

Андриевская Ангелина Михайловна  
Andrievskaia Angelina Mikhailovna

Студент

Student

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет

Saint Petersburg State University

Россия, Санкт-Петербург

Russia, Saint-Petersburg

## ОБЩИЙ АНАЛИЗ СОЦИОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ТЕОРИЙ ОБЩЕСТВЕННЫХ ДВИЖЕНИЙ

### GENERAL ANALYSIS OF THE SOCIOLOGICAL THEORIES OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

**Аннотация:** В статье сделан общий обзор теоретических концепций социальных движений. В статье проанализированы особенности теорий социальных движений.

**Abstract:** The article provides a general overview of the theoretical concepts of social movements. The article analyses the features of the theory of social movements.

**Ключевые слова:** социальные движения, теории социальных движений.

**Key words:** social movements, theories of social movements.

In the time of globalization, dynamic structures are of particular importance, allowing them to react mobilely to changes in the surrounding world. Such structures are voluntary associations of individuals - social movements. They act as one of the most mobile organizational forms, adapt faster than others to new social conditions, adapt to changed rules.

The study of social movements is closely connected with their emergence and development. The beginning of research was laid in the second half of the twentieth century, when the movements of African Americans, women and students for their rights, environmental and anti-nuclear movements, peace movements and others began to actively develop

in the United States. Subsequently, they became the central political figure not only at the level of individual states, but also in the global dimension. The material accumulated in the course of many years of interdisciplinary research became the basis for the creation of theoretical concepts [1, p. 3-5].

Social movements as an object of study are a complex and multifaceted social phenomenon; therefore there are a large number of definitions of this concept in sociological science. In its most general form, this phenomenon can be defined as “collective, organized, sustained, and non-institutional challenge to authorities, power holders, or cultural beliefs and practices” [2, p. 4].

In the Western tradition, it is customary to distinguish three main paradigms for the study of social movements.

The first is the paradigm of “collective behavior” that dominated movement studies until the 1960s. Social movements were interpreted as irrational and uncoordinated collective behavior in a situation of social crisis and related phenomena of deprivation, frustration, and aggressiveness. The classical theories of social movements – collective behavior, relative deprivation, and mass society—were formed in the 1960s and 1970s. In addition, were developed by H. G. Blumer, N. Smelser, W. Kornhauser, T. R. Gurr and others [3, p. 965–976].

The classical theory of social movements is the theory of “relative deprivation”, developed by T. Gurr in the 1970s. Its proponents argue that social movements are the result of rising expectations on the one hand and limited opportunities to realize them on the other.

The next theory, belonging to a number of classical ones, is the theory of “mass society”. W. Kornhauser and her other adherents consider social movements as a phenomenon that occurs when unorganized individuals in a period of rapid social transformation unite in order to change some parts of social life. This theory is less focused on the direct

study of social movements - its focus is on “the specific characteristics of society and the individual, which are factors in the formation of social movements”. According to the authors of the theory, the participants in social movements are mainly irrational fanatics and outcasts, and they consider mass society itself as a society of alienated and isolated individuals. This theory is believed to be particularly useful in explaining the growth of the fascist and communist movement [4, p. 3–26].

Thus, classical theories consider social movements as a kind of irrational, unorganized, spontaneous collective behaviour, which is a response to existing inequalities or changes in society, and are a tool for analysing only particular aspects of their formation and development.

The second paradigm, the theory of “collective action” (resource mobilization), took shape in the 1970s and 80s. Within the framework of this paradigm, the theory of the political process was developed by American researchers Ch. Tilly, S. Tarrow, D. McAdam, which laid the foundation for the study of the interaction of institutionalized politics and social movements.

Having changed in semantic content and significance, the social movements of 1970–1980s began to be positively perceived as an important, rationally operating element of a democratic system, the participants of which are not isolated, as postulated by classical theories, but integrated members of society. As a result, new, modern concepts were developed, which can be divided into two schools - American and European. Within the framework of the first, the theory of “resource mobilization” and the theory of the “political process” provide answers, what are the mechanisms and causes of the formation of social movements. Within the framework of the second, attention is focused on the role of culture, identity, ideology as factors influencing the formation and development of movements in post-industrial societies [5, p. 27–45].

Finally, starting in the 1980s, a paradigm of “new social movements”

(NSM) developed in Europe. Within the framework of this paradigm, unlike the first two, these movements are considered in a general institutional, political, cultural and historical context, from the standpoint of social (structural) conflict and historicity, as a kind of response to the changes brought by the era of late modernity and postmodern.

The term new social movements (NSMs) is a theory of social movements that attempts to explain the plethora of new movements that have come up in various western societies roughly since the mid-1960s (i.e. in a post-industrial economy). Exploring the forms of the environmental and anti-nuclear movement, the movement of women and sexual minorities for their rights, theorists shifted their focus to non-material factors - the logic of collective action began to be seen through the prism of identity, values and culture. Systematizing the various points of view of researchers (H. Johnston et al; N. A. Pichardo; A. Melucci; and others) about the phenomenon of new social movements, five of their key characteristics were obtained.

Firstly, social movements of a new type are much less likely to set economic or political goals. The focus of their attention is more often on the search for autonomy, identity and solidarity within the various institutional structures of the post-industrial society.

Secondly, this theory argues that the participants in the new social movements are not, as previously thought, representatives of the working class. There are two points of view about the social basis of new social movements. According to the first one, this is a “new” middle class employed in the non-productive sector of the economy. This opinion, in particular, was common among British researchers of the environmental movement. According to another point of view, their participants are not only representatives of the “new”, but also the “old” middle class (small entrepreneurs, owners), as well as those who are on the periphery of the class system, for example, students, housewives, pensioners.

Thirdly, new social movements use traditional political channels and decision-making mechanisms much less often – they are more likely to use the tactics of civil disobedience and mobilization of public opinion. However, this does not mean that new social movements are not involved in traditional forms of political participation. The repertoire of actions of new social movements is qualitatively and quantitatively superior to the set of tactics that was characteristic of their previous forms.

Fourth, new social movements are blurring the line between the individual and the collective. The public sphere is often influenced by individual needs and requirements: birth and death, illness and aging become the cause of mobilization. At the same time, those areas that were previously considered exclusively individual are the subject of public discussion and collective action.

Fifth, new social movements avoid rigid organizational forms. Their structure is horizontal and is not a formal organization built in the form of a hierarchy. They also tend to change leaders frequently and put all issues to a vote [6, p. 1–12.].

The theory of new social movements is an extremely significant and necessary tool: the theories that preceded it made a huge contribution to understanding the phenomenon of social movements, almost all of their aspects turned out to be studied, except for those that became so significant in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, namely, culture, value system and identity.

#### **Bibliographic list:**

1. Snow, D. et. al. (2019), *The Wiley-Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, 2nd edition, Oxford, Blackwell, P.3-5.
2. Goodwin, J. & Jasper, J. (2015), *The Social Movements Reader: Cases and Concepts*, London, P.4.
3. James M. Jasper (2010), *Social Movement Theory Today: Toward*

a Theory of Action? *Sociology Compass*. vol. 4, no. 11, P. 965–976.

4. Atkinson, J. D. (2017). The Study of Social Activism. In *Journey into Social Activism: Qualitative Approaches* P. 3–26.

5. Ciżewska-martyńska, e. (2018). The cultural perspective in social movement theories and past research on the solidarity movement. *Polish sociological review*, 201, P. 27–45.

6. Millward, P., & Takhar, S. (2019). Social Movements, Collective Action and Activism. *Sociology*, 53(3), P. 1–12.