Digital Activism and Collective Mobilization: A Narrative Review of Social Identity, Group Efficacy, and the SIMCA Framework

Muhammad Nur Ali
Universitas Tadulako, Indonesia
Correspondent: muhammadnurali24@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Collective action has long been driven by social psychological mechanisms, particularly collective identity and group efficacy. This narrative review examines the interplay of identity, emotion, and structural conditions in predicting participation in collective mobilization. Drawing on empirical findings from multiple cross-national studies, the review integrates qualitative and quantitative insights to understand how emotional catalysts and digital narratives reinforce collective identification. The methodology involved a systematic review of studies indexed in Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, using key terms such as "collective action," "social identity," and "group efficacy." Inclusion criteria prioritized peer-reviewed journal articles that employed mixed-method approaches to examine protest dynamics, psychological predictors, and digital activism. The findings confirm that strong social identity, group efficacy, and collective emotion (especially anger and hope) serve as principal motivators for collective participation. However, participation is also mediated by internal constraints such as identity misalignment, and external structural barriers such as authoritarianism, resource scarcity, and cultural repression. Digital media has emerged as a crucial enabler, reinforcing group solidarity and mobilization narratives. These insights underline the importance of inclusive, context-sensitive policies and interdisciplinary strategies in overcoming systemic impediments to mobilization. Future studies should address variations across cultural and geopolitical contexts and explore how technological innovation can facilitate equitable collective engagement. Understanding the synergy between psychological and structural determinants is essential for advancing sustainable collective action. This review integrates structural and emotional perspectives into an expanded Social Identity Model of Collective Action (SIMCA), highlighting underexplored links between digital engagement and sustained mobilization. Policy implications include enhancing digital infrastructure for civic participation and designing emotionally resonant campaigns for marginalized groups.

Keywords: Collective Action; Social Identity; Group Efficacy; Digital Activism; Structural Barriers; Emotional Mobilization; Participatory Policy.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, collective action and social identity have reemerged as central themes in the study of societal responses to injustice, instability, and political repression. The growing relevance of these topics is underscored by the increasing frequency and intensity of social mobilization across both global and local settings. Empirical research indicates that collective action has become a common mode of resistance against authoritarian governance and structural inequities (Jiménez-Moya et al., 2018; Choma et al., 2024). Scholars argue that key psychological mechanisms, such as perceived injustice, group efficacy, and shared social identity, function as the driving forces behind the initiation and sustainability of these actions (Castro-Abril et al., 2021; Costa et al., 2023).

Concurrently, the proliferation of digital communication platforms has transformed the landscape of collective action, enabling rapid information dissemination and the construction of shared narratives that reinforce group cohesion and mobilization (Chan, 2016; Choma et al., 2024). Social media platforms are now pivotal tools for organizing protests and generating collective awareness, thus deepening the interplay between information technology and civic engagement. This shift signifies not only a new modality in the organization of social movements but also highlights the changing nature of identity formation and public discourse in digital societies (Pozzi et al., 2022).

Empirical data corroborate these developments. Quantitative and qualitative studies have documented a surge in protest events and mass mobilizations in diverse sociopolitical contexts, driven largely by escalating public perceptions of injustice and eroding trust in governmental institutions (Costa et al., 2023; Perugorría & Tejerina, 2013). Social identity theory and meta-analytic findings consistently reveal that group identification, collective emotions such as anger and hope, and ideological alignment significantly correlate with individuals' willingness to participate in collective efforts (Wlodarczyk et al., 2017; Freel & Bilali, 2022).

Furthermore, recent research identifies a paradigm shift in collective action from reactive to proactive orientations, reflecting not only immediate grievances but also deeper expressions of collective aspirations and societal values (Jiménez-Moya et al., 2018; Pozzi et al., 2022). This evolution is accompanied by heightened emotional engagement and creative activism, as well as new forms of participation facilitated through digital ecosystems (Castro-Abril et al., 2021; Chan, 2016).

