ATHENÆUM
Polish Political Science Studies
Polskie Studia Politologiczne

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND POLITICAL PARTIES: COOPERATION AND CONFLICT

RUCHY SPOŁECZNE A PARTIE POLITYCZNE. WSPÓŁPRACA I KONFLIKT

Małgorzata Madej* , *Dorota Drałus*** , *Monika Wichłacz****

—— **ABSTRACT** ——

New social movements, focused around values and sociocultural identities, shape new communities outside the traditional field of party politics. On one hand, in their institutionalization, social movements enter the political sphere, and on the other, political parties strive to attract voters and supporters by application of tools typical for social movements. The subject of this paper is the border area between new social movements and parties, understood primarily as modes of collective action. The study aims at delineating the field of their mutual influence and at identifying its mechanisms, and explores the problems of ambivalence and instability affecting the dynamics of change within political systems.

Keywords: new social movements; political parties; institutionalization; contentious politics; movement party; anti-party

—— **ABSTRAKT** ——

Nowe ruchy społeczne, które są oparte o wartości i tożsamości społeczno-kulturowe, tworzą nowe wspólnoty funkcjonujące poza tradycyjnym obszarem polityki. Relacje między nowymi ruchami społecznymi a partiami są złożone. Z jednej strony w procesie instytucjonalizacji ruchy społeczne wkraczają w sferę polityki, z drugiej zaś partie polityczne, starając się przyciągać wyborców i zwolenników, wdrażają w swojej działalności narzędzia typowe dla ruchów. Artykuł dotyczy obszaru pogranicza nowych ruchów społecznych i partii rozumianych jako formy zbiorowego działania. Celem badania jest demarkacja pola ich wzajemnego wpływu, a także identyfikacja mechanizmów tego wpływu oraz omówienie problematyki ambiwalencji i niestabilności, które oddziałują na dynamikę zmiany wewnątrz systemów politycznych.

Słowa kluczowe: nowe ruchy społeczne; partie polityczne; instytucjonalizacja; polityka kontestacji; partia-ruch; antypartia

  * University of Wrocław, Institute of Political Science.
  ** University of Wrocław, Institute of Political Science.
  *** University of Wrocław, Institute of Political Science.

INTRODUCTION

The distinction between new social movements and political parties has been conceptualized in a great variety of ways. Efforts to capture the diversity of forms and practices of social movements and political parties reflect the growing vagueness or ambiguity of the relations between these two modes of collective action. It leads, however, to conceptual stretching, where the core and the boundaries of the concepts of social movement and political party alike can undermine their conceptual validity.

A multidimensional and complex evolution of contemporary political parties and the new social movements both in the social and political spheres, calls for more rigorous scientific exploration of the interface between them, especially in terms of different models of their cooperation and strategies for collective action. New social movements and contemporary political parties operate in parallel, addressing the needs and challenges faced by the societies, striving to represent large social groups and encourage citizens to take action in the support of their agendas. In this context, the experience of successes and failures of social movements may be a useful lesson for political parties, and vice versa: social movements may use political parties' experience to develop their toolkits of social activism. This could be possible through diffusion and penetration, as well as through an overlap of their activities.

As noted by D.R. Piccio (2016, p. 264), despite the paramount importance of such interplay, the parties as the objects of social movements' impact "are conspicuously absent from mainstream literature on social movements" and need to draw greater scholarly attention.

The subject of this paper is precisely this border area between new social movements and parties, with particular stress on their mutual impact. The present study aims at delineating the field of their mutual influence and at identifying its mechanisms. The aim of the paper is to stress the importance of this relationship, but also its ambivalence and instability which may be interpreted as resulting from a significant tendency toward volatility both on the part of political parties as well as of social movements themselves, which in turn is a result of dynamic changes in contemporary societies.

Social movements are usually perceived as an expression of public informal participation in political processes while the task of formally organized and legally recognized political parties is to deliberate on particular policies. However, the relations between these two forms of political activity cannot be

reduced to the above division of political labour. This is especially true of the contemporary new social movements which differ from their former embodiments in many important ways. The traditional social movements organized themselves around issues of economic and political equality, as exemplified by labour, civil rights, and women's liberation movements. Reflecting the seriousness of public discontent, they assembled wide social participation, demonstrated their sustained determination in their struggle, and, not infrequently, successfully set the agenda for political decision-makers.

New social movements, such as the Battle of Seattle of 1999, Spanish Indignados, France's *Mouvement des gilets jaunes*, Arab Spring movements, or LGBT movements continue to pursue the egalitarian economic and political aims, and aspire to set the agenda for the political decision-making. Some salient features of new social movements are discussed in this paper, with a focus on their role in promoting and supporting, but also subverting, the status of formal political parties. The present investigation employs the method of conceptual analysis used in numerous approaches to the phenomenon of new social movements, worked out in political theory, especially in the contemporary theory of democracy. The distinct features of the new social movements for political processes, and their significance, were captured by such authors as Alain Touraine (1981, 1985, 1987, 2009), Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1985), Claus Offe (1985, 1990, 1997), Charles Tilly (1984, 1988, 1994, 2004), Immanuel Wallerstein (1974, 2004), Manuel Castells (1996, 2015), Castells and Gustavo Cardoso (2005), Jürgen Habermas (1987, 1989), and many others.

AN AMBIVALENT RELATIONSHIP

While the relationship between parties and new social movements is often explained in terms of contradiction between mobilization and representation, it cannot be reduced to the function of contestation. Despite their amorphous and ephemeral nature, new social movements have become an integral part of the dynamics of society and won for themselves an unquestionable political legitimacy. Their public legitimization as an authentic mode of participation in political processes has guaranteed them a permanent place in contemporary political processes. What is most important is that public approval for social movements, recognized as a legitimate form of political activity, is also an important source and carrier of political legitimacy for formally organized political

parties. On the one hand, their activity serves to express, and formulate public discontent and sentiment, put pressure on state institutions, thus effecting their democratic control, and bringing about political initiatives. On the other, they depend on the political processes, structure and social conditions that determine their shape, initiatives, and cooperation.

