt repression and lack of negotiation with movements among the authorities. As such, protest movements may arrive at the paradoxical position in which radicalization is the most straightforward response to repression, resulting in the survival of more radical positions, as compared to more moderate positions which are more like-

ly to be co-opted or successfully suppressed. Such informative trends and dynamics about collective action may fall beyond what can be readily captured by self-report measures.

Need for More Qualitative and Mixed-Method Studies on Collective Action

Correspondingly, we encourage collective action researchers to incorporate a broader range of methods into their research. Studies of collective action tend to be geared toward the use of quantitative methods more than qualitative methods (van Zomeren et al., 2008), yet both approaches may be useful depending on one's research goals. Qualitative and quantitative approaches have been distinguished by the types of data they involve (i.e., textual or numeric), the goals of the investigation (i.e., exploratory or confirmatory), the theoretical basis or logic (i.e., inductive or deductive), and by the method of analysis (i.e., interpretive or statistical). On the one hand, the extensive use of quantitative approaches has allowed collective action scholars to investigate the statistical — and in some cases causal — relationships between variables (e.g., Becker & Wright, 2011; Wright et al., 1990), as well as to synthesize findings across many studies (van Zomeren et al., 2008) and gain insights toward the prediction of future behavior (Blackwood & Louis, 2012; Chayinska et al., 2021; Tausch & Becker, 2013; Thomas et al., 2020). On the other hand, qualitative research has allowed scholars to identify the subjective meanings of manifested behaviors and the psychological processes involved as they unfold (Drury & Reicher, 2000; Fieck et al., 2020; Russell, 2011; Vestergren et al., 2019), thus placing greater focus on human voice and lived experience as the protagonists of collective action. In line with this qualitative approach, Reicher (2017) argues:

> going out into the world, watching people and talking to people and listening to what they have to say, is sidelined. This is not only perverse for a discipline that seeks to understand ordinary behaviour, it also misses the point that good science generally starts with close observation and mapping of phenomena in the world. (p. 597)

While the quantitative nature of collective action research has become increasingly common over the past three decades, a few examples of how the literature can be enriched by qualitative data are worth noting. Recent advances using qualitative approaches have examined individuals' own conceptualizations of their motives and intentions to participate in protests (e.g., Burrows et al., 2022), their subjective sense-making of social injustice (e.g., Acar & Uluğ, 2016), and their narratives describing past participation in social movements (e.g., Drury & Reicher, 2005; Uluğ & Acar, 2018; Vestergren et al., 2018). While perceived injustice tends to be considered an independent variable to predict collective action in quantitative research (see Livingstone, 2014 for a discussion), qualitative research approaches show that individuals meaningfully vary in their subjective experiences of social injustice. In their qualitative study of activists and what led them to engage in Turkey's Gezi Park protests, Acar and Uluğ (2016) identified three core themes underlying their perceptions of injustice: 1) affectively-driven perceptions of social grievances experienced by one's own ingroup, 2) ideology-driven perceptions of structural disadvantaged in the country by people who identified themselves as opponents of the government, and 3) perceived culmination of distributive injustice/pejorative socioeconomic and political events in the country. In the context of the Velvet Revolution in Armenia, Burrows et al. (2022) have analyzed activists' reflections on their motivations for joining protest movements, revealing that participation in collective action as a process involves recurring stages of motivation, implementation, and outcome: Initial motivations of individuals lead primarily to localized, small-scale forms of collective action; when successful or positive outcomes emerge, these actions are likely to fuel new forms of endorsing group identities and efficacy beliefs, which are needed to trans-

form smaller-scale motivations into larger-scale momentum for revolutionary action. These few examples from collective action literature in social psychology (see also Pelak, 2002; Prins et al., 2013 for similar examples in sociology) illustrate that the nature of the phenomena such as perceived injustice can be much more complex, multifaceted, and heterogeneous when the voices of protagonists of collective action are represented in qualitative research (see also Livingstone, 2014).