Despite these developments, collective action is not without significant challenges. Studies highlight that sustaining participant engagement over time remains problematic, often due to emotional fatigue, insufficient resources, or internal group fragmentation (Blackwood & Louis, 2011; Saab et al., 2014). Ideological divergence, regional and cultural disparities, and inadequate communication strategies further complicate the efficacy and longevity of social movements (Zomeren, 2016; Freel & Bilali, 2022).

Communication barriers, particularly in digital settings, are frequently cited as impediments to cohesive mobilization. Variances in narrative interpretation, conflicting media representations, and the risk of digital polarization threaten internal solidarity and public legitimacy (Chan, 2016; Choma

et al., 2024). Moreover, structural limitations such as state repression, economic constraints, and logistical hurdles pose additional barriers that hinder strategic coordination and sustained mobilization (Blackwood & Louis, 2011; Costa et al., 2023).

Although the literature on collective action has expanded, critical gaps remain. Existing models often fail to integrate the multifaceted interactions between psychological, emotional, and structural dimensions of collective action (Gulliver et al., 2023; Stuart et al., 2018). Most theoretical frameworks emphasize either reactive emotional triggers or ideological constructs but do not adequately address the synergistic roles of group efficacy, shared identity, and external constraints in sustaining mobilization efforts (Jiménez-Moya et al., 2018; Saab et al., 2014).

This review aims to synthesize and critically evaluate the existing literature on collective action, with a specific focus on addressing these theoretical and empirical gaps. It seeks to clarify the interdependencies between social identity, perceived injustice, and collective efficacy, while also incorporating insights from interdisciplinary perspectives including psychology, sociology, and media studies (Shafi & Ran, 2021). The review highlights the need for more nuanced models that can accommodate both micro-level emotional processes and macro-level structural factors.

The geographical scope of this review encompasses both Global North and Global South contexts, with an emphasis on underrepresented regions and marginalized populations. By examining case studies involving diverse demographic groups—including women, ethnic minorities, informal workers, and transgender individuals—the review intends to offer a more inclusive and globally relevant understanding of collective mobilization (Sexton & Jenness, 2016; Alcalde-González et al., 2022). The goal is to bridge the existing gaps in literature by incorporating localized experiences and structural particularities into broader theoretical frameworks, ultimately contributing to a more holistic and actionable understanding of collective action dynamics in contemporary society.

Despite growing research on collective action, limited studies fully integrate emotional, psychological, and structural dimensions in a single framework. This review addresses that gap by synthesizing the interconnection between identity formation, emotional catalysts, digital media, and systemic barriers.

METHOD

This study employs a comprehensive and systematic literature review methodology designed to capture the multifaceted dynamics of collective action and social identity. The research draws upon well-established databases and advanced search techniques to ensure the breadth, depth, and credibility of the reviewed literature. The methodology was constructed based on critical insights from prior research in social psychology and social movements, ensuring a robust and replicable framework.

The literature for this narrative review was gathered using three major academic databases: Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. These platforms were selected due to their expansive coverage, rigorous indexing protocols, and advanced search functionalities. Scopus, in particular, provided access to a wide array of peer-reviewed journals across disciplines, allowing for comprehensive exploration of psychological and sociological dimensions of collective action. Web of Science offered robust citation analysis tools, enabling the identification of high-impact articles pivotal to the development of theories such as the Social Identity Model of Collective Action (SIMCA). Google Scholar supplemented this approach by providing access to grey literature, including theses and preprints, thus broadening the scope of inquiry beyond formally indexed publications.

To identify relevant studies, a strategic combination of keywords was employed. The core search terms included "collective action", "social identity", "group efficacy", "mobilization", "protest participation", and "social movements". These terms were combined using Boolean operators (AND, OR, NOT) to refine the results. For instance, expressions like ("collective action" AND "social identity") or ("group efficacy" AND "protest mobilization") were used to locate literature specifically examining the interplay between identity and participation in collective movements. Additional keywords such as "digital activism", "social media mobilization", and "identity fusion" were incorporated to reflect the contemporary relevance of digital contexts and emotional drivers in collective engagement.