Despite the above, it cannot be denied that at the root of the emergence of new social movements there is the growing dissatisfaction with the presently functioning political systems. The new formula of values, goals and methods of action is aimed primarily at the struggle for real empowerment directed at the transformation of reality in a manner consistent with the genuine interests of the political community.

In opposition to the traditional social movements, their contemporary form is characterized by the fact that they are less socio-political and much more socio-culturally oriented (Touraine, 1985, p. 780). The reason behind this transformation is that the distance between civil society and the state is increasing, and the separation of private and public life is gradually evaporating. Political life becomes an increasingly self-enclosed impenetrable area, while sociocultural movements represent constantly changing social conditions. Thus, activated by individualized entities, the new social movements may be seen as platforms of cooperation based not on interests but on a community of values and resources (Touraine, 1985, pp. 765–771). For this reason, they do not cooperate systematically with each other and are guided by the logic of the network rather than the logic of the organization. It is certainly a feature which makes them difficult to recognize and identify. Moreover, actors from outside the network find it more difficult to contact them. This also applies to political actors who, in the new situation, need to adapt their optics and attitudes towards their prospective social partners.

A characteristic feature of social movements is the ideological layer which brings together those disappointed with the mechanisms and effects of traditional politics operative in the system of capitalist liberal democracy. The alternative they propose is a set of new practices based on a genuine empowerment of citizens, enabling them to decide the fate of their own community. "By constructing a free community in a symbolic place, social movements create a public space, a space for deliberation, which ultimately becomes a political space, a space for sovereign assemblies to meet and to recover their rights of representation, which have been captured in political institutions predominantly tailored for the convenience of the dominant interests and values" (Castells, 2015, p. 11).

Social activity based on axiological commitment can create a new type of community, i.e., the community established around a specific set of values. Such communities are shaped by action consistent with the inclusive formula oriented towards their common goal. Instead of traditional ideological identifications, they are held together by a genuine strong bond. Such a bond may become a source of strengthening the existing political capital, but it usually places new movements outside the rivalry of the conventional political parties. In the long run, however, the inability to capitalize on their potential is responsible for the fading of the axiologically motivated social movement and, consequently, for the withering of the scope of their effective action.

The mode of organization of social movements does not fit the model of political parties functioning within the political system which rewards coherent and hierarchical entities with clearly defined leadership. Due to their informal nature, variety of goals, and different social and political contexts in which they operate, it is quite challenging to identify universal features of the new social movements. They form a flexible and dynamic model of political activity characterized by several frequently coexisting features. The spontaneity, informality, ephemerality, temporality, fluidity, and internal differentiation, characteristic of new social movements, do not facilitate mobilization and efficient operation in the long electoral perspective. Such a structure of the new social movements reflects their goals and objectives. Their organization, however, if any, is not ordered according to terms of office, and is not subsumed to the task of winning or maintaining political power (Bulira, 2017). At the same time, it is the specificity of the organization of network movements, the dominant horizontal bonds, and the lack of hierarchical organizational structures that make them more resistant to dangers to which political parties typically are exposed, especially bureaucratic red tape and corruption. Based on a bottom-up, distributed network structure, placing subjectivity and trust in the centre, new movements use the rules of direct democracy in their negotiating and decision-making process. Their strength lies precisely in their spontaneity which is conducive to the freedom of expression within them. In opposition to this, the domain of political parties has become an autonomized political sphere, abstracted from its natural environment in the public sphere. The professionalization of political parties, which depend on the hierarchical structure and aspire to state power, is measured by electoral success (Sagan, 2016, p. 23). It is frequently remarked that these features strengthen the fiction of political representation.

In contrast to that, social movements are a part and parcel of the public sphere, which is the area of spontaneous social discourse, shaping public reason according to the elementary principle of freedom and equality. As such, it has become a space close to the nature of social movements (Habermas, 1989). It needs to be stressed that despite their subversive nature which finds expression in their struggle towards various goals usually through different forms of public protest, the majority of social movements overwhelmingly accept the liberal-democratic *status quo*. In other words, they aim at rationalizing social life rather than subverting it; they aim at controlling the activities of politicians rather than abolishing the whole system. For this reason, the activity of new social movements displays an ambivalent dimension: they aim to eliminate specific types of actions affecting negatively political practice, but they do so in order to strengthen the role of ethics in the public sphere which, as they usually believe, should be governed by an inviolable canon of values and practices.

In other words, the power of the protest movements is both disintegrative and constructive at the same time. Such agonistic activity is needed by the democratic order and is fully in line with its immanent values. The stability and strength of democracy are not about freezing or ossifying its procedures. On the contrary, its vigour and viability depend in a great measure upon the acts of civil disobedience, protests, and conflicts which, while destabilizing the existing democratic order, are in fact strengthening it by triggering its internal mechanisms of self-correction which makes for its continuous improvement and enables the preservation of diversity in unity.

Internal diversity, respect for the agency of participants, supporters, and sympathizers, as well as openness are features that strengthen the identity of new movements as an important alternative to the existing political *status quo*. Their recognition and acceptance by traditional forms of political activity contribute to a more nuanced perception of social phenomena and a gradual transformation of social awareness. Social movements not only articulate real social needs but also act as interpreters and mentors, mediating the transmission of information between the political power detached from real social life, and the disappointed members of society. The major strength of social movements is the fact that they put on their agenda the issues which are dismissed in the calculations of political parties as counter-productive and useless from the point of view of their internal interests and goals of political marketing.

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS INSTITUTIONALIZATION
AND POLITICAL PARTIES: FROM CONTESTATION TO HYBRIDIZATION,
TAKEOVERS, AND OVERLAPS

In the most common view, new social movements are characterized as a type of collective action that contests, and is disruptive to, the conventional, mainstream and institutional politics, challenging not only stability but also the legitimacy and normative basis of the political system (Jenkins & Klandermans, 1995; Tilly, 1978; Snow, Soule, & Kriesi, 2006). Such an approach is visible in the definition of J.C. Jenkins (1995, p. 15), in which new social movements are "excluded or marginalized in the political order, either organizing new groups or advancing new political claims that have previously been ignored or excluded".

