The role of social media in shaping the animal protection movement in indonesia

Angga Prawadika Aji

Airlangga University
Dharmawangsa Dalam, Surabaya, Indonesia
Email: anggaprawadika1@gmail.com/ Phone +6231 5034015

Abstract In the past decade, the number of community-based animal protection movements has shown a significant increase in Indonesia. These groups are actively fighting for animal rights, protection, and conservation while continuing to expand the influence and attract new members through various channels, especially social media. This article seeks to see the contribution of the social media strategy used by animal rights groups to the three basic elements of a social movement: collective identity, actual mobilisation, and network organisation. How social media, especially Face book and Instagram, are used by animal rights groups to achieve their ultimate goal as a social movement. This analysis also seeks to map the character of the movement for animal protection in Indonesia in the realm of new media based on their ideology, strategies, and objectives they want to achieve.

Keywords: animal protection movement; social media; social movement

INTRODUCTION

The main purpose of this article is to explain the role of social media use for the animal protection movement in Indonesia. But first I want to clarify two important points in the discussion. First about the use of terminology. Although the author use "animal protection movement" as a term that covers all social movements within the scopes of protection, anti-cruelty, and anti-exploitation of animals, but animal activism does not have the same and uniform goals and tactics (Munro, 2012). There are several 'schools' which each have their own ideologies, such as animal rights movement and animal liberation movement. The second point includes movements or animal protection organisations that will be the focus of this research. To avoid

expanding the issue, the author will limit my research to movements or organisations that specifically focus on efforts to end animal cruelty and fight for their better treatment. Social movements that focus on more macro issues, such as environmental conservation is not included as objects of research. This concept is in line with the explanation from Crook et a. (Munro, 2012) who saw the animal protection movement as a different and 'stand-alone' form of social movement, considering that this movement had a unique moral grip such as animal rights and the use of drama and spectacle such as sharing photographs containing 'moral shock' picture (for example the picture of badly mauled animal from blood sports) made to achieve mass media exposure.

Although the animal protection movement is often associated with Peter Singer's utilitarian work published in 1975 titled Animal Liberation, efforts to encourage policies to reduce torture and exploitation of animals have long begun in the early 19th century (Munro, 2012). The animal protection movement emerged along with the momentum of public awareness about human rights and humanity, anti-slavery, and woman suffrage. In 1822 the anti-cruelty law on animals was first ratified in England, initiating the first political foundation for animal protection and marked the initial victory of an advocacy movement carried out by sympathiser for animal better treatment (Becker & Lobao, 2012). This law was then supported by the establishment of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA) organisation in 1834. The presence of the SPCA then began to expand to the United States in 1860 along with the abolitionist rising importance and protection of human rights (Munro, 2001). The SPCA branch then expanded to various regions such as Pennsylvania, Massachusetts and San Francisco, where these organisations not only sought to encourage the enforcement of anti-torture laws, but also formed animal shelter for abandoned animals and victims of torture. The big leap in the animal protection movement in the US began in 1877 with the establishment of the American Humane Association (AHA), an advocacy organisation for the protection of children and animals.

It should be understood that from the outset the animal protection movement never had one uniform and specific struggle idea. The ideas and identities of these movements have developed in line with socio-cultural changes in society. The early generation of the animal protection movement was marked by political efforts to encourage the government to issue policies to eliminate various forms of animal torture practice, such as blood sports and protect large-sized livestock such as cattle and horses from torture practices on farms. In the early twentieth century, the ideas brought by the animal protection movement began to experience a shift in focus. The Humane Movement for example, began to focus on the condition of dogs and cats in urban areas along with changes in people's lifestyles (Munro,

2001). Technological developments in the field of transportation make the use of horses as transport animals diminish while increasing living standards make the number of pets increased. Pet ownership numbers skyrocketed in the post-World War II era, where the concentration of war veterans and older generations who lived independently on the edge of the city ballooned rapidly. The development of technology in the field of medicine also broadens the scope of issues of concern to the animal protection movement. The opposition movement to fight the use of animals in a variety of medical laboratory research began to emerge in America with the establishment of the American Anti-Vivisection Society. Other organisations such as the Audubon Society prefer to focus on efforts to wild animal conservation.