The inclusion criteria for literature selection were as follows: (1) studies published in peer-reviewed journals or reputable academic sources; (2) studies that explicitly addressed concepts related to collective action, group identity, or mobilization; (3) articles published in English; and (4) articles that provided empirical data, theoretical models, or comprehensive conceptual discussions relevant to the research focus. Exclusion criteria included: (1) publications without substantial academic rigor, such as opinion pieces or non-peer-reviewed reports; (2) articles not addressing the psychological or sociological dimensions of collective action; and (3) duplicate studies across multiple databases.

The types of research included in this review span across quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-methods studies. These encompass experimental studies, longitudinal cohort analyses, case studies, and theoretical discussions. The inclusion of diverse methodological approaches enabled a holistic understanding of how collective identity and perceived group efficacy influence engagement in social movements.

The literature selection process involved multiple stages. Initially, a broad search was conducted using the identified keywords across all three databases. Results were then filtered based on relevance, as indicated by title and abstract screening. Articles deemed relevant underwent full-text review to assess their alignment with the study's inclusion criteria. Citation tracking was also used to locate seminal works and identify newer studies that referenced influential publications. This iterative process ensured that the selected literature not only met methodological standards but also contributed significantly to the theoretical framework of the study.

All parameters of the literature search, including keyword combinations, applied filters, and the number of results from each database, were meticulously documented to ensure transparency and reproducibility. The literature was then thematically coded into categories such as identity dynamics, emotional antecedents, group efficacy, and structural influences on mobilization. This categorization facilitated the identification of thematic patterns and gaps in the literature, forming the basis for further analysis.

In summary, the methodology integrates structured keyword strategies, rigorous inclusion criteria, and the use of advanced academic databases to ensure a comprehensive and credible foundation for analyzing the dynamics of collective action and social identity. By employing citation tracking and thematic coding, the study provides a nuanced synthesis of existing knowledge while identifying opportunities for future research. This approach underscores the methodological rigor essential for advancing scholarship in the field of social movements and collective behavior.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of this narrative review are synthesized based on a wide range of literature that examines the intricate interplay between collective action and social identity. The findings are organized into three major thematic sections: (a) Main Findings, (b) Specific Influencing Factors, and (c) Global Perspectives or International Comparisons. Each section highlights key empirical and theoretical insights supported by both quantitative and qualitative evidence.

(a) Main Findings

A dominant theme in the collective action literature is the role of collective social identity and group efficacy as primary drivers of protest participation and social mobilization. Jiménez-Moya et al. (2018) provide robust evidence showing that individuals who may not directly identify as victims of injustice can develop a shared identity with a larger group, leading to enhanced collective efficacy. Their findings demonstrate a statistically significant positive correlation between group efficacy perceptions and the intensity of protest participation across different sociopolitical contexts.

Castro-Abril et al. (2021) further reveal that participants in collective actions consistently report significantly higher levels of social identification than non-participants. Quantitative analysis in their study supports a strong correlation between perceived injustice and protest involvement. Moreover, collective emotional experiences, particularly emotional synchrony among group members, significantly bolster the strength of these actions. Emotions such as anger and hope act as mediators linking perceived injustice to protest behavior, a dynamic confirmed through qualitative analysis (Stuart et al., 2018).

The emotional component is further substantiated by Stuart et al. (2018), who observed that anger often catalyzes the intensity of action among core protest groups, even when identity constraints and efficacy limitations act as barriers. Their findings underline that both negative and positive emotions play simultaneous roles in legitimizing collective action.

Alcalde-González et al. (2022) emphasize the role of digital platforms in strengthening shared identity and facilitating group mobilization. Empirical data indicate that digitally integrated groups report higher participation levels, demonstrating a positive relationship between online engagement and mobilization intensity. These findings support earlier studies that identify social identity and group efficacy as significant predictors of collective action.

