

Title of proposed Workshop:	A Closely Coupled Tango? Interactions between Electoral and Protest Politics
Outline of topic:	<p>Social movement studies have tended to declare social movements the defining feature of established post-1968 democracies (Meyer and Tarrow 1998) and generally prioritized the protest arena of action (for exceptions see Meyer and Lupo 2007: 120-122). However, there have been important recent contributions pointing out the need to focus on the electoral arena, political parties, and their interactions with social movements and protest politics (e.g., Goldstone 2003; McAdam and Tarrow 2010, 2013; Kriesi et al. 2012; Hutter 2014; Heaney and Rojas 2015; della Porta et al. 2016). As stated by one of us in a recent review of the field, this type of inter-arena interaction constitutes one of the most important challenges of social movement research (Císař 2015). At present, their interaction remains undertheorized and understudied. Therefore, the proposed workshop focuses on one of the most debated <i>theoretical and empirical problems of social movement research</i>. Moreover, by focusing on these two particular arenas, the papers assembled in the workshop will be able to address more general issues related to interactions of social fields in modern societies (Fligstein and McAdam 2012). Also, it will hopefully stimulate conversations across various research areas by bringing together scholars working on social movements and political parties, as well as on political participation and representation more generally.</p> <p>Focusing on the interactions between electoral and protest politics seems especially important in studying those segments of the population that tend to express their grievances not through street protest, but through the protest vote, which compared to the movements of the Left is more common among those siding with the (radical) Right (Koopmans et al. 2005). While the relationship between the electoral and protest arenas is reinforcing in case of the Left, it seems to be substitutive for the political Right (Hutter and Kriesi 2013; Hutter 2014). Given that European societies are currently facing multiple challenges, such as the recent economic recession in some parts of the continent, the rise in political populism, and xenophobic mobilization against diverse representatives of the supposed European “other”, this type of research focused not only on protest, but also its electoral consequences is about to become even more important. This is currently reinforced by the European “migrant crisis” which holds a clear potential to politically reconfigure not only the European political arena, but also national politics in many member states (see current Poland as an example). In this respect, the workshop focuses on a problem of <i>high real-world relevance</i>.</p>

<p>Relation to existing research:</p>	<p>Politics is about conflicting political interests and issues that are advocated by parties, social movements, citizens' groups etc. The available literature on political parties has conceptualized this terrain of contested political issues as a country's political space (see for example Marks et al. 2006; Kriesi et al. 2008; Vachudova and Hooghe 2009; Rovny and Edwards 2012). While the party literature has used a spatial model to understand interactions among political parties, we suggest to extend its idea of political space to include not only political parties but also protest politics. Political space is a structure of issue dimensions that are relevant in various societies, on which political actors take positions and compete for public support (Rovny and Edwards 2012: 57). Similarly, the currently burgeoning literature on social fields (drawing mostly on Bourdieu, see for example Bourdieu 1991) has developed a related concept of political field that is the site in which collective agents articulate their visions of the world and thereby transform "the world itself" (Thompson 1991: 26). By producing slogans, programs and the like, political actors seek both to construe and impose a particular vision of the world and to mobilize the support of those who should serve as a basis of their political power to accumulate political capital.</p> <p>The classical assumption of the spatial understanding of politics is that political actors, being restricted by their ideology and constituency, strategically interact with other actors and posit themselves within the political space and colonize a specific issue area. A particular area of political space can be taken only by one political actor. If political space on a specific issue dimension is already taken by an established political actor, there is no space left for other political actors to mobilize in this issue area. This mechanism has been used to explain the countervailing or disalignment effect between parties and movements. For instance, authors focusing on xenophobic and extreme right claims making (Koopmans et al. 2005: 185-187, Giugni et al. 2005: 146, Koopmans and Statham 1999) explain that if there is an established party which articulates a similarly radical agenda and which is even able to participate in the government and implement its program, the space for radicals decreases, since most potential supporters will channel their concerns through this established party. The available space for radical protest contracts or even closes completely (see Kriesi et al. 2012 and Hutter 2014 for a more general application of this logic in the context of Western Europe; Císař and Navrátil 2015a and Císař and Vráblíková 2016 on Central-Eastern Europe).</p> <p>Also, as emphasized by many authors in both the party and social movement literatures (for example Kitschelt et al. 1999; Kriesi et al. 2008), a multi-dimensional character of the political space is particularly important for our understanding of the interaction between the party and protest fields. Specifically, this means that although political space in all countries has a "master dimension," often labelled as the left-right axis, there is no uniform issue composition of this axis; instead "different semantics" characterize different countries (for example Kitschelt et al. 1999; Marks et al. 2006; Kriesi et al. 2008; Vachudova and Hooghe 2009, Rovny and Edwards 2012). Countries vary in terms of what issues form the primary conflict dimension and what issues remain of secondary</p>
--	---

importance. The mainstream political parties not only position themselves on this dimension and try to usurp place for themselves, but also actively seek to preserve this very dimension as the only 'political playground' and to keep potentially disruptive new issues at bay. As a result, issues that are politically relevant but not as salient as the master dimension are actively downplayed and pushed outside the party politics arena by the mainstream parties (Rovny and Edwards 2012). Due to this mechanism, under normal conditions, we should expect a substitutive relationship suggesting that the party and protest fields move in opposite directions in terms of their issue composition.