Similarly, quantitative studies focusing on outcomes of collective action participation have often conceptualized empowerment as tied to the experience of the success of movement actions. However, qualitative studies on empowerment have demonstrated that "empowerment is not reducible to the experience of success" (Drury & Reicher, 2005, p. 35). Moreover, a sense of empowerment may be coupled with ambivalent or mixed feelings about collective action participation. For example, when asked about the impact of the Gezi Park protests on activists' own lives, both hope and hopelessness emerged as coexisting themes at the individual level (Uluğ & Acar, 2018). Moreover, while the movement was experienced as empowering for many members of the LGBTI community, activists who self-identified as Kurds did not feel in the same way, as their ethnic identity was suppressed even more harshly following the Gezi Park protests. Thus, inherently dynamic and intersectional processes may underlie individuals' ambivalence about collective action participation, which are not likely to be addressed adequately merely through quantitative studies (see also Curtin et al., 2016).

We wish to clarify that we do not mean to claim that qualitative methods are superior to quantitative methods or that quantitative methods should be used to a lesser extent in collective action research than what is currently the norm. Rather, we seek to express that quantitative and qualitative methods would (and should) usefully complement each other, far beyond what is commonly practiced in our field. Recently, a few collective action scholars have started to adopt such an approach by combining quantitative and qualitative methods in their research and analysis. For instance, Cornejo et al. (2021) examined the intergenerational transmission of collective action from parents to children using a mixed-method approach. These authors analyzed data from 100 dyads of activist parents in Chile who were involved in mobilizations against the dictatorship during the 1980s and their adult children. Their quantitative analysis examined conversations about politics within the family and conceptualized these conversations as a causal antecedent of the children's frequency of participation in collective action. By adding thematic analyses obtained through qualitative methods, Cornejo et al. (2021) were able to cross-validate and confirm the important role of political conversations among family members, along with identifying two additional mechanisms corresponding with greater intergenerational transmission of collective action mobilization: a) cultural consumption of parents such as books and movies and b) joint political participation among parents and their children.

A similar strategy has been adopted by Selvanathan and colleagues (2022). They used a mixed-method approach to identify perspectives about the role of White allies in racial justice efforts shared by both White and Black activists in the United States. In their first study, using Q methodology (Watts & Stenner, 2012), they identified four shared perspectives among Black and White activists: White allies should 1) mobilize to support Black leadership, 2) take actions that focus on the needs and well-being of Black people, 3) be careful not to take over Black people's efforts, and 4) engage in lifelong learning. In Study 1, they found that these four perspectives were highly correlated. In their second study, by employing a qualitative approach, the authors interviewed a different activist sample to understand their evaluation of and preference for each of the four perspectives identified in Study 1. They asked participants the reasons why they endorse one perspective over another in the qualitative study as well as the reasons why they did not choose or endorse a particular perspective. Thus, they could then distinguish between those four

perspectives in greater detail. By employing both Q methodology and interviews, Selvanathan et al. (2022) provided valuable insights into activists' sense-making processes behind endorsing or not endorsing different perspectives on allyship in the racial justice movement in the United States. In line with these examples, we recommend that qualitative and quantitative research methods should be integrated to enhance our understanding of how and why perceptions of social injustice trigger intentions to participate in collective action, as well as for whom, in which ways, and under what circumstances.

Contextual Challenges

The mainstream social identity theories of collective action appear to fit into a specific historical context (established, mostly Western democracies; Henrich et al., 2010) where protest is seen as a legitimate authority-challenging political behavior. However, findings observed in such settings may not always be applicable to other contexts where democratization is an ongoing process and challenging reality (see Odağ et al., in press for a discussion). While social-psychological analysis of collective action tends to focus its attention on individuals as autonomous political actors, there is less consensus in the literature about how the contrasting inter-context variation in terms of a regime's political openness and the systematic use of coercive tactics (e.g., official intimidation, harassment, physical violence) may affect individual propensity to protest. The idea that contextual factors such as political stability of a government, restrictions to civil liberties, political tolerance of public expressions of dissent, and distinct historical legacies tend to influence the incidence and the course of protest is not new. Such notions that a social, historical, and (geo)political context can alter the cognitive processes that shape individuals' political behavior have been discussed extensively by sociologists and political scientists since the 1970s (Eisinger, 1973; Kostelka & Rovny, 2019; McAdam, 1982; Meyer, 2004; Tarrow, 1994). The contribution that social psychology of collective action may provide to this scholarship may consist in a fain-grained analysis of the dynamic interplay between individual-level antecedents of protest behaviors (i.e., perceptions, emotions, motivations, identities) and macro-level socio-structural conditions afforded by the social context.

