

The Differentiation in Motivations among Participants in Candlelight Rallies to Impeach Park Geun-hye: Immediate Resignation, Impeachment and Grievance Expression

Lee Hyeon-Woo¹

Abstract— This study analyses the results of the survey conducted on 2,058 among the participants in the fifth Gwanghwamun rally held on November 26, 2016. In this survey, motivations to participate in the candlelight rally were classified into resignation, impeachment and grievance expression from the perspective that those motivations varied. First, the results of the analysis showed that there was a generational difference in the participatory motivations. There was a high ratio of grievance expression among the respondents in their teens and 20s, whereas there was a high ratio of participants calling for resignation among the 40s and 50s. Second, it was discovered that the candlelight rallies were not a political attack by progressive powers aimed at the conservative government. Third, participants with the purpose of resignation or impeachment displayed a relatively high loyalty to the rally.

Keywords— candlelight rally, participatory motivation, grievance expression, impeachment, candlelight rally participation

I. INTRODUCTION

This study intends to analyze the motivations to participate in the candlelight rallies that grew into massive mass rallies in late 2016 and early 2017, in an attempt to have an adequate understanding of the rally participants. Research on such a theme requisitely requires the comparison between participants and non-participants in the rallies. The reason is that the analysis of rally participants alone cannot produce results in which the participants' characteristics are verified to be discriminative ones. But with a little more thinking, a question can be raised about whether it is fine to regard the participants as a homogeneous group. In addition to a comparative study between participants and non-participants, a study on the differentiation in participatory motivations is essential in finding out about the characteristics and meanings of the candlelight rallies. To put it more concretely, there can be a difference in motivations to participate in the candlelight rallies; some may want Park's resignation or impeachment while others may want to express their grievances. It needs further discussion whether these participatory purposes can be seen to be exclusively associated with one another. In general, the basic motivator of rally participation was their grievances towards the

influence-peddling scandal and the rally participants can be seen as wanting to apply political pressure for a change in Park's status as president.

The starting point of this study is that not all rally participants have the same participatory motivation, just as not all people agreeing with the purpose of candlelight rallies participate in the rallies. If the frequency of participation, the efficacy of rallies and the trust differ depending on participatory motivations, there is a need for a study on participatory motivation. In recent studies on rally participation, the focus is shifting from an analysis framework, such as resource mobilization theory and rational choice theory, to the affective factor grievances (Jasper 2003; Van Zomeren et al. 2004; Stumer and Simon 2009). This study was conducted to identify that not only a purposeful motivation based on cost, benefit and the efficacy of rallies but also an expressive motivation such as grievance expression is an important factor of rally participation and that a difference in participatory motivation leads to a difference in rally participants' attitude and conduct.

II. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS STUDIES OF PARTICIPATION OF RALLIES

The fundamental question in studies on civic rallies concerns the conditions for civic rallies to occur. Social movement theories have in common that they are premised on the condition in which there exists social discontent. However, this is only a necessary condition, not a sufficient condition because not all people with social discontent are spurred into action. According to resource mobilization theory, the basic starting point is social discontent, and yet the discontent can evolve into a social movement of collective action only when accompanied by changes in resources, organization and political opportunities. And political opportunity structure theory emphasizes that social movements can succeed only when three factors such as insurgent consciousness, organizational strength and political opportunities are met (Meyer 2004). These two prominent theories regarding the occurrence of social movement are implicitly based on rational choice theory.

Entering the 2000s, there appeared numerous civic rallies by unorganized citizens who participated voluntarily, the analysis framework using social movement participation based on personal calculation of gains and losses came to have constraints in terms of explanatory power. And further studies

Lee Hyeon-Woo ¹Sogang University, Seoul, Korea

on voluntary participation began to take note of the finding that the emotion grievance towards the injustice of society becomes an important motivation to participate in protest rallies (Leach et al. 2006; van Zomerem et al. 2004). Grievances are instigating social phenomenon experiences that stimulate participatory desires in group members trying to fight against injustice. According to the new perspective regarding grievances as a participatory motivation, the emotion grievance is not a sufficient condition for movement participation, and the necessary condition of collective identity should be met for movement participation. In other words, individuals' sense of belonging to a group should be premised for movement participation because social movements are a type of collective action (Kelly and Breinlinger 1996; Simon 2004; Stürmer and Simon 2004). And empirical studies found that even when Klandermans' cost-benefit analysis is controlled, the affective factor grievances with the mediation of group identity are a useful variable in predicting the possibility of the social movement or rally participation. Other related studies also showed that the grievances at affective injustice can serve as a stronger participatory motivation than grievances resulting from other sources (Smith and Ortiz 2002; Van Zomeren et al. 2004).