Castro-Abril et al. (2021) present compelling path analysis results indicating that group efficacy mediates the relationship between social identity and protest legitimacy. This reinforces the argument that collective social identity is a crucial variable influencing mobilization, validated through a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods.

Other studies explore the influence of group-based anger on collective action, underscoring the cohesion between emotion, identity, and injustice within a holistic theoretical model (Jiménez-Moya et al., 2018; Castro-Abril et al., 2021). The model, validated through structural equation modeling (SEM), demonstrates consistent empirical support across varied social contexts.

Qualitative interviews further confirm that the sense of togetherness and solidarity derived from group identification serves as a strong motivator for sustained participation in collective movements (Castro-Abril et al., 2021). These insights are complemented by survey data illustrating similar distributions of identity and efficacy scores among voluntary participants.

Narratives and collective historical memories also play a pivotal role in solidifying social identity, especially when historical narratives are used to reframe injustices (Freel & Bilali, 2022). The integration of these narratives within media discourse strengthens the emotional and identity-based dimensions of collective engagement.

Empirical field data also affirm that perceived structural injustice correlates with elevated solidarity levels and increased participation rates, particularly when trust in institutions is low (Jiménez-Moya et al., 2018). Regression analysis reveals statistically significant beta coefficients linking perceived injustice to protest participation.

Stuart et al. (2018) note that communication barriers and unclear group values can dilute the effect of social identity on participation. Qualitative evidence indicates that inconsistencies between messaging and group norms reduce mobilization efficacy.

Statistical tests comparing participant and non-participant groups further highlight significant differences in perceived injustice, emotion, and social identification, confirming identity as a fundamental mobilizing factor (Castro-Abril et al., 2021).

(b) Specific Influencing Factors

Various social, economic, and cultural factors significantly shape collective action outcomes. Kurland & McCaffrey (2016) argue that access to resources and supportive networks enhances a group's ability to organize and mobilize. Structural conditions such as economic distribution often determine mobilization potential.

Sexton & Jenness (2016), examining the collective identity formation among transgender individuals in prison, highlight how institutional culture and shared oppression histories influence

identity development. Their qualitative findings demonstrate that collective identity in marginalized communities is intricately tied to historical and cultural narratives.

Leadership structures also play a critical role in collective action success. Effective leaders translate individual grievances into cohesive agendas, while weak leadership contributes to internal fragmentation (Kurland & McCaffrey, 2016).

Economic disparities directly correlate with protest intensity, where income inequality and poverty indexes serve as significant predictors of mobilization levels. These findings are supported by robust statistical analysis (Kurland & McCaffrey, 2016).

Cultural values shape collective responses to public policies and discrimination. In societies with strong familial ties, social solidarity and protest intensity are notably higher. This is substantiated by qualitative interviews illustrating how local norms structure collective behavior (Sexton & Jenness, 2016).

Internal and external structural dimensions—group identity, collective emotion, government regulation, and political pressure—offer a framework for understanding mobilization at both micro and macro levels (Kurland & McCaffrey, 2016).

Social interactions and networks significantly influence mobilization efficacy. Densely connected groups exhibit higher coordination and awareness, indicating that collective efficacy is embedded within social relationships.

Qualitative findings emphasize that solidarity and empathy among group members are closely tied to specific cultural and historical contexts, reaffirming the importance of cultural values in shaping collective motivations.

Theoretical models integrating these diverse factors enhance predictive accuracy for collective action. The interaction of structural and psychological dimensions is crucial to understanding the complexities of mobilization dynamics.

(c) Global Perspectives or International Comparisons

Reichert et al. (2023) document how protest strategies in Hong Kong adapt to state repression, demonstrating that political context influences both participation levels and mobilization modes. Their empirical findings underscore the importance of institutional frameworks.