It is also argued that this disruptiveness and ability to avoid co-optation by established institutions constitute the source of social movements' political successes (Cowell-Meyers, 2014, p. 63).

The contrast between movement politics and institutional politics, based on the location–form–content distinction (political space, political method, and political claims), stressed in such an approach, is however too readily overdrawn (Katzenstein, 1998, p. 196). The institutionalization of social movements can be seen as a natural stage in their life cycle[1] (Oommen, 1990; Kriesi et al., 1995) and in this framework it means a "transition from outside to inside, informal to formal, radical to more moderate, genuine to artificial" (Katzenstein, 1998, p. 196). In this way, due to losing their radicalism and horizontalism, their core and identity are challenged to the point that they can cease to exist as movements and become formalized political organizations, i.e., interest groups (Prentoulis & Thomassen, 2020, pp. 345–346). Institutionalization can, however, be the outcome of the conscious choices made jointly by the movement and the state, possible only in specific circumstances shaped by the international environment, as well as correspondence of the political decisions, activities and measures taken by the social movements (Suh, 2011, p. 443). Institutionalization becomes a strategy that

---

[1] This path of formalization and adaptation is of course only one of the evolutionary possibilities for social movements, others being, for example, radicalization – the path to reinvigorated mobilization; commercialization – transformation in the direction of a service organization; involution – an exclusive emphasis on social incentives stemming from the solidarity to the constituency or social activities with the other members of the organization; reducing contacts with the surrounding environment; not reacting to demands of the environment and not adjusting their goals and modes of action (Kriesi, 1996, pp. 156–157; della Porta & Diani, 2006, p. 150).

allows social movements not only achieve their goals, but also introduce broader social and political changes that can benefit the collective good (Ruzza, 1997; Stearns & Almeida, 2004; Meyer, 2007, after Suh, 2011, p. 442).

It shows that sharp differentiation between social movements and traditional political representation does not seem to hold true, particularly in terms of organization and modes of political action. Social movements cannot be reduced to just confrontational and mobilizing tactics – they have positive power to affect various structures within the political system, including parties (Goldstone, 2003, p. 2). Their repertoire of strategies and tactics, the effectiveness of particular alliances that are cultivated, specific claims that are advanced, and finally the extent to which they affect mainstream institutional politics and policy (Meyer, 2004, p. 126) are to a large degree determined by the specific political opportunity structure within which they operate, where both attractiveness and efficiency of particular strategies depend on the structure of the polity (Meyer, 2004, p. 128).

The process of institutionalization of social movements can be divided into three parts that reinforce each other: organizational growth (regarding the constituency of its organizations and financial resources), internal institutionalization (higher degree of professionalization and centralization), and external institutionalization (a strategic shift in the action repertoire: from unconventional, confrontational collective actions towards more conventional and cooperative practices with formerly adversarial, institutional actors, mostly government agencies) (Van der Heijden, 1997, pp. 31–33). It is achieved in five interrelated ways, involving:

(1) individuals – members of social movement enter governmental or bureaucratic positions;

(2) ideas – ideas proposed by a movement are absorbed and often redefined by political parties and politicians;

(3) laws – legislation that addresses movement goals is passed, providing avenues of legal recourse;

(4) new bureaucratic institutions – designed to address movement concerns;

(5) formal recognition as non-governmental groups – an official way is created to represent their claims or constituency within government (Meyer & Laschever, 2016, p. 567).

Social movements and political parties are progressively more intertwined through the means of co-optation. They often create an ongoing symbiotic relationship involving sharing information and strategies, gaining from each other's

successes in electoral mobilization, swaying public opinion, and even joint fundraising (Goldstone, 2003, p. 23). Professionalization, co-optation, formalization, and routinization may however limit the options, resources, and appeal of the movement. Through institutionalization, it becomes similar to a political party, which can destroy its own image and integrity in the process (Cowell-Meyers, 2014, p. 63).

This tension between mobilizing discontent and representation is manifested in the hybrid nature of a movement party, which is "coalition(s) of political activists who emanate from social movements and try to apply the organization and strategic practice of social movements in the arena of party competition" (Kitschelt, 2006, p. 280). The departure from the weak coordination and unstructured, *ad hoc* modes of collective behaviour is marked by changes in the institutional setting, organizational infrastructure of collective action and procedures of social choice that create shared preference schedules of social movements (Kitschelt, 2006, p. 278).

A movement party is characterized by a low level of formal organizational structures and professionalization, and an absence of a formal definition of membership. The method of aggregating interests, decision-making structure and procedures are informal and fluid. A movement party lacks designated organs and officers that make decisions binding for the organization. At one end of the continuum, it can be dominated by one person – a charismatic leader, enjoying devoted personal following and patrimonial staff, who exercises unconditional and undisputed control, at the other end, it involves universal participatory coordination in grassroots style (Kitschelt, 2006, pp. 280–281).

This deficiency of structured and institutionalized methods of aggregating and formulating group interests leads to a somewhat meagre political programme focusing usually on only a few political issues that can be rather contradictory and inconsistent (Kitschelt, 2006, p. 281).

Finally, the political activities of a movement party combine more conventional practices of political engagement within the institutional arena (parliamentary debates, elections, etc.) as much as the extra-institutional mobilization such as protests (Kitschelt, 2006, p. 281).

Social movements have entered the space that before was occupied by political parties, also because it has been willingly given up by the latter in terms of organization, functions and ability to articulate citizens' interests and aspirations. The erosion of mainstream parties opened the window of opportunity for social movements so as to be a serious challenger for parties' role and position.