Participation driven by benefit calculation is an instrumental participation, whereas participation based on group identity is an intrinsic participation based on the internal obligation of following the group's norms and purposes as a group member. It was empirically verified through various experiential studies that grievances as an emotion shared collectively are important to social movement participation, and it was also empirically found that grievances lead to participation action through a conscious and prudent decision-making process, not a spontaneous one (Simon and Klandermans 2001). However, it needs further discussion to know whether the fact that grievances become a direct motivator of social movement participation can also mean that grievances drive continuous participation. The reason is that a desire to prevent grievances from rising could operate in participants. From this perspective, the act of participating in social movements can be understood as a way to lower the grievance level through grievance expression. In other words, the complex relationship between grievances as a participatory motivation and the decision to participate in social movements can have a paradoxical aspect. On the one hand, grievances increase social movement participation, but on the other hand, the participatory motivation based on grievances weakens after grievances are expressed through social movement participation and the grievance level decreases accordingly (Stürmer and Simon 2009, 703).

III. TYPES OF PARTICIPANTS AND HYPOTHESES

Based on the discussions of theories introduced above, the analysis on motivations to participate in 2016 candlelight rallies can be presented through two pathways. First, participants with an instrumental purpose seek to achieve the purpose they pursue through rally participation. Consequently, a pathway model can be constructed in a way people decide whether to participate

through the process of calculating benefits, including the possibility to achieve a purpose. Second, another pathway model can be constructed in a way grievance expression itself affects whether to participate (Kelly and Breinlinger 1996). And the parameters of these two models indicate that both the variable efficacy and the variable social support play an important role in the instrumental participation model and the grievance expression model, respectively.

As aforementioned, the starting point of this study is the fact that not all citizens who participated in 2016 candlelight rallies at Gwanghwamun Plaza could not have the same purpose of participation. When the dual-pathway model of previous studies on social movement participation is applied to this study, participants with an instrumental motivation called for a change in Park Geun-hye's status as president, such as immediate resignation or impeachment. On the other hand, some citizens had a participatory purpose of expressing grievances and empathising with other citizens. They intended to share their grievances at the influence-peddling scandal, which was disclosed through the media, and at the reality where minimum principles of democracy were not abided by. The existence of such participants can be surmised from the fact that the rallies took place in a cultural festival-like festive mood unlike the fighting mood at previous rallies.

The analysis of this study was conducted regarding 2016 candlelight rallies, which took place through the citizens' voluntary participation. Theoretically, all participants in candlelight rallies at Gwanghwamun Plaza constitute a population of this study.

The questionnaire items used in this survey include two items to classify participatory motivations. One item directly asks respondents what their participatory motivation is. Another item asks them what they think should be done about Park's status as president. The two questionnaire items were used to classify the respondents' motivations to participate into three categories: immediate resignation, impeachment and grievance expression.² According to the classification methods of participatory motivations in the aforementioned previous studies, the motivation of respondents calling for Park's resignation or impeachment can be categorised as an instrumental purpose. And the motivation of respondents answering that grievance expression is their major reason for participation, can be categorised as having the purpose of grievance expression itself.

As shown in Table 1, around half (51%) of the rally participants placed the first priority on Park's immediate resignation. The respondents, who answered that they participated to express their grievances at the

² The three categories (resignation/impeachment/grievances expression) should be seen as measuring the relative importance of participatory motivations rather than as being exclusively associated with one another. For example, participants with the purpose of impeaching Park do not oppose the immediate resignation. And they certainly feel grievances at the influence-peddling scandal. Consequently, the participatory motivations should be viewed in terms of relative intensity.

influence-peddling scandal, occupied as much as 34.8%, or more than one out of three persons. Those who participated to achieve the goal of Park’s impeachment through legal proceedings occupied 14.2%, taking up the least portion among the three groups.

TABLE I
CLASSIFICATION OF PARTICIPANTS ACCORDING TO PARTICIPATORY MOTIVATIONS

Participatory motivation	Number of persons	Ratio (%)
Immediate resignation	934	51.0
Impeachment	261	14.2
Grievance expression	637	34.8
Total	1832	100

If there appears a difference in participants’ attitude according to the three categories of participatory motivation, the following hypotheses can be established.