Some compelling empirical evidence along these lines has been provided by Corcoran and colleagues (2011). Using the cross-national data from the World Values Survey (1999–2004; 48 countries), these authors have examined the extent to which country-level factors pertaining to political opportunity structure (i.e., the extent of repression of or openness to challengers) moderated the effects of individual-level efficacy on political participation. Corcoran and colleagues (2011) found a macro-micro positive conditional relationship between open political opportunity structure and individuals' collective action suggesting that while structural variables pertaining to political opportunity structure may not be a proximate cause of political participation, they are likely to shape the individual cognitive mechanism (efficacy) that establish incentives for political mobilization. This finding underscores the value of examining how country-level structural variables (e.g., the party and electoral system, democratic consolidation, political access, and representation of collective interests) affect people's subjective efficacy to attain social change through protests in the broader social and political context in which they live.

Contextual differences in political tolerance to collective action may also feed into people's varied perceptions of the legitimacy of protest and obstacles for political participation (Chayinska et al., 2017; Saavedra & Drury, 2019). For instance, Saavedra and Drury (2019) have proposed to extend the psychological analysis of protests by incorporating subjective perceptions of political context. Their proposed construct of subjective political openness encompasses three dimensions related to different political ac-

tors: the government (government openness), the police (perceived repression), and public opinion (legitimacy of protests). Similarly, Chayinska et al. (2017) have argued about the relevance of studying the role of public opinion in the legitimization of collective action, especially in new democracies and repressive regimes where social protest has not been routinized and accepted as a conventional political behavior.

Another crucial issue that is typically not examined in collective action research involves state-level attempts to suppress collective action and protest behavior. In semi-authoritarian and repressive political contexts (e.g., Venezuela, Hong Kong, Sudan, Lebanon), citizens who have confronted societal injustices and challenged the status quo often risk arrest, injury, and even their lives (e.g., Anisin, 2016; Ayanian & Tausch, 2016; Aytaç et al., 2018; Curtice & Berhlendorf, 2021; Sullivan et al., 2012). An illustrative example is provided by Ayanian et al. (2021), who conducted a series of studies in four countries with somewhat repressive regimes (Russia, Ukraine, Hong Kong, and Turkey) to examine whether people's perceptions of risk associated with state-level repression can function as a distal predictor of collective action intentions along with other well-established concepts (e.g., collective efficacy, outrage, politicized identity). These authors observed that perceived risk due to repression spurs rather than quells resistance, both directly and indirectly, through feelings of outrage at state repression, identification with civil society, and a sense of moral obligation to resist. Even in so-called established democracies like France or the United States, it is not uncommon to observe violent police reactions against social movements, which may inadvertently strengthen protesters' commitment to the cause (e.g., Mahfud & Adam-Troian, 2021; Ritter & Conrad, 2016). For instance, in their cross-sectional survey of more than 500 Yellow Vest protesters in France, Adam-Troian, Çelebi, and Mahfud (2021) observed a positive direct association between one's exposure to police violence and intentions to attend future demonstrations; this relation was sequentially mediated by feelings of significance loss (e.g., experiencing significance loss in the form of humiliation) and increased levels of identification with the cause. In a nutshell, there are important reasons to consider a social context as an intervening variable to fully understand the impact of top-down factors (e.g., state-level openness) in shaping bottom-up (e.g., perceptions, emotions, motivation, identities) processes believed to establish incentives for political participation. As such, we recommend collective action scholarship to more systematically integrate the empirical study of political context into its own research agenda.

Conclusion and Recommendations for Future Research

In this review, we have sought to highlight some of the ways in which the scope of existing research in collective action has been limited, with an eye toward envisioning how this work may be broadened in the future. By scrutinizing the conceptual, methodological, and contextual challenges associated with existing work on collective action, we can eventually make more progress in conducting conceptually grounded, methodologically sound, and contextually sensitive research. Based on these challenges we perceive that collective action researchers face, we outline some recommendations for future research directions below.