Reversely, the effectiveness of social movements' flexible, heterarchical structures, mobilization potential and networked logic of political action pose an attractive solution to the crisis of political parties' relevancy and legitimacy. Contemporary political parties become more like social movements, by adopting, or taking over, movements' goals, strategies, or organization. Hence, we can witness, for example, such phenomena as:

- anti-party – "a political organization that mobilizes against the established party system as a whole by competing with the established parties in the electoral channel" (Kriesi, 2015, p. 676), which "borrows social movements' rationale"; Italian the 5-Star Movement (The Movimento 5-Stelle) or German the Pirate Party, the Free Voters, or finally Alternative for Germany (AfD) can serve as notable examples (de Petris & Poguntke, 2015);

- social movement partyism – oppositional political parties that behave as social movements: mobilize groups outside electoral campaigns and beyond their party members, take up a social movement cause as its own by blending with a movement, and use actions typical for social movements, such as disruptive protests, to mobilize party members and other groups (Almeida, 2010, p. 174); such characteristics can be found, for example, in the Tea Party movement in the United States (Almeida & Van Dyke, 2014), Syriza coalition in Greece, the Polo Democrático Alternativo (Colombia), or the Movement toward Socialism (Movimiento al Socialismo, MAS) in Bolivia (Almeida, 2010);

- party de-institutionalization – which involves three main features: on the internal level, de-routinization (namely deterioration in organizational features), which makes established patterns of behaviour inside the organization replaced by *ad hoc* decision-making; on the external level, it means de-alignment between the party and its core electorate and changed perceptions of other parties (for example, lower coalition potential); and personalization of leadership, which involves an increasing emphasis on the party leader at the expense of the party structure and which causes violating the organization's formal and informal procedures (Harmel, Svåsand, & Mjelde, 2018, pp. 113–114, as cited in Yardımcı-Geyikçi & Yavuzyilmaz, 2022, pp. 72–75); the party de-institutionalization is visible in the cases of evolution of far-right radical parties, such as Progress Parties of Denmark and Norway (Harmel et al., 2018) and can also be connected with the decay of party systems resulting from the process of autocratization of the political system – the Justice and Development Party

(Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi, AKP) in Turkey can serve as an example here (Yardımcı-Geyikçi & Yavuzyilmaz, 2022).

New social movements go way beyond their definitional role of seeking or halting social and political change, filling the institutional void, by advancing the values and demands that are unheard or unaddressed by institutional politics, and placing themselves in the "non-electoral channels of the public sphere" (Hutter, Kriesi, & Lorenzini, 2019, p. 324). They are gaining, or are being prescribed, qualities of an institution, not only in organizational terms but also, or maybe primarily, along the lines of Claus Offe's (2006, p. 9) framework, as holders of social power.

New social movements have become institutions that "define the rules of the political game and as such, they define who can play and how they play. Consequently, they ultimately can shape who wins and who loses" (Steinmo, Neil, & Paul, 2001, p. 7555). In this view, social movements, as political institutions, are systems of rules that apply to the actors' future behaviour. They shape their motivational dispositions and actions by providing sets of opportunities and incentives, help actors make strategic choices, and raise the efficiency of social, political, and market transactions (Offe, 2006, pp. 10–17).

They come into being as a manifestation of communicative power, not a design of founders. Members of society gain reflexive awareness of their presence as institutions and their claim to validity. Institutions also provide moral resources, legitimizing ideas or ideologies that are required for their existence and endurance. Through this formative role and institutions' ability to shape actors' expectations and actions and regulate the distribution of values, they can provide predictability, stability, integration, and cooperation (Offe, 2006, pp. 12–19).

PARTIES' APPLICATION OF TOOLS TYPICAL FOR MOVEMENTS

On the other hand, social movements have affected priorly existing parties, too. The mechanism is twofold: firstly, parties apply tools and terminology typical of social movements, and secondly, they are influenced by the movements' discourse and solutions they promote in the public sphere.

The most perceptible and significant tool that was adapted by parties from social movements involves broad activization and mobilization with bottom-up communication and initiatives (Kruszewska, 2016, pp. 104–105). Analogically to

social movements responding to the spontaneous articulation of their members' needs and demands, modern parties stress their role of listening to and promoting the interests of the society, its members and/or specific groups, rejecting the elitist discourse of parties' defining right policies in cooperation with experts and technocrats. This type of discourse and attempts to build relationship with the electorate was applied by Southern European populist movement parties arising from anti-austerity movements. Like Greek Syriza, Spanish Podemos built its image in contrast to both national and supranational elites represented by the government and business on the national level, and the European Union and World Bank outside Spain (Fanoulis & Guerra, 2021). They strive to present their inclusiveness and openness, sometimes waiving the word "party" in their name or even the legal form in favour of more flexible forms, referring to social movement organizations: in Poland, none of the leading political groups in the parliament uses the word *partia* (literal Polish equivalent of "party"), in most cases applying some sort of agenda description as the name (e.g., Law and Justice, Civic Platform, Poland 2050) or the leader's name (Kukiz 15). Thus, parties apply social movement techniques to electoral and government politics in order to convey their message more effectively and to improve their image within the society. This may be a more complex process in which parties also absorb themes and issues raised by social movements (as described further in the text) or only a mechanism of image-shaping.

The anti-elitist discourse has sometimes taken the form of populism. It should be stressed that while most social movements are nowadays left, rightist movements have a strong stance, too (Caiani & della Porta, 2018) and populist parties claiming to represent the interest of everyman against the broader system and its elite are frequently observed on the right of the political spectrum. The toolkit of populism can be applied to a set of either right- or left-wing values (Rucht, 2019, pp. 68–70). This can be illustrated by the example of the German far-right party Alternative für Deutschland, which developed as a response to the growing salience of migration issues within the society (Hutter & Weisskircher, 2023, pp. 409–410) and which also applies typical party-movement instruments in mobilization of its supporters (Doerr, 2021).

Populism draws from the concept of bottom-up activism of people as opposed to the conventional initiatives of parties' agendas, but it also refers to the idea of identity. It has been highlighted by researchers that "populism's cultivation of an elitist out-group can be connected to the theoretical underpinnings of social identity framing" (Hameleers et al., 2021, p. 493). For populist parties, the social

movement toolkit is an important mechanism, however in this case, too, it is used for purposes of strictly electoral policies.