The 1970s marked the beginning of the new animal Protection Movement. Unlike the previous movement, the movement of animal protection in this new era was based on increasing emotional sentiment in animals. Philosophers such as Peter Singer and Tom Regan began to form a philosophical foundation that explained the relationship between humans and animals. Singer then spearheaded the animal rights movement after popularizing the concept of "speciesism" (parallel to racism and sexism) while Regan emphasised the importance of respecting basic rights of animals. But the most dominant influences came from the human rights movement and women liberation. The appreciation of animal rights can easily be analogous to the rights of minorities and oppressed people. This tradition continues to this day where the majority of the memberships of animal protection activists are women (Munro, 2001) accompanied by the use of language and strategies similar to the woman's rights movement. The animal protection movement has also begun to use confrontational tactics such as splashing red paint on wearers of animal fur jackets, disrupting biomedical research conferences, and infiltrating research laboratories to free animals used as test subjects. People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) formed in 1980 became one of the most recognised militant animal protection organisations.

Based on the frame analysis framework described earlier, the animal protection movement is clearly not a movement that has singular goals and tactics. Lyle Munro (2005) identified three major groups in the animal protection movement. The first group is the animal welfare movement, led by experienced anti-violence animal organisations such as ASPCA and HSUS. Animal welfare movement seeing problems regarding animals as a political issue and seeks to increase the treatment of livestock and pets through changes in laws and policies. The second group is the rights movement which sees animal issues as a moral and philosophical issue. Social movements that hold this principle, such as the organisation led by Tom Regan and Gary Francione, see animals as sentient beings that have rights that must be recognised and protected. Animal rights movements attempt

to eliminate all forms of exploitation of any kind against animals. The last is the Animal Liberation Movement, which holds the pragmatic view of Peter Singer, who sees that the exploitation of animals is an endemic effect of capitalism. Each of these movements focuses on increasing human treatment of animals but has a foundation of beliefs and strategies that are different from each other. The Animal Welfare Movement focuses more on conventional political advocacy efforts such as lobbying and petitions, both real and online to achieve broader and legally binding changes (Becker & Lobao, 2012). Liberationist animals prefer tactical unconventional and disruptive ones such as civil disobedience, while animal rights groups use militant strategies such as hidden videos and infiltration into various farms suspected to animal torture practices (Munro, 2012).

In Indonesia the animal protection movement developed from the environmental conservation movement that developed from 1970s (Nawiyanto, 2015; Rochwulaningsih, 2017). The issue of environmental pollution is one of the important issues that seized public concern along with the expansion of industrial areas into agricultural and residential areas. Beginning in the early 1970s the role of non-governmental organisations began to appear in nature conservation struggles, starting with outdoor and mountaineering club (*pecinta alam*, literally means 'nature lover') which began to appear in many universities. The two most influential clubs that took stand in environmental issues in this era were Mapala (*Mahasiswa Pecinta Alam*, Nature Lovers Students) of University of Indonesia and Wanadri Group in Bandung (Nawiyanto, 2015). The big leap in the conservation movement in Indonesia emerged when various environmentalists from various professions declared the formation of the *Kelompok Sepuluh* (Group of Ten). This group is a forum for exchanging information and ideas on various environmental issues (Nawiyanto, 2015). *Kelompok Sepuluh* became the early prototype of one of the oldest and most respected environmental conservation movements in Indonesia, WALHI (*Wahana Lingkungan Hidup*, Live and Nature Means). The shift in focus from broad environmental conservation towards the protection of endangered species was marked by the birth of the BOS (Borneo Orang-utan Foundation) movement in 1991 and Profauna in 1994. The animal protection movement began to shift its focus to more specific issues, such as endangered animal trade and educational efforts community independently about the practice of animal torture. These movements also open wider opportunities for the community to participate in various actions and activities.

Along with the various developments in the animal protection movement, a big leap in digital communication is also happening, one of which is marked by the emergence of various social media platforms on the internet. The discussion about internet-based activism itself has actually been started since the 1990s, including about how this new media can be used effectively to support various social and political

movements (Jasper & Poulsen, 2019). Social media is considered capable of being present as a support tool for collective actions because of its ability to change communication flow to be denser, complex, and interactive. According to Clay Shirky, communities become more exposed to a variety of access to information and more opportunities to engage in public discussions that ultimately increase their ability to form collective action (as cited in Lopes, 2014). Social media removes socio-cultural boundaries and demographic hierarchies, such as economic and age levels, thus ensuring a broader and freer interactivity for all societies.