Hypothesis 1: Participants with the participatory motivations of immediate resignation and impeachment had an instrumentally purposeful motivation, whereas for participants with the motivation of grievance expression, participation itself was their aim.

Hypothesis 1-1: Participants with a purposeful motivation had a higher expectation for the efficacy of candlelight rallies (the degree of effects on Park’s status as president) than participants with the participatory motivation of grievance expression.

Hypothesis 1-2: Participants with a purposeful motivation had a stronger will to participate in subsequent rallies than participants with the motivation of grievance expression.

Hypothesis 1-3: Participants calling for immediate resignation had a higher expectation for the efficacy of candlelight rallies than participants calling for impeachment.

IV. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS

A. Diversity of Participatory Motivations

Whether classifying rally participants according to their participatory motivations is meaningful depends on whether there is a difference in the characteristics of the classified participants. Accordingly, the differentiation in participants according to their participatory motivations was examined. As shown in Table 2, there was a high rate of grievance expression among participants in their teens and 20s, while there was a high rate of impeachment among participants in their 40s and 50s. Such results refute the claim by some people that the candlelight rallies were politically driven. There is a claim that the purpose of the candlelight rallies was for progressive powers to politically attack the conservative government. According to this claim, the rate of participants calling for Park’s impeachment should be higher among the youth with a stronger progressive tendency. However, the empirical data shows the opposite.

The difference in the generational distribution of participatory motivations can be explained in terms of generational tendencies and political experiences. Youth in their teens and 20s have a higher immediate reactivity to phenomena compared to other age groups, and youth is a period when people feel more indignation at injustice. In addition, they are not used to making political calculations yet. They are less interested in political outcomes of rallies. These explain their higher rate of grievance expression compared to other age groups. In contrast, participants in their 40s and 50s, who are more familiar with politics, not only expressed their grievances towards the influence-peddling scandal but also demanded Park’s resignation as a way to deal with the scandal. Due to the generational difference in the familiarity with politics, grievance expression was the strongest participatory motivation among participants in their teens and 20s, whereas resignation was the strongest participatory motivation among participants in their 40s and 50s.

TABLE II
GENERATIONAL DISTRIBUTION BY PARTICIPATORY MOTIVATION (%)

Participatory motivation	Teens	20s	30s	40s	50s	60s	Number of persons
Resignation	10.2	22.5	15.9	27.3	19.0	5.2	932
Impeachment	18.5	26.9	15.8	24.6	10.8	3.5	260
Grievance expression	23.7	35.8	14.4	14.9	8.5	2.7	637
Total	16.1	27.8	15.4	22.6	14.2	4.0	1829

Table 3 shows the results of cross-analysis of the degree of political participation experiences against participatory motivations. The analysis was conducted in an attempt to verify the previous argument that the generational difference in participatory motivations result from the difference in political experiences. The degree of political participation experiences was measured by asking respondents if they have participated in the four given major types of political activities and adding up the number of activities.³ As shown in Table 3, a mere 12.3% had three or four types of political participation experiences among those with the participatory motivation of expressing grievances. By comparison, 22.7% and 21.7% were found to have three or four types of political participation experiences among those calling for Park’s resignation and impeachment, respectively. Consequently, there was a 10% difference in the degree of political participation experiences between those with a purposeful motivation (resignation/impeachment) and those with the motivation of expressing grievances. As much as 62% had little political participation experience (none or 1 type) among the participants with the motivation of expressing grievances, while around 50% did among the participants with a purposeful motivation. These results indicate a considerable difference.

³ In terms of the content of political participation, it was considered that contacting a politician and the like can be a rare experience for youth. For this reason, an analysis was conducted excluding respondents in their 20s and 30s. However, the results of the analysis were not significantly different from those of the analysis that included them.