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS' IMPACT ON PARTIES' DISCOURSE AND DECISIONS

As collective action is what defines social movements, communication is key to their efficiency both in terms of mobilization of supporters and encouraging change of actual public policies. To achieve this, social movements need to communicate their message, and this frequently involves not only promoting some concepts and practical proposals, but also modifying the very essence of how the movement's central problem is perceived by the society (McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1996, p. 17). This context is analyzed through the concept of framing, first introduced by Erving Goffman (1974) and defined by David A. Snow as "the signifying work or meaning construction engaged in by social-movement activists and participants and other parties (e.g., antagonists, elites, media, countermovements) relevant to the interests of social movements and the challenges they mount" (2006, p. 384). The framing process involves influences on the relationship between reality and the actor's perception of this reality, affecting their knowledge, emotional stance, as well as actions with respect to this reality (Crossley, 2002, pp. 134–135). The objective of this process is to convince participants, but also actual and potential allies and antagonists "that their cause is just and important" (Tarrow, 2011, p. 26).

As parties are among actors involved in various relations with social movements (Piccio, 2016, p. 263), the way they perceive and describe social phenomena may be directly affected by signifying effort of movement leaders or participants. A successful process of framing was observed in Cabo Verde, where postulates concerning regionalization were absent from the public discourse, until their promotion of a bottom-up movements only to be taken over by political parties and to become a significant point of parliamentary argument (Rodrigues Sanches & Lopes, 2022). Movement activists are frequently involved in party politics or agenda building, too – either by way of activists' entering political arena, or else through politicians' interest and openness to movements. Among the most prominent examples in the modern world, one can list the presidents of Brazil, Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva in 2003–2010 and from 2023 (Nogueira, 2017), as well as Bolivia, Evo Morales in 2006–2019 (McNelly, 2020).

On the other hand, the impact on political parties' strategies and actions is also indirect, mediated through the public opinion. Especially for the new, identity-based social movements, affecting the public and modifying cultural norms concerning this identity has become a major objective in itself (Banaszak & Ondercin, 2016, pp. 362–363). This involves the important dilemma of whether to challenge the popular attitudes and convictions in order to encourage a deep transformation in accordance with the movement's fundamental concepts or else to take small steps, accepting compromise in a longer-term strategy. The same question concerns the choice of methods: while more drastic and attention-catching actions get more media coverage and reach a broader audience, they can discourage by-standers not only to a single campaign or the movement itself, but also to its main cause (Gamson, 2006, pp. 249–251). This radicalism is sometimes soothed by the division of roles between different actors within a single movement – which can be especially effective in the case of bigger movements.

Social media are an important tool in social movements' kit not only in terms of attracting participants or organising specific initiatives but also in the area of communicating the message to the public. The new online forum is key for the organization of social movements (Carty, 2018, pp. 1–18), but equally importantly, "[a]nalysing the influence of the ICT on the democracy we are able to see that new communication technologies may increase access to political decision makers and, in a broader sense, contribute to public opinion formation both on global as well as local issues" (Biernacka-Ligieza, 2016, p. 115). This is an important way to shift the consensus and persuade the public opinion to support the movement's cause without the agency of traditional media or politicians.

And acting through the public opinion, political parties and organizations, social movements may achieve the major envisaged outcome in the form of a policy change. Depending on the political opportunity structure (Meyer & Minkoff, 2004), there are also other mechanisms of introducing the movement's postulates into state decisions. Some of them are disruptive ones, related to various forms of public protest which "can have effects on elected officials, courts, third parties, and counter-movements. These effects can derive from specific, targeted campaigns or can be the cumulative result of widespread protest" (Andrews, 2002, p. 108), as well illustrated by the deep change in pre-war politics in Ukraine, affected by the recurring activities of protest movements (Oliinyk & Kuzio, 2021). Others involve the direct participation of movement activists in decision-making bodies, including collective organs or public administration (Banaszak, 2005, pp. 150–152). This can occur in both ways: either by way

of active participants of the movement striving to achieve a position in such organs, or else by recruiting politicians or officials to support the movement. Movements may also apply various participatory and consultative mechanisms tools available to the public, such as public hearings, minipublics, consultations, or even the right of petition. The instrumentarium of cooperation and participation developed by the European Union for various components of the civil society have been well used by many social movements and social movement organizations, including the environmental movement cooperating with the European Commission and European Parliament in development of environmental strategies and policies (Ruzza, 2011, p. 460). Only in 2022, in the European Union's petition mechanism (Magnette, 2002, pp. 69–70), there were 152 petitions submitted associated with various subthemes of the "Environment" key word, and further 37 concerned with animal welfare (European Parliament, 2023). One should stress that movements' impact on public policies may range from simply affecting the agenda, through providing solutions for discussion, to legal changes and to structural transformation within the state and society (Almeida, 2019, p. 132). The process may also evolve in time, forcing the evolution of the movement's strategy as well.

Nowadays, in line with changes in the political arena, social movements and social movement organizations frequently go global or at least international. This means, on one hand, international cooperation and participation in various forums of social movement organizations (Smith, 2015, p. 188), but also, on the other, an effort to impact policies shaped or implemented by international bodies, too (Marks & McAdam, 1999, pp. 102–103). In this area, an important role is played by those social movement organizations whose operations surpass state borders. Transnational movements have become major actors in some areas, including environmentalist and global justice movements (Khagram, Riker, & Sikkink, 2002, pp. 3–4). In the early 21st century, the transnational strategy was best illustrated by the alter-globalist movement, a coalition of environmentalist, labour and indigenous protesters and a series of demonstrations at major international economic events, most notably Seattle 1999, but also Washington 2000, Quebec City and Genoa 2001 (Munck, 2007, pp. 57–70). It should be highlighted that in many cases, the participants apply very loose forms of cooperation, keeping to their own values and objectives. They may act as individual organizations joining members from different states and representing supranational interests, or else as coalitions of groups and movements of variable interests which are still somehow associated and related (Eschle, 2001, p. 154). A good example

of the latter model can be found in the cooperation of indigenous peoples' movements (Eschle, 2001, p. 154). Despite their differences and peculiarities of their situation, they face analogical issues, especially concerning protection of cultural and natural heritage, as well as land claims. Therefore, they engage in transnational cooperation to pursue shared values and goals (Etty et al., 2020). It should be stressed that while modern communication technologies facilitate cross-border cooperation in general, including cooperation within social movements, transnational movements existed and operated as early as in the 1950s (Pieterse, 2001, p. 26).