We contend that future collective action research would benefit from a more comprehensive framework that allows researchers to specify collective action dynamics within diverse socio-political contexts. As Chayinska et al. (2017) note, a "multiplicity of actors, political agendas and group identities are likely to achieve higher mobilization power in certain contexts" (p. 1), and such contextual factors that facilitate or inhibit collective action efforts should be taken into account. We recommend researchers adopt a multifaceted approach, reflecting on the intra-individual level variables as well as structural and contextual

factors. To be able to reflect on the applicability of models that were developed in Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic (WEIRD) contexts, more cross-cultural studies that compare the same model(s) in different settings are needed as well (see Ayanian et al., 2021 for an excellent example).

Given our current over-reliance on individuals' self-reports in survey studies, we encourage researchers to recognize the value of supplementing self-report data with more direct observations of collective action dynamics across time and space. Dynamics of real-world social movements may be examined through qualitative and/or mixed methods (see, e.g., Cornejo et al., 2021; Selvanathan et al., 2022), as well as through search volume data (Adam-Troian, Bonetto, & Arciszewski, 2021), to provide greater insights regarding how collective action behaviors and social movements unfold. Correspondingly, greater incorporation of multiple methods into collective action research may help to elucidate differences in predictors of willingness to engage in collective action and actual collective action behavior (see Manalastas et al., 2018). Thus, we recommend that future research should include assessments of both collective action intentions and behavior to disentangle the psychological processes and dynamics underlying each construct and to examine similarities and differences in their predictors. Further work could also usefully refine collective action models by balancing a focus both on deductive approaches (i.e., testing existing theory and scientific knowledge) and inductive approaches (i.e., developing new theories based on otherwise understudied factors and concepts). It is our hope that this review will open up many opportunities for discussions on how we can use a multiplicity of concepts and methods to study collective action and how these varieties may help us understand collective action in different contexts.

REFERENCES

Acar, Y. G., & Uluğ, Ö. M. (2016). Examining prejudice reduction through solidarity and togetherness experiences among Gezi Park activists in Turkey. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, *4*(1), 166-179. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v4i1.547

Adam-Troian, J., Bonetto, E., & Arciszewski, T. (2021). 'We shall overcome': First-person plural pronouns from search volume data predict collective action across the United States. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *12*(8), 1476-1485. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550620987672

Adam-Troian, J., Çelebi, E., & Mahfud, Y. (2021). "Return of the repressed": Exposure to police violence increases protest and self-sacrifice intentions for the Yellow Vests. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *23*(8), 1171-1186. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220920707

Agostini, M., & van Zomeren, M. (2021). Toward a comprehensive and potentially cross-cultural model of why people engage in collective action: A quantitative research synthesis of four motivations and structural constraints. *Psychological Bulletin*, *147*(7), 667-700. https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000256

Anisin, A. (2016). Violence begets violence: Why states should not lethally repress popular protest. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, *20*(7), 893-913. https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2016.1192536

Ayanian, A. H., & Tausch, N. (2016). How risk perception shapes collective action intentions in repressive contexts: A study of Egyptian activists during the 2013 post-coup uprising. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *55*(4), 700-721. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12164

Ayanian, H. A., Tausch, N., Acar, G. Y., Chayinska, M., Cheung, W. Y., & Lukyanova, Y. (2021). Resistance in repressive contexts: A comprehensive test of psychological predictors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *120*(4), 912-939. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspi0000285

Aytaç, S. E., Schiumerini, L., & Stokes, S. (2018). Why do people join backlash protests? Lessons from Turkey. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *62*(6), 1205-1228. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002716686828

Baldassarri, D. (2009). Collective action. In P. Hedstrom and P. Bearman (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of analytic sociology* (pp. 391-417). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199215362.013.17

Baumeister, R. F., Vohs, K. D., & Funder, D. C. (2007). Psychology as the science of self-reports and finger movements: Whatever happened to actual behavior? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *2*(4), 396-403. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2007.00051.x

Becker, J. C., & Wagner, U. (2009). Doing gender differently: The interplay of strength of gender identification and content of gender identity in predicting women's endorsement of sexist beliefs. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*, 487-508. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.551