Within the context of social movements, social media has the speed, scope and interactivity that traditional forms of media don't have. Media which previously popularly used by activists and organisations, such as leaflets, posters and faxes (Cammaerts, 2015). Messages written on Facebook, Twitter and Instagram can reach millions of audiences almost instantly, as if removing the geographical and time boundaries. The increasing speed of information dissemination encourages the process of validation, mobilization, and scope enlargement of a social movement (Lopes, 2014). But the most important element of communication that social media has is its ability to bypass official sources and mass media as a whole and provide opportunities for ordinary citizens to change the political landscape in which they live. Social media also creates channels for individuals to interact globally. Facebook and Twitter act as a relay to convey local issues to a global audience. This means that the global audience can have the opportunity to advocate for various issues that are outside their locality (Tweneboah, 2012). Furthermore, according to Bimber (1998) the position of social media becomes increasingly important in groups that is outside the boundaries of public institutions and traditional political organisations (as cited in Cammaerts, 2015). This new citizen-based movement does not have official support, both financial and legitimate. Therefore they will be very dependent on the ability of social media to be able to organise and mobilise their supporters.

The role of social media in mobilising resources and framing issues in social movements has been recognised by many previous researchers. However, some researchers expressed scepticism about the effects of social media on social movements. According to McAdam et al. (1996), in the case of social movements that existed before the internet era, increasing communication capacity generated by the internet did not mean that it could replace interpersonal networks that had been built strongly before (Lewis, Gray, & Meierhenrich, 2014). Malcolm Gladwell (2010) states that social movements need strong ties within its members to create risky actions, such as demonstrations and boycotts. Social media on the other hand is considered to only be able to create weak ties and doubtful ability to be able to create emotions and real enthusiasm (Resolute, 2016) .

Social media also seems to have a great influence on the struggle for the animal protection movement. This is indicated by the emergence of official accounts of animal protection movements in various social media sites such as Facebook and Twitter accompanied by a series of campaign tactics carried out through this new media platform. Some of the most popular animal protection organisations such as HSUS and PETA wrote an average of 14 posts in one week on Facebook and 134 times on Twitter, while approximately 18,967 people on Facebook and 1,695 people on Twitter discussed various issues regarding these organisations every week. The themes related to animal protection organisations are one of the most talked about social media users (Becker & Lobao, 2012). Similar things are also found in cases in Indonesia. The oldest animal protection movement in Indonesia, ProFauna, has 127 thousand followers on Facebook and 1212 followers on Instagram since the movement decided to adjust their strategy to the development of social media. The same situation is also evident from three other animal protection movements such as the Indonesian Animal Guard, Jogja Animal Friend, and the Jakarta Animals Aid Network. All three have thousands of followers on various social media platforms such as Facebook and Instagram. In addition to Facebook and Instagram, these four organisations also have a presence on many other social media platforms such as YouTube, Pinterest and Instagram, and are supported by blog accounts that are usually owned by leaders or key figures of the movement.

METHODOLOGY

In this paper, I will examine how the animal protection movement and organisations use social media to support the success of their struggle. I will also look at the contributions that social media provides to the three main conditions for the realization of ideal social movement formations: collective identity, actual mobilization, and organisational networks (Della Porta & Diani, 2006) . Four animal protection organisations were chosen because they are the most representative of the dynamics of the animal protection movement in Indonesia. ProFauna is the oldest organisation that focuses on animal issues in Indonesia, making it an ideal comparison for other movements that have grown in the new media era. Garda Satwa Indonesia is the most popular animal protection movement on social media (one of which is supported by famous Indonesian celebrities and a strong financial base). Animal Friend Jogja and Jakarta Animals Aid Network are unique forms because even though they focus on specific geographical spheres, they are able to create movements supported by international global organisations.

DISCUSSION
Collective Identity

Collective identity is the core of the formation of a collective movement. Without a collective framework or "series of meanings and definitions carried by a group of individuals in a particular situation", the possibility of forming a collective identity that manifests itself in action is very small (Della Porta & Diani, 2006). Identity in this paper is interpreted as frame of references from each organisation and animal protection movement. The use of frame analysis was first introduced by Irving Goffman (1986) which was later developed in the context of social movements (Benford & Snow, 2000). In this paper, I will focus on two main framing elements, namely diagnostic framing and prognostic framing. Diagnostic framing tries to see how organisations identify problems and their causes, while prognostic framing tries to see how the problem-solving plan is developed through various strategies. For this reason, we are trying to see how each animal protection movement defines animal protection efforts and how they are trying to achieve their goals.