CONCLUSION

Social movements have readily populated our political imagination, and their impressive range of ways to influence political life is considered to be a perpetual and crucial element of the political landscape. The qualities and roles acquired by social movements allow us to see them as institutions of social and political practices that are formative for the "movement society and the modern public sphere. However, they are facing an important dilemma which is posed before them by the prospect of entering the mechanisms of institutional politics. On the one hand, such a decision is often against their value system, and it implies a serious risk of weakening and withering away. On the other hand, the choice is to remain outside the system, confining their activities to a struggle towards their goals by means of pressure and protest, which delimits the effectiveness of their actions" (Steyn, 2012, pp. 340–341). The politicization of social movements, by establishing formal ties of cooperation with a specific political party, is associated with the peril of losing independence and the possibility of their instrumental treatment by organized political bodies. It is not always obvious, however, to what extent the establishment of such ties with political parties is a genuine concern for social movements. A decision to establish such ties may result from a calculation and its risks are accepted as unavoidably associated with the need to exert a more effective pressure, demonstrate publicly one's unique agenda and identity, and fill a void left by existing political parties.

References:

Almeida, P. (2010). Social Movement Partyism: Collective Action and Political Parties. In: N. Van Dyke, & H.J. McCammon (Eds.). *Strategic Alliances: Coalition Building and Social Movements* (pp. 170–196). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Almeida, P. (2019). *Social Movements: The Structure of Collective Mobilization*. Oakland: University of California Press.

Almeida, P., & Van Dyke, N. (2014). Social Movement Partyism and the Tea Party's Rapid Mobilization. In: N. Van Dyke, & D.S. Meyer (Eds.). *Understanding the Tea Party Movement* (pp. 55–72). London: Routledge.

Andrews, K.T. (2002). Creating Social Change: Lessons from the Civil Rights Movement. In: D.S. Meyer, N. Whittier, & B. Robnett (Eds.). *Social Movements: Identity, Culture, and the State* (pp. 105–117), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Banaszak, L.A. (2005). Inside and Outside the State: Movement Insider Status, Tactics, and Public Policy Achievements. In: D.S. Meyer, V. Jenness, & H. Ingram (Eds.). *Routing the Opposition: Social Movements, Public Policy, and Democracy* (pp. 149–176). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Banaszak, L.A., & Ondercin, H.L. (2016). Public Opinion as a Movement Outcome: The Case of the U.S. Women's Movement. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly*, *21*(3), 361–378. DOI: 10.17813/1086-671X-21-3-361.

Biernacka-Ligieza, I. (2016). Active or Passive Citizen: The Influence of New Media Over Local Communities' Participation. In: B. Çoban (Ed.). *Social Media and Social Movements: The Transformation of Communication Patterns* (pp. 109–129). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Bulira, W. (2017). Nowe ruchy społeczne: nowa jakość w polityce ponowoczesnej? In: M. Marczewska-Rytko, & D. Maj (Eds.). *Nowe ruchy społeczne* (pp. 27–36). Lublin: Wydawnictwo UMCS.

Caiani, M., & della Porta D. (2018). The Radical Right as Social Movement Organizations. In: J. Rydgren (Ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of the Radical Right* (pp. 327–347). Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190274559.013.17.

Carty, V. (2018). *Social Movements and New Technology*. London–New York: Taylor and Francis.

Castells, M. (1996). *The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture.* Vol. 1: *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford/Cambridge, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Castells, M. (1997). *The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture.* Vol. 2: *The Power of Identity*. Oxford/Cambridge, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Castells, M. (2015). *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Castells, M., & Cardoso, G. (Eds.). (2005). *The Network Society: From Knowledge to Policy*. Washington, DC: Johns Hopkins Center for Transatlantic Relations.

Cowell-Meyers, K.B. (2014). The Social Movement as Political Party: The Northern Ireland Women's Coalition and the Campaign for Inclusion. *Perspectives on Politics, 12*(1), 61–80. DOI: 10.1017/S153759271300371X.

Crossley, N. (2002). *Making Sense of Social Movements*. Buckingham–Philadelphia: Open University Press.

de Petris, A., & Poguntke, T. (Eds.). (2015). *Anti-Party Parties in Germany and Italy: Protest Movements and Parliamentary Democracy*. Rome: LUISS University Press.

della Porta, D., & Diani, M. (2006). *Social Movements: An Introduction*. Hoboken: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Doerr, N. (2021). The Visual Politics of the Alternative for Germany (AfD): Anti-Islam, Ethno-Nationalism, and Gendered Images. *Social Sciences*, *10*(1), 20. DOI: 10.3390/socsci10010020.

Eschle, C. (2001). *Global Democracy, Social Movements and Feminism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Etty, T., Heyvaert, V., Carlarne, C., Huber, B., Peel, J., & van Zeben, J. (2020). Indigenous Rights Amidst Global Turmoil. *Transnational Environmental Law*, *9*(3), 385–391. DOI: 10.1017/S2047102520000357.

European Parliament. (2023). *Petitions*. Retrieved February 14, 2023, from: https://www.europarl.europa.eu/at-your-service/en/be-heard/petitions.

Fanoulis, E., & Guerra, S. (2021). Aporias in Greece and Spain's Left-Wing Inclusionary Populism. *New Political Science*, *43*(3), 339–354. DOI: 10.1080/07393148.2021.1954438.

Gamson, W.A. (2006). Bystanders, Public Opinion, and the Media. In: D.A. Snow, S.A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 242–261). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. DOI: 10.1002/9780470999103.ch11.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. New York: Harvard University Press.

Goldstone, J.A. (2003). Introduction: Bridging Institutionalized and Noninstitutionalized Politics. In: J.A. Goldstone (Ed.). *States, Parties, and Social Movements* (pp. 1–24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511625466.002.