Becker, J. C., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Yet another dark side of chivalry: Benevolent sexism undermines and hostile sexism motivates collective action for social change. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*(1), 62-77. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022615

Blackwood, L. M., & Louis, W. R. (2012). If it matters for the group then it matters to me: Collective action outcomes for seasoned activists. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *51*(1), 72-92. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2010.02001.x

Blee, K. M., & Creasap, K. A. (2010). Conservative and right-wing movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *36*, 269-286. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102602

Burrows, B., Uluğ, Ö. M., Khudoyan, K., & Leidner, B. (2022). *Introducing the Collective Action Recursive Empowerment (CARE) Model: How small-scale protests led to large-scale collective action in Armenia's Velvet Revolution* [Manuscript submitted for publication]. Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Cakal, H., Hewstone, M., Schwär, G., & Heath, A. (2011). An investigation of the social identity model of collective action and the 'sedative' effect of intergroup contact among Black and White students in South Africa. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*(4), 606-627. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02075.x

Chenoweth, E., & Stephan, M. (2011). *Why civil resistance works: The strategic logic of nonviolent conflict*. Columbia University Press.

Chayinska, M., & McGarty, C. (2021). The power of political déjà vu: When collective action becomes an effort to change the future by preventing the return of the past. *Political Psychology*, *42*(2), 201-217. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12695

Chayinska, M., Minescu, A., & McGarty, C. (2017). 'The more we stand for—The more we fight for': Compatibility and legitimacy in the effects of multiple social identities. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *8*, Article 642. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00642

Chayinska, M., Miranda, D., & González, R. (2021). A longitudinal study of the bidirectional causal relationships between online political participation and offline collective action. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *121*, 106810. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106810

Corcoran, K. E., Pettinicchio, D., & Young, J. T. N. (2011). The context of control: a cross-national investigation of the link between political institutions, efficacy, and collective action. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*, 575-605. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02076.x

Cornejo, M., Rocha, C., Castro, D., Varela, M., Manzi, J., González, R., Jiménez-Moya, G, Carvacho, H., Álvarez, B., Valdenegro, D., Cheyre., M., & Livingstone, A. G. (2021). The intergenerational transmission of participation in collective action: The role of conversation and political practices in the family. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *60*(1), 29-49. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12420

Curtice, T., & Berhlendorf, B. (2021). Street-Level Repression: Protest, Policing, and the Generation of Dissent in Uganda. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *65*(1), 166-194. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002720939304

Curtin, N., Kende, A., & Kende, J. (2016). Navigating multiple identities: The simultaneous influence of advantaged and disadvantaged identities on politicization and activism. *Journal of Social Issues*, *72*(2), 264-285. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12166

D'Enza, A. I., & Greenacre, M. (2012). Multiple correspondence analysis for the quantification and visualization of large categorical data sets. In A. Di Ciaccio, M. Coli, & J. M. Angulo Ibanez (Eds.), *Advanced statistical methods for the analysis of large data-sets* (pp. 453-463). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21037-2_41

De Weerd, M., & Klandermans, B. (1999). Group identification and political protest: Farmers' protests in the Netherlands. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *29*, 1073-1095. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199912)29:8<1073::AID-EJSP986>3.0.CO;2-K

Dixon, J., Elcheroth, G., Kerr, P., Drury, J., AlBzour, M., Subašić, E., Durrheim, K., & Green, E. G. T. (2020). It's not just "us" versus"them": Moving beyond binary perspectives on intergroup processes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *31*(1), 40-75. https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2020.1738767

Drury, J., & Reicher, S. (2000). Collective action and psychological change: The emergence of new social identities. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *39*(4), 579-604. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466600164642

Drury, J., & Reicher, S. (2005). Explaining enduring empowerment: A comparative study of collective action and psychological outcomes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*(1), 35-58. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.231

Eisinger, P. K. (1973). The conditions of protest behavior in American cities. *American Political Science Review*, *67*(1), 11-28. https://doi.org/10.2307/1958525

Esteban, J., & Ray, D. (2001). Collective action and the group size paradox. *American Political Science Review*, *95*(3), 663-672. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055401003124