Choma et al. (2024) find that indicators of injustice and efficacy vary in impact depending on a country's political culture. Using multi-level modeling, they show that while theory remains consistent, its application differs across national settings.

In high-uncertainty political environments, collective identity scores are significantly higher due to shared threat perceptions. This has been validated through cross-national statistical modeling.

Digital mobilization techniques differ by country, influenced by technological infrastructure and media culture. Studies by Bernroider et al. (2022) and Chan (2016) show that media platforms can both enhance and obstruct identity formation and perceived efficacy.

Keshavarzi et al. (2021) highlight that in politically fragmented contexts like Iran, social identity and perceived injustice are stronger predictors of action than in stable systems. These findings call for context-specific research adaptations.

Developing countries focus more on economic and social inequality, while developed countries emphasize political identity and historical narratives. Longitudinal data confirm divergent trends in response to global shifts.

Ayanian & Tausch (2016) compare Egypt to more open systems and find that repression intensifies identity-based mobilization. Qualitative data and statistical variance analyses support these conclusions.

Shafi & Ran (2021) argue that digital networks have globalized mobilization strategies, reducing the relevance of geographical boundaries. Their study suggests a need for more inclusive collective action theories.

Odag et al. show that the influence of digital activism varies with digital literacy and information policy, further complicating the role of media in identity and efficacy.

In conclusion, the global perspective reveals that while foundational theories of collective action remain applicable, local political, cultural, and technological contexts critically shape both strategy and outcomes. The synthesis of empirical and theoretical insights across contexts builds a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of collective action and social identity.

The findings of this study reaffirm the central role of social identity construction and group efficacy in motivating participation in collective action. This aligns with the theoretical framework of the Social Identity Model of Collective Action (SIMCA), which emphasizes the importance of identity and perceived efficacy as key predictors of mobilization (Jiménez-Moya et al., 2018). The empirical data reinforce Jiménez-Moya et al.'s claim that strengthening social identity not only galvanizes support from marginalized groups but also activates solidarity from individuals indirectly affected by authoritarian policies. This is evidenced by the positive correlation between perceived group efficacy and the intensity of participation across different social contexts.

The integration of both qualitative interviews and survey data further illustrates that emotions, particularly anger and hope, mediate the relationship between perceived injustice and collective action (Stuart et al., 2018). These emotional responses are consistent with Stuart et al.'s qualitative findings, which highlight that feelings of unfairness and anger catalyze collective reactions, despite internal barriers such as misalignment between personal identity and group norms. This affirms the conceptual theory of emotional mediation and supports the idea that collective emotions serve as motivational forces in mobilization.

Media's role, particularly social media, also emerges as a critical agent in building collective narratives and identity, as suggested by Alcalde-González et al. (2022). Their findings confirm that digital interaction enhances collective identification and mobilization offline. This synergy between digital activism and real-world protest underlines the increasingly hybrid nature of modern collective action. The positive association between online engagement and mobilization intensity echoes existing digital activism literature, demonstrating that media platforms can amplify emotional resonance and collective goals.

Moreover, the study underscores that effective collective action is contingent not only on the presence of identity and emotional motivation but also on the belief in the group's capacity to enact change. Empirical evidence supports the argument that strong social identity combined with high group efficacy predicts loyalty to ongoing activism (Jiménez-Moya et al., 2018). The findings validate the interconnectedness of identity and efficacy as mutually reinforcing constructs essential for legitimacy and sustained participation in collective efforts.

Nevertheless, the research also reveals limitations within existing theoretical frameworks. Stuart et al. (2018) noted that personal dissonance with collective values can inhibit participation, even when emotional triggers such as anger are present. This internal conflict points to the need for more nuanced understanding of identity misalignment, especially among non-activist populations who exhibit ambivalence despite high emotional motivation. Thus, the study highlights a conceptual gap that necessitates further exploration of individual-level constraints and their interplay with collective narratives.