TABLE III
POLITICAL PARTICIPATION EXPERIENCES AND PARTICIPATORY MOTIVATION (%)

Classification of motivations	Participatory motivation	None					Number of persons
		1 type	2 types	3 types	4 types	5 types	
Purposeful	Resignation	24.4	30.6	22.3	14.2	8.5	844
	Impeachment	18.8	33.9	25.5	14.2	7.5	239
Expressive	Grievance expression	27.9	34.3	25.6	8.5	3.8	610
Total		24.9	32.4	23.9	12.2	6.7	1693

Question: Have you performed any of the following activities? Contacting a political party or a politician/Providing your signature/Recommending or encouraging participation in a rally/Making a protest call or writing a protest comment on the internet

There was a claim that the candlelight rallies were driven by a political slant. Some claimed that although the rallies were participated by ordinary citizens, supporters of opposition parties such as the Minjoo Party of Korea and the Justice Party politically participated to strongly call for Park’s resignation or impeachment. If this claim is true, classification of supporters according to political parties they support would display a clear difference in their participatory purposes. As shown in Table 4 below, supporters of the Saenuri Party accounted for less than 1% of the entire respondents, a very low figure, whereas supports of the Justice Party occupied 24.8%, a considerably high figure.⁴ In terms of the rate of rally participants by political party of support, the rate of participants supporting an opposition party was far higher than that of the participants supporting the ruling party. However, one cannot assert that the candlelight rallies were a political attack aimed at the conservative government that was led by opposition party leaders, simply based on the rate of the political party that participants support. It should be taken into consideration that the rallies were held to criticize the conservative government’s maladministration case and that civic rallies are traditionally participated by a high rate of people with a progressive tendency. Table 4 shows that the distribution of participants according to their participatory purposes for each political party of support is similar among different political parties and the group of political independents, except for the Justice Party.⁵ Such results allow a different interpretation than when a judgement is made based solely on the rate of participation by political party of support. Because the participatory purposes of rally participants, including political independents, do not differ according the political party they support, with the exception of the Justice Party, a judgement can be made that their

⁴ According to the nationwide Gallop research (Nov. 24) performed on the same period of this survey, the distribution of political party support was as follows: the Saenuri Party (12%); the Minjoo Party of Korea (34%); the People’s Party (16%); the Justice Party (7%); and None/Reserved opinion (30%).

⁵ When a statistical analysis is performed, excluding supports of the Justice Party, the value of chi-square is 5.16 (df=8), and the p value is 0.74. This indicates that there is no difference in the distribution of participatory motivations among different groups of political supports, with the exception of supports of the Justice Party.

participatory purposes are not partisan.

TABLE IV
POLITICAL PARTY OF SUPPORT AND PARTICIPATORY PURPOSE (%)

Political party of support	Total rates	Participatory purpose			Number of persons
		Resignation	Impeachment	Grievance expression	
Saenuri Party	0.9	47.1	17.6	35.3	17
The Minjoo Party of Korea	30.5	47.7	13.8	38.5	514
The People’s Party	13.3	46.1	16.1	37.8	230
Justice Party	24.8	60.1	15.1	24.8	436
Other Parties	12.3	51.3	14.4	34.4	195
Political independents	18.3	53.2	11.7	35.1	325
Total	100.0	52.1	14.2	33.8	1,717

B. Participatory Motivations and Loyalty to Rallies

This study’s categorisation of participatory motivations can contribute to analysing meanings of the candlelight rallies against Park by showing that participants’ expectation regarding the rallies and intention of continuous participation can be differentiated according to participatory motivations. The grievance level in this state of affairs is expected to be highest among the group calling for Park’s immediate resignation on the basis of the general finding that the basic motivator of rally participation is grievances. The reason is that the participatory purpose of the group calling for the immediate resignation was the strongest in terms of the demand level. If the same logic is applied, the grievance level is expected to be next highest among the group calling for Park’s impeachment and relatively low among the group whose primary participatory motivation is grievance expression.

Members of a group sharing a purposeful motivation have faith that they can achieve a goal by participating in rallies. It is expected that the stronger the faith is, the stronger their loyalty to the group is. If this logic is converted to the level of operational definition, members of a group calling for Park’s resignation or impeachment would think that the rallies will have a large effect on Park’s status as president. And their intention of continuous participation is highly likely to be maintained even when the rallies are suppressed by outside pressure. If these hypotheses are valid, members of a group sharing a participatory purpose will have the intention to participate continuously in rallies until their purpose is achieved. In contrast, with regard to participants with the purpose of expressing grievances, their participatory motivation would weaken once their grievances have been expressed. It is also expected that they would participate in a smaller number of rallies and have a relatively weak faith that rally participation would affect Park’s status as president. And it can be surmised that they have a relatively weaker intention of continuous participation if there is external interference.