Feldman, R. (2013). Techniques and applications for sentiment analysis. *Communications of the ACM*, *56*(4), 82-89. https://doi.org/10.1145/2436256.2436274

Fieck, M., Miron, A. M., Branscombe, N. R., & Mazurek, R. (2020). "We stand up for each other!" An interpretative phenomenological analysis of collective action among US College Women. *Sex Roles*, *83*(11), 657-674. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-020-01144-y

Fisher, D. R., Dow, D. M., & Ray, R. (2017). Intersectionality takes it to the streets: Mobilizing across diverse interests for the Women's March. *Science Advances*, *3*(9), eaao1390. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aao1390

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common ingroup identity model*. Psychology Press.
Gaither, S. E. (2018). The multiplicity of belonging: Pushing identity research beyond binary thinking. *Self and Identity*, *17*(4), 443-454. https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2017.1412343
Goodwin, J., & Jasper, J. M. (2006). *Social movements: Critical concepts in sociology*. Routledge.
Gram, L., Kanougiya, S., Daruwalla, N., & Osrin, D. (2020). Measuring the psychological drivers of participation in collective action to address violence against women in Mumbai, India. *Wellcome Open Research*, *5*, 22. https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15707.1
Greenwood, R. M. (2012). Standing at the crossroads: An intersectional approach to women's social identities and political consciousness. In S. Wiley, & T. A. Revenson (Eds.), *Social categories in everyday experience* (pp. 103-129). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/13488-006
Greijdanus, H., de Matos Fernandes, C. A., Turner-Zwinkels, F., Honari, A., Roos, C. A., Rosenbusch, H., & Postmes, T. (2021). The psychology of online activism and social movements: Relations between online and offline collective action. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *35*, 49-54. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.03.003
Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature*, *466*(7302), 29. https://doi.org/10.1038/466029a
Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2000). Assimilation and diversity: An integrative model of subgroup relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *4*(2), 143-156. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0402_03
Horowitz, J. (2017). Who is this "we" you speak of? Grounding activist identity in social psychology. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, *3*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023117717819
Isoke, Z. (2013). Framing Black women's resistance: A Black feminist intersectional approach. In Z. Isoke (Ed.), *Urban Black women and the politics of resistance* (pp. 13-36). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137045386_2
Jost, J. T., Barberá, P., Bonneau, R., Langer, M., Metzger, M., Nagler, J., Sterling, J., & Tucker, J. A. (2018). How social media facilitates political protest: Information, motivation, and social networks. *Political Psychology*, *39*(Suppl 1), 85-118. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12478
Kang, S. K., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2015). Multiple identities in social perception and interaction: Challenges and opportunities. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *66*, 547-574. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015025
Kapucu, N., & Beaudet, S. (2020). Network governance for collective action in implementing United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. *Administrative Sciences*, *10*(4), 100. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci10040100
Klandermans, B. (1997). *The social psychology of protest*. Blackwell Publishers.
Kostelka, F., & Rovny, J. (2019). It's not the left: Ideology and protest participation in old and new democracies. *Comparative Political Studies*, *52*(11), 1677-1712. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414019830717
Lantos, N. A., Kende, A., Becker, J. C., & McGarty, C. (2020). Pity for economically disadvantaged groups motivates donation and ally collective action intentions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*(7), 1478-1499. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2705
Livingstone, A. G. (2014). Why the psychology of collective action requires qualitative transformation as well as quantitative change. *Contemporary Social Science*, *9*(1), 121-134. https://doi.org/10.1080/21582041.2013.851404
Louis, W. R., Amiot, C. E., Thomas, E. F., & Blackwood, L. (2016). The "activist identity" and activism across domains: A multiple identities analysis. *Journal of Social Issues*, *72*(2), 242-263. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12165
Louis, W., Thomas, E., McGarty, C., Lizzio-Wilson, M., Amiot, C., & Moghaddam, F. (2020). The volatility of collective action: Theoretical analysis and empirical data. *Political Psychology*, *41*(S1), 35-74. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12671
Mahfud, Y., & Adam-Troian, J. (2021). "Macron demission!": Loss of significance generates violent extremism for the Yellow Vests through feelings of anomia. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *24*(1), 108-124. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430219880954
Manalastas, E. J., Wood, C., & Iyer, A. (2018, February 14). *Intentions and Behaviour in Collective Action. Protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis.* https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/A9G4Q
McAdam, D. (1982). *Political process and the development of Black insurgency: 1930-1970*. The University of Chicago Press.
Meyer, D. S. (2004). Protest and political opportunities. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *30*, 125-145. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.30.012703.110545
Meyer, D. S. (2014). *The politics of protest: Social movements in America* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
Morselli, D., Passini, S., & McGarty, C. (2021). Sos Venezuela: an analysis of the anti-Maduro protest movements using Twitter. *Social Movement Studies*, *20*(5), 509-530. https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2020.1770072
Odağ, Ö., Uluğ, Ö. M., Kanık, B., & Maganic, M. (in press). Exploring the context-sensitivity of collective action motivations and the mobilizing role of social media: A comparative interview study with activists in Germany and Turkey. *Political Psychology*.