Furthermore, Castro-Abril et al. (2021) illustrate that local context and group dynamics significantly influence the effectiveness of identity-based mobilization. While social identification generally correlates with participation, variations in cultural context or group cohesion may moderate this relationship. These findings imply that existing models must incorporate structural and cultural variables as moderating factors, thus promoting a more interdisciplinary approach that accounts for regional diversity and situational specificity.

While the literature largely supports the theoretical triad of identity, efficacy, and emotion, emerging evidence points to the complexity and context-dependence of these interactions. The combination of qualitative and quantitative data in this study strengthens the validity of interdisciplinary perspectives that integrate psychological, social, and digital dimensions of collective action (Jiménez-Moya et al., 2018; Alcalde-González et al., 2022).

However, as Stuart et al. (2018) noted, certain barriers are not adequately captured by traditional psychological variables. External structural constraints, such as state repression or institutional resistance, play a substantial role in shaping collective behavior. This calls for an expansion of current models to include macro-level factors that influence group mobilization and sustain or inhibit protest movements. Accordingly, incorporating structural variables enhances the explanatory power of these models and aligns them with real-world complexities.

Digital media's influence, as corroborated by Alcalde-González et al. (2022), affirms its role as both a conduit for identity construction and a mobilization tool. Platforms such as Twitter and Facebook facilitate narrative formation and enable rapid dissemination of movement goals, which intensifies collective cohesion. These findings reinforce claims in digital activism literature that online spaces have become pivotal in shaping the emotional and cognitive frameworks of protest (Alcalde-González et al., 2022).

The study also confirms that differences in emotional response between activists and non-activists influence mobilization patterns. Castro-Abril et al. (2021) found that active participants reported higher levels of identification and emotional resonance, which translated into more sustained engagement. These results suggest that emotional depth, coupled with identification, can predict

levels of activism and commitment, supporting previous findings about emotional catalysts in social movements.

Contextual and cultural variables further differentiate collective action dynamics. Narratives of historical injustice and collective memory enhance mobilization in some communities, while others remain inert due to cultural norms or historical trauma (Castro-Abril et al., 2021). Thus, identity cannot be analyzed in isolation from cultural context, necessitating the inclusion of sociohistorical frameworks in collective action research.

Internal group dynamics also present challenges. Stuart et al. (2018) highlighted that internal communication breakdowns and conflicting expectations can fragment movements and weaken mobilization. These organizational dynamics illustrate that internal cohesion is a prerequisite for successful collective efforts. The recognition of such intra-group barriers underscores the need to revise theoretical models to better reflect internal diversity and conflict.

Systemic factors such as economic inequality and political repression further complicate collective action. Kurland and McCaffrey (2016) emphasized that unequal resource distribution impedes organizational capacity and discourages participation. Empirical data confirm that low-resource communities struggle to mobilize, even when motivated by strong emotional or identity factors.

Political structures also exert a repressive influence. As Ayanian and Tausch (2016) noted, state repression undermines mobilization through fear and coercion. This can demobilize participants or, paradoxically, provoke intensified protests. The interplay between repression and resistance necessitates theoretical frameworks that capture this duality.

Cultural values, especially in conservative or hierarchical societies, may hinder progressive identity formation and collective solidarity (Sexton & Jenness, 2016). Where cultural norms discourage dissent, mobilization becomes an uphill battle. Thus, any analysis of collective action must consider how culture facilitates or constrains movement development.

Organizational structure and leadership are equally pivotal. Blackwood and Louis (2011) demonstrated that weak organizational frameworks and poor leadership diminish movement coherence. A lack of coordination and strategic clarity undermines collective efficacy, even in groups with high identity and emotional investment. This underscores the critical importance of responsive leadership and adaptable organizational models in sustaining activism.

Communication barriers, as discussed by Blackwood and Louis (2011), also contribute to collective action failures. Misalignment between leadership messages and participant interpretation impairs trust and reduces engagement. Clear and consistent internal communication is essential for mobilization to succeed.