As is expected, the group calling for Park’s resignation displayed a higher level of grievance towards the influence-peddling scandal than the two other groups. Although there was a difference in the grievance level between the group

calling for Park’s impeachment and the group with the motivation of expressing grievances, the difference was not at a statistically significant level. Consequently, there is a possibility that the level of participants’ grievance could lead to a difference in purposes they try to achieve through candlelight rallies.

TABLE V
PARTICIPATORY MOTIVATIONS AND THE GRIEVANCE LEVEL

Classification of motivations	Participatory motivation	Average grievances	Number of persons	Statistical results (ANOVA, p=.00)
Purposeful	Resignation	9.50	929	
	Impeachment	9.32	259	
Expressive	Grievance expression	9.23	629	

If the grievance level affects participatory motivations, then participants’ attitude towards rallies can differ as well according to participatory motivations. To analyze this, two factors were chosen to measure participants’ attitude towards the rallies that

TABLE VI
PARTICIPATORY MOTIVATION, LOYALTY TO RALLIES AND PERCEIVED EFFICACY OF RALLIES

Classification of Motivations	Participatory motivation	In case of an armed clash with the police			Influence of the candlelight rallies on Park’s status as president				Number of persons
		Continue to participate	Depending on circumstances	Do not participate	Considerable influence	Some influence	little influence	No influence	
Purposeful	Resignation	66.9	31.3	1.8	49.6	41.6	7.9	0.9	933
	Impeachment	61.7	34.9	3.4	34.5	52.9	11.9	0.8	261
Expressive	Grievance expression	50.3	44.2	5.5	29.4	55.2	14.2	1.3	636
Total		60.4	36.3	3.3	40.4	47.9	10.7	1.0	1830

Table 6 shows the results of the empirical analysis regarding the hypotheses above. Overall, participants’ loyalty to the rallies was found to be considerably high. As much as 60.4% of all respondents said they would continue to participate in case of armed suppression by the police. Only 3.3% said they would not participate in case of an armed clash with the police. The average value of participants’ grievances amounted to 9.3 out of 10, indicating considerable grievances. And the president’s plunging approval rating and a positive public opinion towards the candlelight rallies led participants to perceive the candlelight rallies as justifiable. When participants’ loyalty to rallies is examined according to their participatory motivations, a considerable difference is found among the three groups. In the group calling for Park’s resignation, around 66.9% had an intention of continuous participation, indicating the highest level of loyalty, whereas only around a half had an intention of continuous participation in the group having the motivation of expressing grievances. And when participants with a purposeful motivation, such as Park’s resignation or impeachment and participants with an expressive motivation to express grievances are compared, there is a more than 10 percentage point difference in loyalty to rallies between the two groups of participants.

With regard to the perceived efficacy of rallies, overall, as much as 88.3% of all respondents said the candlelight rallies would affect Park’s status as president. The first rally of around 50,000 people, held in October, swelled up explosively to a massive

were presented in Hypotheses 1 and 2. Participants’ loyalty to the rallies was measured with a variable, that is, a question asking if they would continue to participate in case of an armed clash between rally participants and the police. And the perceived efficacy of rallies was measured by using the degree they believe the rallies can affect Park’s status as president. The group seeking to achieve Park’s resignation by participating in rallies is expected to have the highest level of trust towards the rallies among the three groups because their demand level is the highest. Accordingly, the group is expected to maintain the highest participatory motivation to continue to participate even when there is an armed clash with the police and is also expected to have the highest level of expectation regarding the effects of rallies on Park’s status as president. As seen here, it is considered that the loyalty to rallies and the perceived efficacy of rallies will be highest among the group calling for Park’s resignation, the group calling for Park’s impeachment and the group wanting to express grievances in descending order.

rally of a million people in late November, just in five rounds because rally participation was the only lawful way citizens could apply political pressure directly on the president.⁶ And it is natural for rally participants to expect that the rallies would bring about change because they have paid the cost of participating in rallies, beyond merely agreeing with the rallies. At a time like this, when an absolute majority perceive the efficacy of rallies as positive, the dichotomous division into positive and negative attitudes cannot show a difference in the perceived efficacy of rallies according to participatory motivations. Nonetheless, the answer option ‘There will be considerable effects’, was chosen by 49.6% of the group with the purpose of making Park resign from office. And the figure is more than twice the percentage of those (29.4%) who chose the answer option among the group with an expressive motivation. The group calling for Park’s impeachment was in between the two groups. Consequently, it can be seen that the intensity of perceived efficacy of rallies was remarkably high in the group calling for Park’s resignation. These results show that the stronger demand a group made in terms of Park’s status as president, the higher the group’s perceived efficacy of rallies was, in the same way as previously seen.