Habermas, J. (1987). *The Theory of Communicative Action*, vol. 2. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hameleers, M., Schmuck, D., Schulz, A., Wirz, D.S., Matthes, J., Bos, L., Corbu, N., & Andreadis, I. (2021). The Effects of Populist Identity Framing on Populist Attitudes across Europe: Evidence from a 15-Country Comparative Experiment. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 33*(3), 491–510. DOI: 10.1093/ijpor/edaa018.

Harmel, R., Svåsand, L., & Mjelde, H. (2018). *Institutionalization (and De-institutionalization) of Right-Wing Protest Parties: The Progress Parties in Denmark and Norway*. London–New York: ECPR Press/Rowman & Littlefield.

Hutter, S., Kriesi, H., & Lorenzini, J. (2019). Social Movements in Interaction with Political Parties. In: D.A. Snow, S.A. Soule, H. Kriesi, & H.J. McCammon (Eds.). *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 322–337). Oxford–Cambridge, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. DOI: 10.1002/9781119168577.ch18.

Hutter, S., & Weisskircher, M. (2023). New Contentious Politics. Civil Society, Social Movements, and the Polarisation of German Politics. *German Politics, 32*(3), 403–419. DOI: 10.1080/09644008.2022.2044474.

Jenkins, J.C. (1995). Social Movements, Political Representation, and the State: An Agenda and Comparative Framework. In: J.C. Jenkins, & B. Klandermans (Eds.). *The Politics of Social Protest: Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movements* (pp. 14–36). London: UCL Press.

Jenkins, J.C., & Klandermans, B. (Eds.). (1995). *The Politics of Social Protest: Comparative Perspectives on States and Social Movements* (pp. 14–36). London: UCL Press.

Jenness, V. (2005). Velcro Triangles: Elite Mobilization of Local Antidrug Issue Coalitions. In: D.S. Meyer, V. Jenness, & H. Ingram (Eds.). *Routing the Opposition: Social Movements, Public Policy, and Democracy* (pp. 98–116). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Katzenstein, M.F. (1998). Stepsisters: Feminist Movement Activism in Different Institutional Spaces. In: D.S. Meyer, & S. Tarrow (Eds.). *The Social Movement Society: Contentious Politics for a New Century* (pp. 195–216). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Khagram, S., Riker, J.V., & Sikkink, K. (2002). From Santiago to Seattle: Transnational Advocacy Groups Restructuring World Politics. In: S. Khagram, J.V. Riker, & K. Sikkink, *Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks and Norms* (pp. 3–23). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Kitschelt, H. (2006). Movement Parties. In: R. Katz, & W. Crotty (Eds.). *Handbook of Party Politics* (pp. 278–290). London–Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Kriesi, H. (1996). The Organizational Structure of New Social Movements in a Political Context. In: D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy, & M.N. Zald (Eds.). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (pp. 152–184). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511803987.009.

Kriesi, H. (2015). Party Systems, Electoral Systems, and Social Movements. In: D. della Porta, & M. Diani (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Social Movements* (pp. 667–680). Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199678402.013.24.

Kriesi, H., Koopmans R., Dyvendak J.V., Giugni M.G. (1995). *New Social Movements in Western Europe. A comparative analysis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Laclau E., Mouffe C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.

Kruszewska, D. (2016). Social Movements and Political Parties. *Perspectives on Europe, 46*(1), 100–114.

Magnette, P. (2002). Vers une citoyenneté européenne directe? Pratiques du droit de petition dans l'Union européenne. *Revue Internationale de Politique Comparée*, *9*(1), 65–78.

Marks, G., & McAdam, D. (1999). On the Relationship of Political Opportunities to the Form of Collective Action: The Case of the European Union. In: D. della Porta,

H. Kriesi, & D. Rucht (Eds.). *Social Movements in a Globalizing World* (pp. 97–111). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

McAdam, D., McCarthy, J.D., & Zald, M.N. (1996). Introduction: Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Framing Processes – Toward a Synthetic, Comparative Perspective on Social Movements. In: D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy, & M.N. Zald (Eds). *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings* (pp. 1–20). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511803987.002.

McNelly, A. (2020). The Incorporation of Social Organizations under the MAS in Bolivia. *Latin American Perspectives, 47*(4), 76–95. DOI: 10.1177/0094582X20918556.

Meyer, D. (2004). Protest and Political Opportunities. *Annual Review of Sociology, 30*(1), 125–145. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.soc.30.012703.110545.

Meyer, D. (2007). *The Politics of Protest: Social Movements in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Meyer, D., & Laschever, E. (2016). Social Movements and the Institutionalization of Dissent in America. In: R. Valelly, S. Mettler, & R. Lieberman (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of American Political Development* (pp. 563–589). Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199697915.013.14.

Meyer, D., & Minkoff, D.C. (2004). Conceptualizing Political Opportunity. *Social Forces, 82*(4), 1457–1492. DOI: 10.1353/sof.2004.0082.

Mouffe, Ch. (1996). Radical Democracy or Liberal Democracy? In: D. Trend (Ed.). *Radical Democracy. Identity, Citizenship and the State* (pp. 19–26). London: Routledge.

Munck, R. (2007). *Globalization and Contestation: The New Great Counter-movement*. London–New York: Routledge.

Nogueira, A.S. (2017). Lulism and the Institutionalization of Social Movements in Brazil: Strengthening Democratic Inclusion and Perpetuating Hegemony. *Tempo Social, revista de sociologia da USP*, *29*(3), 229–260. DOI: 10.11606/0103-2070. ts.2017.118722.

Offe, C. (1985). New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics. *Social Research*, *52*(4), 817–868.

Offe, C. (1990). Reflections on the Institutional Self-transformation of Movement Politics: A Tentative Stage Model. In: J.R. Dalton, & M. Kuechler (Eds.). *Challenging the Political Order: New Social and Political Movements in Western Democracies* (pp. 232–250). Cambridge: Polity Press.