Adaptive capacity is another structural factor influencing movement resilience. Organizations that quickly respond to external pressures are more likely to maintain participation, whereas rigid structures are prone to internal collapse (Blackwood & Louis, 2011).

These systemic constraints collectively illustrate that identity and emotion alone are insufficient drivers of collective action. Without structural support and strategic coordination, even the most motivated groups may falter. Thus, policy responses must address these multi-layered challenges

by enhancing communication infrastructure, providing resource support, and safeguarding civil liberties.

Policy implications extend to fostering inclusive digital environments where media tools can be safely and effectively used for mobilization (Alcalde-González et al., 2022). Ensuring access and security for digital activism can empower marginalized voices and strengthen collective identity formation.

The study also suggests that redistributive economic policies and democratic governance reforms are vital for reducing barriers to participation (Kurland & McCaffrey, 2016; Ayanian & Tausch, 2016). When resource access and political representation are equitably distributed, groups are more likely to organize and sustain collective action.

Additionally, culturally sensitive approaches to identity development and movement organization can enhance relevance and inclusivity. As Sexton and Jenness (2016) argue, identity is deeply embedded in cultural narratives, and policy design must reflect this diversity to resonate with local communities.

This discussion affirms that while current theoretical models provide a strong foundation, they must evolve to accommodate structural, systemic, and contextual complexities. Only by integrating these dimensions can we develop a comprehensive understanding of collective action that is both empirically grounded and practically applicable.

CONCLUSION

This study reinforces the centrality of social identity and collective efficacy in shaping participation in collective action, corroborating theoretical models such as SIMCA. Findings consistently show that strong social identification, coupled with a high sense of collective efficacy, significantly predicts mobilization, even in the presence of structural or emotional barriers. Emotional responses, particularly anger and hope, act as mediators that enhance mobilization when individuals perceive systemic injustice. This intersection of identity, emotion, and perceived injustice highlights the psychological foundation of collective engagement.

Furthermore, the role of digital platforms in enhancing narrative coherence and group solidarity marks a vital shift in the dynamics of collective action, especially in the digital age. However, structural and systemic barriers—such as resource inequality, cultural norms, authoritarian policies, and organizational limitations—emerged as significant inhibitors to sustained mobilization. The findings underscore the necessity for inclusive and adaptive policy frameworks that support grassroots mobilization through equitable resource distribution, civic protections, and leadership development.

Policy interventions should focus on bolstering communication infrastructures, promoting digital inclusivity, and fostering collective identity through community-centered education and participatory practices. Future research should aim to further disentangle the complex interplay between psychological and structural factors, and to refine theoretical models to account for

regional and cultural variation. Emphasizing collective identity and efficacy remains paramount in understanding and advancing effective strategies for mobilization in diverse sociopolitical contexts.

In sum, this review advances theoretical integration by bridging emotional, cognitive, and structural domains within the SIMCA framework. Policymakers are encouraged to enhance digital inclusivity, invest in civic education, and support grassroots leadership to foster sustainable collective action.

REFERENCE

Alcalde-González, V., Mozo, A., & Valenzuela-Bustos, A. (2022). 'las kellys son las que limpian': collective identity and social media in the mobilisation of room attendants in spain. *New Media & Society*, 26(5), 2914-2931. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448221097891

Ayanian, A. and 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

Bernroider, E., Harindranath, G., & Kamel, S. (2022). From connective actions in social movements to offline collective actions: an individual level perspective. *Information Technology and People*, 35(8), 205-230. https://doi.org/10.1108/itp-08-2020-0556

Blackwood, L. and Louis, W. (2011). 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

Carvacho, H., González, R., Cheyre, M., Rocha, C., Cornejo, M., Jiménez-Moya, G., … & Livingstone, A. (2023). When social movements fail or succeed: social psychological consequences of a collective action's outcome. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1155950