The observation of for animal protection movement shows that the prominent animal protection movement in Indonesia takes the position of an animal welfare movement. The ideological debate that emerged in the global animal protection movement as stated by Lyle Munro (2004) did not appear in Indonesia. In general, the animal protection movement studied has more or less the same vision and mission. The first focuses on efforts to save animals from exploitation and cruelty, followed by education efforts and increasing public awareness on the issue of animal protection. The programs implemented by this movement are also in line with each other, although the emphasis of the issues raised can vary. Among them are adopting programs, sheltering abandoned animals (foster), rescuing tortured animals or those which needs help (rescue), legal assistance for particular legal cases involving animals (advocacy), providing special shelter for stray animals, and healthcare assistance for sick animals. Jakarta Animal Aids Network has tried several times to introduce views of animal rights, such as the opinion of Linda Matthews, which is based on Peter Singer's thoughts but has received little response. Political advocacy efforts carried out by these movements are also limited to making online petitions and legal assistance in cases that bring up the issue of animal cruelty and torture, such as a petition to close the Extreme Market in Tomohon, North Sulawesi (where animals such as dogs and cats are slaughtered and traded for consumption) which is opened on Change.org's online petition site. This petition was initiated by the Wildlife Guard and supported by many other animal protection movements.

Social media seems to have a significant influence in the process of forming the collective identity of sympathizers of the animal protection movement. Garda Satwa, Animal Friends Jogja, and Jakarta

Animal Aids Network provide in-depth information about the movement's vision and mission through social media platforms. These three movements also actively open opportunities to join and be involved in the movement through social media. The process of engagement becomes much easier. Often participants only have to provide data or even just push 'likes' button and follow social movement accounts. Different findings came from ProFauna, which emphasised the professionalism and commitment of the participants. This difference shows an interesting indication, where movements formed long before the era of social media (such as ProFauna formed in 1994) put more emphasis on real action rather than 'superficial' involvement presented by social media. Social media only provides information, but activities are organised through channels that have long been established and developed such as physical recruitment, training, etc. Social media functions is just to attract sympathy for various programs and information on activities, attract donations, socialize the program, but direct involvement has never been initiated on social media.

Social media encourages the emergence of feelings of ownership of collective identity which ultimately leads to the formation of a community. Social media also creates a perception among individuals that they are part of a larger group that is united by the same issues and concerns. This same feeling then reinforced by a strong communication system, thus creating networks that make it possible for individuals to connect with each other.

Actual Mobilisation

The actual mobilisation process, which means inviting participants to take to the streets and take real actions such as protest and boycott, has always been the most difficult and unpredictable element in the success of social movements (Stekelenburg & Klandermans, 2014). Various ways are carried out by social movements to mobilise the masses, ranging from mass media, direct mail, formal organisations, to unconventional methods such as underground newspapers. The change in the media landscape driven by ICT development means that social movements have a wider opportunity to use a variety of new media to mobilise.

Various literatures try to explain how mobilization methods are carried out in social movements. The role of ICT in the process of mobilising social movements can be divided into three points; level of participation, contentious activity, and organisational issues (Garrett, 2006) . This paper will focus on elements of the level of participation, where the ability of social media to mobilise can be seen based on the ability of this media to engage more members and open opportunities for participation.

The biggest role of social media in the mobilisation process is its ability to reduce participation costs. Prospective participants can easily

join ProFauna, Garda Satwa, AFJ, or JAAN just by following Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and various other social media accounts. ProFauna has a different approach than the three other movements where the involvement of members is distinguished between supporters and real activists. Supporters are those who are interested in ProFauna's struggle but limited to support on social media while real activists are those who are truly involved and committed in various ProFauna programs such as conducting animal monitoring in forest areas and socialisation of wildlife conservation education in remote villages.

In general, social media reduces the costs of coordination and communication, and provides an opportunity for anyone to join social movements. Social media also shortens the distance between audiences and social movements, making the recruitment and access to information easier to provide.