Offe, C. (1997). Micro-aspects of Democratic Theory: What Makes for the Deliberative Competence of Citizens. In: A. Hadenius (Ed.). *Democracy's Victory and Crisis* (pp. 81–104). New York: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/ CBO9780511558832.005.

Offe, C. (2006). Political Institutions and Social Power: Conceptual Explorations. In: I. Shapiro, S. Skowronek, & D. Galvin (Eds.). *Rethinking Political Institutions: The Art of the State* (pp. 9–31). New York–London: New York University Press.

Oliinyk, A., & Kuzio, T. (2021). The Euromaidan Revolution, Reforms and Decommunisation in Ukraine. *Europe–Asia Studies*, *73*(5), 807–836. DOI: 10.1080/09668136.2020.1862060.

Oommen, T.K. (1990). Movements and Institutions: Structural Opposition or Processual Linkage? *International Sociology, 5*(2), 145–156. DOI: 10.1177/026858090005002003.

Pelling, N. (2004). *The Network Is the Knowledge: Ideology & Strategy in Mintzberg's Ten Schools*. [MBA Dissertation]. Surrey, UK: Kingston University Business School.

Piccio, D.R. (2016). The Impact of Social Movements on Political Parties. In: L. Bosi, M. Giugni, & K. Uba (Eds.). *The Consequences of Social Movements* (pp. 263–284). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pieterse, J.N. (2001). Globalization and Collective Action. In: P. Hamel, H. Lustiger-Thaler, J.N. Pieterse, & S. Roseneil (Eds.). *Globalization and Social Movements* (pp. 21–40). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Prentoulis, M., & Thomassen, L. (2020). Movement Parties: A New Hybrid Form of Politics? In: C. Flesher Fominaya, & R.A. Feenstra (Eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Contemporary European Social Movements: Protest in Turbulent Times* (pp. 343–356). London–New York: Routledge.

Rodrigues Sanches, E., & Lopes J. (2022). Shaking Up Democracy from Below: Protest and Change in Cabo Verde. In: E. Rodrigues Sanches (Ed.). *Popular Protest, Political Opportunities, and Change in Africa* (pp. 19–38). London: Routledge.

Rucht, D. (2019). Right-Wing Populism in Context: A Historical and Systematic Perspective. In: G. Fitzi, J. Mackert, & B.S. Turner (Eds.). *Populism and the Crisis of Democracy*. Vol. 2: *Politics, Social Movements and Extremism* (pp. 68–84). London–New York: Routledge.

Ruzza, J. (1997). Institutional Actors and the Italian Peace Movement: Specializing and Branching Out. *Theory and Society*, *26*(1), 87–127.

Ruzza, J. (2011). Social Movements and the European Interest Intermediation of Public Interest Groups. *Journal of European Integration, 33*(4), 453–469. DOI: 10.1080/07036337.2011.579750.

Sagan I. (2016). Młoda demokracja a neoliberalna polityka miejska. *Przegląd Socjologiczny*, 1: 9–26.

Sitrin, M., & Azzellini, D. (2014). *They Can't Represent Us! Reinventing Democracy from Greece to Occupy*. London–New York: Verso Books.

Smith, J. (2015). The Transnational Network for Democratic Globalization. In: J. Goodwin, & J.M. Jasper (Eds.). *The Social Movements Reader* (pp. 184–195). Oxford–Cambridge, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Snow, D.A. (2006). Framing Processes, Ideology, and Discursive Fields. In: D.A. Snow, S.A. Soule, & H. Kriesi (Eds.). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (pp. 380–412). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. DOI: 10.1002/9780470999103.ch17.

Snow, D.A., Soule, S.A., & Kriesi, H. (Eds). (2006). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Stearns, L.B., & Almeida, P.D. (2004). The Formation of State Actor-Social Movement Coalitions and Favorable Policy Outcomes. *Social Problems*, *51*(4), 478–504. DOI: 10.1525/sp.2004.51.4.478.

Steinmo, S., Neil, J.S., & Paul, B.B. (2001). Institutionalism. In: N.J. Smelser, & P.B. Baltes (Eds.). *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Vol. 11 (pp. 7554–7558). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Steyn, I. (2012). The State and Social Movements: Autonomy and Its Pitfalls. *Politikon*, *39*(3), 331–351. DOI: 10.1080/02589346.2012.746184.

Suh, D. (2011). Institutionalizing Social Movements: The Dual Strategy of the Korean Women's Movement. *The Sociological Quarterly*. *52*(3), 442-471.

Tarrow, S.G. (2011). *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics. Revised and Updated Third Edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, Ch. (1978). *From Mobilization to Revolution*. Boston: Addison-Wesley.

Tilly, Ch. (1984). Social Movements and National Politics. In: C. Bright, & S. Harding (Eds.). *State-Making and Social Movements: Essays in History and Theory* (pp. 297–317). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Tilly, Ch. (1988). Social Movements, Old and New. In: L. Kriesberg, B. Misztal, J. Mucha (Eds.). *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change*. Vol. 10: *Social Movements As a Factor of Change in the Contemporary World: A Research Annual* (pp. 1–18). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Tilly, Ch. (1994). Social Movements as Historically Specific Clusters of Political Performances. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, *38*, 1–30.

Tilly, Ch. (2004). *Social Movements 1768–2004*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Touraine, A. (1981). *The Voice and the Eye: An Analysis of Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Touraine, A. (1985). An Introduction to the Study of Social Movements. *Social Research*, *52*(4), 749–787.

Touraine, A. (1987). *The Workers' Movement*. Cambridge–New York: Cambridge University Press.

Touraine, A. (2009). *Thinking Differently*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Van der Heijden, H.A. (1997). Political Opportunity Structure and the Institutionalisation of the Environmental Movement. *Environmental Politics*, *6*(4), 25–50. DOI: 10.1080/09644019708414357.

Wallerstein, I. (1974). *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Academic Press.

Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Yardımcı-Geyikçi, S., & Yavuzyilmaz, H. (2022). Party (De)Institutionalization in Times of Political Uncertainty: The Case of the Justice and Development Party in Turkey. *Party Politics, 28*(1), 71–84. DOI: 10.1177/1354068820960010.