Castro-Abril, P., Costa, S., Navarro-Carrillo, G., Caicedo-Moreno, A., Gracia-Leiva, M., Bouchat, P., … & Rovira, D. (2021). Social identity, perceived emotional synchrony, creativity, social representations, and participation in social movements: the case of the 2019 chilean populist protests. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.764434

Chan, M. (2016). Media use and the social identity model of collective action: examining the roles of online alternative news and social media news. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 94(3), 663-681. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699016638837

Choma, B., Sumantry, D., & Nasser, L. (2024). Sociopolitical ideologies as predictors of collective action across liberal and conservative domains: injustice-based anger, efficacy, and empathy as mediators. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 54(8), 474-486. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.13054

Freel, S. and Bilali, R. (2022). Putting the past into action: how historical narratives shape participation in collective action. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 52(1), 204-222. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2813

Gulliver, R., Chan, C., Chan, W., Tam, K., & Louis, W. (2023). Bystanders, protesters, journalists: a qualitative examination of different stakeholders' motivations to participate in collective action. *Journal of Pacific Rim Psychology*, 17. https://doi.org/10.1177/18344909231187018

Jiménez-Moya, G., Miranda, D., Drury, J., Saavedra, P., & González, R. (2018). When nonactivists care: group efficacy mediates the effect of social identification and perceived instability on the legitimacy of collective action. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 22(4), 563-577. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217751631

Keshavarzi, S., McGarty, C., & Khajehnoori, B. (2021). Testing social identity models of collective action in an iranian environmental movement. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 31(4), 452-464. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2523

Kurland, N. and McCaffrey, S. (2016). Social movement organization leaders and the creation of markets for "local" goods. *Business & Society*, 55(7), 1017-1058. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650314549439

Park, J. (2019). In the name of immigrant mothers: gendered mobilization of korean-chinese women in south korea. *Asian Journal of Women's Studies*, 25(4), 515-536. https://doi.org/10.1080/12259276.2019.1675848

Perugorría, I. and Tejerina, B. (2013). Politics of the encounter: cognition, emotions, and networks in the spanish 15m. *Current Sociology*, 61(4), 424-442. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392113479743

Pozzi, M., Passini, S., Chayinska, M., Morselli, D., Ellena, A., Włodarczyk, A., … & Pistoni, C. (2022). 'coming together to awaken our democracy': examining precursors of emergent social identity and collective action among activists and non-activists in the 2019–2020 'chile despertó' protests. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 32(5), 830-845. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2598

Reichert, F., Au, A., & Fiedler, A. (2023). How collective demands strengthen sympathy for normative and non-normative protest action: the example of hong kong's anti-extradition law amendment bill protests. *Sociology Compass*, 18(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.13169

Saab, R., Tausch, N., Spears, R., & Cheung, W. (2014). Acting in solidarity: testing an extended dual pathway model of collective action by bystander group members. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 54(3), 539-560. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12095

Sexton, L. and Jenness, V. (2016). "we're like community": collective identity and collective efficacy among transgender women in prisons for men. *Punishment & Society*, 18(5), 544-577. https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474516642859

Shafi, S. and Ran, B. (2021). Social movements as complex adaptive systems: the antecedents and consequences of movement participation in the age of social media. *The Social Science Journal*, 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/03623319.2021.1949551

Stuart, A., Thomas, E., & Donaghue, N. (2018). "i don't really want to be associated with the self-righteous left extreme": disincentives to participation in collective action. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 6(1), 242-270. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v6i1.567

Włodarczyk, A., Basabe, N., Rovira, D., & Zumeta, L. (2017). Hope and anger as mediators between collective action frames and participation in collective mobilization: the case of 15-m. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 5(1), 200-223. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v5i1.471

Zomeren, M. (2016). Building a tower of babel? integrating core motivations and features of social structure into the political psychology of political action. *Political Psychology*, 37(S1), 87-114. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12322