As stated by Clay Shirky (2011), social media also makes it easier for participants to take the participation ladder process (Lopes, 2014). Various forms of participation are not seen as separate processes that can be differentiated according to their effects and scope, but rather as a developing process. Every social movement start from sharing all the way to cooperation, then gradually increasing to collaboration and finally reach collective action. In various accounts of the animal protection movement, participants actively shared with each other photos and opinions on animal protection issues. This trend appears on many Facebook and Instagram accounts Garda Satwa, AFJ, and JAAN. The photos and opinions presented by the majority contained more concrete calls for action to ask for donations, support in online petitions, updates on rescue efforts, and calls for protest. The most obvious example is the invitation to take part in the petition to Stop Illegal Trafficking of Dogs and Cats and Prohibit Postings of Violence against Animals on Facebook held on Change.org. Social media also opens opportunities for cooperative action, or the easiest to show by having conversations and discussions on a particular topic. For example, the Wildlife Guard opened a discussion for all participants in the social media regarding the issue of the Indonesian government's statement (represented by Luhut Binsar Pandjaitan, Indonesian Coordinating Minister for Politics, Legal and Security Affairs) who was considered to be took no responsibility on the issue of violence experienced by orang-utans in Sumatra.

The ultimate form of participation, collective action, is the most difficult group effort to achieve and lies in the centre of debate about the role of social media in supporting social movements. Collective action starts with a group of people who committed to do certain action together, where decisions taken by the group will bind all group members. For a group to take collective action, the existing level of participation requirements must already be owned. The group must have a shared vision and identity along with a strong organisational structure and communication.

Garret (2004) introduces the concept of micro-contributions as a form of compromise on critics who doubt the role of social media in encouraging real collective action. Micro-contribution refers to the form of contributions from members of a movement that are small, but in aggregate will form a bigger and more effective effect. Micro-contributions provide opportunities for members to participate according to their abilities, which in the end will create a feeling of greater bonds to be involved again. The animal protection movement shows a good example of the principle of micro-contributions. Support for online petitions initiated by the animal protection movement is an example of micro-contributions. In addition, social media is slowly being directed to invite participants to take real action, such as demonstrations demanding the banning of dolphin circuses in Yogyakarta and Jakarta.

Networks Organisation

Social movements can always be seen as a set of social networks over a variety of formal and informal organisations (Diani & McAdam, 2002). Social media can form networks between diverse organisations through a range of features offered.

The best example is the Dog is Not Food (DANF) campaign initiated by Animal Friends Jogja in 2013. The campaign departs from the findings of brutal practices in the process of catching, shipping, and slaughtering dogs for consumption in Yogyakarta and surrounding areas. DANF was originally a local scale movement which later expanded after coalition with JAAN (Jakarta Animals Aid Network). Campaigns carried out on social media and connections with other organisations opened the door to collaboration with international movement such as Change for Animal Foundation (CFAF) movement, the Humane Society International (HSI), Four Paws, and Animals Asia. DANF later changed to Dog Meat Free Indonesia (DMFI), a coalition of international protection movements that seeks to encourage the Indonesian government to stop trafficking, slaughter and consumption of dogs in Indonesia.

The DANF case provides an interesting illustration where social movements initiated in the local context have the opportunity to get attention to the global domain. Social media facilitates the organisational process and coordination for various movements that have similar goals, which in the end can form cooperation where the resources possessed by each movement can be collected and shared according to needs. For example, connections with international movements make DMFI able to use resources that cannot be obtained beforehand. This includes expertise, legitimacy, and support from global public figures such as Ricky Gervais and Peter Egan. Until now, DMFI has become one of the most influential umbrella movements for animal protection efforts in Indonesia.

An important point which previously not discussed in social movement literature, especially animal activism-based ones, is that social media not only acts as a means of communication and organisation, but as a medium for gathering resources. Resource mobilisation is not only done through collecting donations, but also by selling various merchandise which will be channelled into movement's pool of resources. ProFauna, GardaSatwa, AFJ, and JAAN use social media as a channel to sell a variety of self-made merchandise. Social media is a very profitable medium in the marketing process, making efforts to gather resources more varied than solely donating requests. Some movements such as Garda Satwa also actively adjust marketing strategies with changes in the social media landscape by providing services as buzzers.

Within the context of social movements, coalitions and cooperatives between various similar movements have a significant role. The success achieved by animal advocacy groups in the 1970-180s was a product of a coalition of various similar movements, not just the achievements of one organisation. For example, an animal protection advocacy group led by Henry Spira took a joint action to stop the Draize Irritation Test (this test blinded the eyes of rabbits who were the subject of the experiment) by two leading cosmetic producers, Avon and Revlon (Munro, 2012). The coalition creates the superiority of the number of supporters and the scope of the movement so as to increase the bargaining position of social movements in the presence of authorities such as the government.