Odağ, Ö., Uluğ, Ö. M., & Solak, N. (2016). "Everyday I'm çapuling": Identity and collective action through social network sites in the Gezi Park protests in Turkey. *Journal of Media Psychology*, *28*(3), 148-159. https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-1105/a000202

Olson, M. (1965). *The logic of collective action: Public goods and the theory of groups*. Harvard University Press.

Osborne, D., Jost, J. T., Becker, J. C., Badaan, V., & Sibley, C. G. (2019). Protesting to challenge or defend the system? A system justification perspective on collective action. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *49*, 244-269. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2522

Pelak, C. F. (2002). Women's collective identity formation in sports: A case study from women's ice hockey. *Gender & Society*, *16*(1), 93-114. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243202016001006

Polletta, F., & Jasper, J. M. (2001). Collective identity and social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *27*(1), 283-305. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.283

Prins, J., van Stekelenburg, J., Polletta, F., & Klandermans, B. (2013). Telling the collective story? Moroccan-Dutch young adults' negotiation of a collective identity through storytelling. *Qualitative Sociology*, *36*(1), 81-99. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-012-9241-5

Rees, J. H., & Bamberg, S. (2014). Climate protection needs societal change: Determinants of intention to participate in collective climate action. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *44*, 466-473. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2032

Reicher, S. (2017). "La beauté est dans la rue": Four reasons (or perhaps five) to study crowds. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *20*(5), 593-605. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217712835

Ritter, E. H., & Conrad, C. (2016). Preventing and responding to dissent: The observational challenges of explaining strategic repression. *American Political Science Review*, *110*(1), 85-99. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055415000623

Russell, G. M. (2011). Motives of heterosexual allies in collective action for equality. *Journal of Social Issues*, *67*(2), 376-393. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01703.x

Saavedra, P., & Drury, J. (2019). Including political context in the psychological analysis of collective action: Development and validation of a measurement scale for subjective political openness. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, *7*(2), 665-694. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v7i2.1030

Selvanathan, H. P., Techakesari, P., Tropp, L. R., & Barlow, F. K. (2018). Whites for racial justice: How contact with Black Americans predicts support for collective action among White Americans. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *21*(6), 893-912. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217690908

Selvanathan, H. P., Uluğ, Ö. M., & Burrows, B. (2022). *"What should White allies do?": Identifying activist perspectives on the role of White allies in the struggle for racial justice* [Manuscript submitted for publication]. School of Psychology, University of Queensland.

Simon, B., & Klandermans, B. (2001). Politicized collective identity: A social psychological analysis. *American Psychologist*, *56*(4), 319-331. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.4.319

Snow, D. A., Vliegenthart, R., & Ketelaars, P. (2019). The framing perspective on social movements: Its conceptual roots and architecture. In D. A. Snow, S. A. Soule, H. Kriesi, & H. J. McCammon (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (2nd ed., pp. 392-410). Wiley Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119168577.ch22

Sullivan, C. M., Loyle, C. E., & Davenport, C. D. (2012). The coercive weight of the past: Temporal dependence in the conflict-repression nexus. *International Interactions*, *38*(4), 426-442. https://doi.org/10.1080/03050629.2012.697005