⁶ After the fifth rally, the impeachment motion was passed at the National Assembly and the Park’s status as president did not change. Whether participants’ perceived efficacy of rallies lasted as before is a theme that needs detailed further analysis.

V.SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study is to show that in conducting an empirical analysis of the candlelight rally participants, it is necessary to prove that the participatory motivations are differentiated and the attitude towards the rallies differ among the participants. Subjects for analysis can be considered as a group when the group members have homogeneity. If a group is considered as a homogeneous one despite a considerable heterogeneity inside the group, it is certain to produce erroneous results. With regard to the participatory motivations of participants in the candlelight rallies against Park Geun-hye, it was found that only about a half, or 51% of the participants, had a purpose to accomplish Park's impeachment. And around 34.8% had the primary purpose of expressing grievances towards the influence-peddling scandal. This study has confirmed that there was a statistically significant difference in participants' attitude towards rallies and loyalty to rallies according to participatory motivations, thus showing that classifying participatory motivations was a meaningful task. It is natural for the analysis of the candlelight rallies to begin with the question 'who participated in the rally?' And a more sophisticated question for the analysis would be what participatory motivations participants had and if a difference in the motivations affected their attitude towards rally participation. Through these questions and answers, the characteristics of the candlelight rallies will be adequately identified.

What was confirmed by setting hypotheses and conducting an empirical analysis in this study can be summarised as follows. First, there was a difference in the distribution of participatory motivations according to different generations. There was a high rate of participants with the purpose of expressing grievances among respondents in their teens and 20s, whereas there was a high rate of participants with the immediate impeachment purpose among respondents in their 40s and 50s. Such a difference was related to political participation experiences, and it appears that younger generations were at the stage of expressing grievances because they were beginning to have earnest interest in politics. Second, it was found that the candlelight rallies were not a political attack by progressive powers aimed at the conservative government. When the participants were classified according to the political party they supported, the difference in participatory motivations was not statistically significant. And there was no statistically significant difference between participants who supported a political party and political independents. Third, participants with a purposeful motivation (resignation or impeachment) displayed a high degree of loyalty to rallies. The rate of participants, who said they would continue to participate when there is an armed conflict with the police, was highest among the participants calling for Park's resignation and lowest among the participants with the purpose of expressing grievances. Fourth, the expectation for the efficacy of rallies was also found to be highest among the participants calling for Park's resignation. Only 8.8% of them said the rallies would not influence on Park's

presidential status. Last, it was discovered that it was more valid to conduct an analysis on the degree of participants' will to participate further with the data from classified participants according to participatory motivations than with the data from the entire participants. And the efficacy of the candlelight rallies was found to be a meaningful variable for participants with the resignation purpose, whereas it did not have a statistically significant effect for participants with the purpose of expressing grievances.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kelly, Caroline, and Sara Breinlinger. 1996. *The Social Psychology of Collective Action: Identity, Injustice and Gender*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- [2] Lee, Jiho, Lee Hyeon-woo, and Seo Bok-kyeong. 2017. *The Inside and Outside of the Impeachment Square*. Seoul: Chaekdam.
- [3] Mackie, Diane M., Thierry Devos, and Eliot R. Smith. 2000. "Intergroup Emotions: Explaining Offensive Action Tendencies in an Intergroup Context." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79 (4): 602–612.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.79.4.602>
- [4] Meyer, David S. 2004. "Protest and Political Opportunities," *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 125–145.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.30.012703.110545>
- [5] Simon, Bernd, and Bert Klandermans. 2001. "Politicized Collective Identity: A Social Psychological Analysis." *American Psychologist* 56 (4): 319–331.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.56.4.319>
- [6] Simon, Bernd. 2004. *Identity in Modern Society: A Social Psychological Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470773437>
- [7] Smith, Heather J., and Daniel J. Ortiz. 2002. "Is It Just Me? The Different Consequences of Personal and Group Relative Deprivation." In *Relative Deprivation: Specification, Development and Integration*, edited by Iain Walker and Heather J. Smith, 91–115. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Van Zomeren, Martijn, Russell Spears, Agneta H. Fischer, and Colin Wayne Leach. 2004. "Put your money where your mouth is! Explaining collective action tendencies through group-based anger and group efficacy." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 87 (5): 649–664.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.5.649>