CONCLUSION

Based on the framework described by Della Porta and Diani (2006), the formation of an ideal social movement depends on four main elements. The first is (1) the process of network organisation, (2) which is based on collective identity, (3) the ability to mobilise the community to join and take concrete action, (4) to achieve political and social goals. In this paper, I narrow the focus on the role of social media in the formation of social movements in the first three elements of the framework of thinking, namely collective identity, network organisation, and actual mobilisation. The extent of the use of social media, especially Facebook and Instagram, affects the three elements above in the process of developing the animal protection movement in Indonesia.

Based on the results of a review of the four animal protection movements in Indonesia, I find a lot of evidence that shows that the movement and animal protection organisations, including the actors involved, have used and developed social media as the main means to expand influence and mobilise sympathizers. Social media facilitates the process of forming collective identity and actual mobilisation by shortening the path of participant involvement to join and providing a variety of channels to engage in micro actions such as engaging in

discussions and sharing photos of pets. This form is in accordance with Garret's (2004) view of micro transactions in social movements. But the main strength of social media in the formation of social movements is their ability to support network organisational processes. Social media is able to present a broad network of local animal protection movements in Indonesia to create strong ties of information and ideas, supported by the ease of access that social media has. The ability of social media to create a communication network between various animal protection movements, both national and global, shortens the process of forming coalitions. Social media accounts of the animal protection movement always adhere to each other, creating a network of connections that can be easily traced by audiences

REFERENCES

Becker, C., & Lobao, L. (2012). The Effects of Social Media on Participation Levels , Contentious Activity , and Organizational Issues in the Animal Protection Movement, 1–30.

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. (2000). Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review in Sociology*, *26*(August). https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.26.1.611

Cammaerts, B. (2015). Social media and activism. *The International Encyclopedia of Digital Communication and Society*, 1027–1034. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118290743.wbiedcs083

Della Porta, D., & Diani, M. (2006). *Social Movements : An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Diani, M., & McAdam, D. (2002). *Social Movement Analysis : The Network Perspective* (1st ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/0199251789.001.0001

Garrett, R. K. (2006). PROTEST IN AN INFORMATION SOCIETY A review of literature on social movements and new ICTs. *Information, Communication, & Society*, *9*(2), 202–224. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691180600630773

Jasper, J. M., & Poulsen, J. D. (2019). Recruiting Strangers and Friends : Moral Shocks and Social Networks in Animal Rights and Anti-Nuclear Protests Problems Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article : Recruiting Strangers and Friends : Moral Shocks and Social Networks in Animal, *42*(4), 493–512.

Lewis, K., Gray, K., & Meierhenrich, J. (2014). The structure of online activism. *Sociological Science*, *1*(February), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.15195/v1.a1s

Lopes, A. R. (2014). The Impact of Social Media on Social Movements : The New Opportunity and Mobilising Structure.

Munro, L. (2001). Caring about Blood , Flesh , and Pain : Women ' s Standing in the Animal Protection Movement. *Society & Animals*, *9*(2001). Retrieved from https://philpapers.org/rec/MUNCAB

Munro, L. (2012). The Animal Rights Movement in Theory and Practice : A Review of the Sociological Literature, *2*, 166–181.

Nawiyanto. (2015). GERAKAN LINGKUNGAN DI JAWA MASA. *Paramita*, *25*(1), 51–72.

Resolute, P. (2016). Humanizing the Non-Human Animal : the Framing Analysis of Dogs ' Rights Movement in Indonesia. *Masyarakat, Jurnal Sosiologi*, *21*(80), 149–172.

Rochwulaningsih, Y. (2017). DINAMIKA GERAKAN LINGKUNGAN DAN. *Jurnal Sejarah Citra Lekra*, *2*(2), 151–160. Retrieved from https://ejournal.undip.ac.id/index.php/jscl/article/view/16188/pdf

Stekelenburg, J. Van, & Klandermans, B. (2014). The Social Psychology of Protest. *Current Sociology*, *61*(September 2013). https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392113479314

Tweneboah, D. (2012). The not so Social Media : Critic of the Use of Social media for the Organization of Social Media. *Students of Sociology*, *4*, 1–14.