Tabri, N., & Conway, M. (2011). Negative expectancies for the group's outcomes undermine normative collective action: Conflict between Christian and Muslim groups in Lebanon. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*, 649-669. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02071.x

Tarrow, S. (1994). *Power in movement*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511973529

Tausch, N., & Becker, J. C. (2013). Emotional reactions to success and failure of collective action as predictors of future action intentions: A longitudinal investigation in the context of student protests in Germany. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *52*(3), 525-542. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2012.02109.x

Thomas, E. F., & Louis, W. R. (2014). When will collective action be effective? Violent and non-violent protests differentially influence perceptions of legitimacy and efficacy among sympathizers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *40*(2), 263-276. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213510525

Thomas, E. F., McGarty, C., Lala, G., Stuart, A., Hall, L. J., & Goddard, A. (2015). Whatever happened to Kony 2012? Understanding a global Internet phenomenon as an emergent social identity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *45*, 356-367. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2094

Thomas, E. F., McGarty, C., & Mavor, K. I. (2009). Aligning identities, emotions, and beliefs to create commitment to sustainable social and political action. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *13*(3), 194-218. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309341563

Thomas, E. F., Zubielevitch, E., Sibley, C. G., & Osborne, D. (2020). Testing the social identity model of collective action longitudinally and across structurally disadvantaged and advantaged groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *46*(6), 823-838. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219879111

Tropp, L. R., & Brown, A. C. (2004). What benefits the group can also benefit the individual: Group-enhancing and individual-enhancing motives for collective action. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *7*(3), 267-282. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430204046111

Tropp, L. R., & Uluğ, Ö. M. (2019). Are White women showing up for racial justice? Intergroup contact, closeness to people targeted by prejudice, and collective action. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *43*(3), 335-347. https://doi.org/10.1177/0361684319840269

Uluğ, Ö. M., & Acar, Y. G. (2018). What happens after the protests? Understanding protest outcomes through multi-level social change. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *24*(1), 44-53. https://doi.org/10.1037/pac0000269

van Bezouw, M. J., Zavecz, G., Penna, C., Rijken, A. J., Klandermans, P. G., & Uluğ, Ö. M. (2019). Social psychological explanations of political inaction: Citizens' perspectives in Brazil, Hungary, and the Netherlands. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *19*(1), 381-406. https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12189

van Stekelenburg, J., & Klandermans, P. G. (2010). The social psychology of protest. *Sociopedia.isa*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1177/205684601076

van Zomeren, M., & Iyer, A. (2009). Introduction to the social and psychological dynamics of collective action. *Journal of Social Issues*, *65*(4), 645-660. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2009.01618.x

van Zomeren, M., Kutlaca, M., & Turner-Zwinkels, F. (2018). Integrating who "we" are with what "we"(will not) stand for: A further extension of the Social Identity Model of Collective Action. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *29*(1), 122-160. https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2018.1479347

van Zomeren, 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*(4), 504-535. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.4.504

van Zomeren, M., Postmes, T., & Spears, R. (2012). On conviction's collective consequences: Integrating moral conviction with the social identity model of collective action. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *51*(1), 52-71. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.2010.02000.x

Vestergren, S., Drury, J., & Chiriac, E. H. (2018). How collective action produces psychological change and how that change endures over time: A case study of an environmental campaign. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *57*(4), 855-877. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12270

Vestergren, S. K., Drury, J., & Chiriac, E. (2019). How participation in collective action changes relationships, behaviours, and beliefs: An interview study of the role of inter-and intragroup processes. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, *7*(1), 76-99. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v7i1.903

Vilar, R., Milfont, T. L., & Sibley, C. G. (2020). The role of social desirability responding in the longitudinal relations between intention and behaviour. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *70*, 101457. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101457

Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2012). *Doing Q Methodological research: Theory, method and interpretation*. Sage. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446251911

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*(6), 994-1003. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.6.994

Zeileis, A., Kleiber, C., Krämer, W., & Hornik, K. (2003). Testing and dating of structural changes in practice. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, *44*(1–2), 109-123. https://doi.org/10. 1016/S0167-9473(03)00030-6