However, it is not clear whether the same mechanism characterizes the relationship between party and protest politics in general. According to Hutter's (2014) results on Western Europe, summarized in the form of the differing logics hypothesis, while the countervailing mechanism defines the political Right, in case of the Left there is congruence between parties in power and political protest. Unlike the political Right, whose success in formal politics decreases protest, the left government reinforces protest of allied movement forces. When summarizing the development of US politics in the 20th century, McAdam and Tarrow (2013) found congruence for both political Right and Left. While the dominance of the Left triggers liberal and left movements, the hegemony of the conservative forces helps right-wing movements; in general, the institutionally prevailing political forces open opportunities for their potential movement allies in the political system. On the contrary, focusing on the whole political spectrum in post-1989 Central-Eastern Europe, Cisar and his collaborates (Císar and Navrátil 2015a, Císar and Vráblíková 2016) demonstrate the existence of countervailing relation between the arenas of party and protest politics.

The existing work on the party-protest relationship has interpreted the countervailing dynamics mainly from the perspective of the movements: as the master issue is already articulated in the party field, there is not much space left for movements and it makes less sense for political actors in the protest field to mobilize on the same issue (Kriesi et al. 2012: 190, Hutter 2014: 37, see also Tilly 1995, Tarrow 2011). The present workshop should open an opportunity also for different conceptualization of these interactions. Obviously, one of them is the congruence dynamics. For instance, such a connecting role can be played by niche parties (like Greens, ethnic regionalists or radical right) that tend to be newer political actors marginalized in relation to the main political dimension (Meguid 2005, 2008). In general, the countervailing dynamics between parties and protest changes into congruence when the equilibrium of competition among the mainstream parties on the master issue dimension is destabilized. In these times, opportunities open for protest actors to put their demands on the agenda in the party field. In terms of the classical political opportunity structure apparatus, this is an instance of shifting alignments. Shifting alignments make party leaders to look for new sources of support outside the established camps; as a result, opportunities for protest actors open up (Tarrow 2011: 165). In situations shifting alignments the two

	<p>fields align in terms of issues expressed in them.</p> <p>Similarly, the saliency of political issues might be reconfigured because of external developments such as the appearance of a new social cleavage (demarcation-integration due to globalization; see Kriesi et al. 2012; Hutter 2014) or the occurrence of some significant threat leading to a major crisis, as the current economic crisis. In such moments, the equilibrium supported by the mainstream parties is lost, a new space for other issues and actors opens up and the party and protest fields get aligned. If we look at the general protest actors' ability to put their issues on political agenda, Jack Goldstone (2004: 355) shows that it is "triggered by major society-wide crises, such as military or economic challenges that weaken support for a government." In other words, protest can align with the mainstream political agenda once a major crisis hits the country. According to Goldstone (1980: 1041), a protest group has "excellent chances of eventually attaining its aims, provided it maintains its challenge until a crisis arises that makes success likely."</p> <p>Contemporary Europe is going through at least two types of <i>crises</i> right now. The Great Recession has been accompanied by the massive inflow of refugees, which hit the continent unprepared. While the first one has already been covered in the literature (see Bermeo and Bartels 2014; della Porta 2015; Giugni and Grasso 2015), the second one is in an urgent need of research attention (but see Eggert and Giugni 2015; Morales et al. 2015). Therefore, our workshop addresses timely issues of economic, cultural and social sources of collective action. Will the current crises lead to new types of political mobilization and electoral action? Do they lead to ever more closely coupled mobilization in the two arenas? Or are we witnessing ever increasing detachment and differentiation between the various forms of interest intermediation? Most importantly, how does mobilization in protest and electoral politics interact and influence perceptible political outcomes?</p> <p>However, our workshop is not limited to the spatial modeling of party–movement interactions. We are equally interested in studies that center more on organizations or individual participants to study that interaction. For example, we are interested in papers that look at cooperation or the lack of it on the level of inter-organizational networks that relate political parties, interest groups and protest movements (e.g., Petrova and Tarrow 2007; Beyers et al. 2008; Diani 2015; Čisáň and Navrátil 2015b). Here, the workshop is open also to those researching, for example, recent transformations in the relations between social democrats and unions, Christian democrats and churches, and Greens and new social movements. Of course, we are particularly interested in the interactions between Right and Left wing party populists and their broader movement-based extra-parliamentary milieus across and beyond Europe. What role do these extra-parliamentary milieus and organizations play? How do they differ across contexts? Moreover, the workshop is open to research focusing on the individual-level relations between involvement in protest and electoral politics. Already Barnes and Kaase (1979) indicated that these two forms are not exclusively used by certain types of individuals (see also Saunders 2014). However, we do not</p>
--	--

	<p>know much about differences across various segments of the population and across countries. In addition, as Heaney and Rojas (2015) show, the in- and out-flow of activists in a specific arena changes quite considerably over time and might have profound implications for the interactions between movements and parties. Therefore, we welcome contributions that try to disentangle the complex individual-level relationship and its relation to the broader context in which participation is embedded.</p>
--	--

<p>Likely participants:</p>	<p>Although we would encourage the participation of scholars working on theoretical interpretations of contemporary forms of activism and their interactions, we are particularly keen to include and entice academics engaged in fine-grained empirical comparative analysis. Also, we are keen to attract scholars working not only on Europe, but also on Asia and the global South. We are addressing equally political scientists as well as sociologists and researchers in related fields.</p>
------------------------------------	---

<p>Type of Papers required:</p>	<p>On the general level, we aim at bridging the rift between scholars of political parties, social movements and political participation, which hinders our adequate understanding of current developments. These developments offer a broader potential for incorporating the results of the last four decades of social movement research more firmly into political science, which has traditionally viewed them either as marginal or alternative to institutionalized politics, or a disruptive outburst of popular dissatisfaction. Our workshop will provide its participants with a unique opportunity to further develop these and related issues relevant to the interactions of parties and movements. We invite theoretical, conceptual and empirical papers, which focus on how movements, parties, and political elites interact in democratic and de/democratizing settings.</p> <p>In terms of selecting papers, the workshop has two main objectives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To develop comparative analysis of the interactions of party and movement politics, and to construct a far more extensive and thorough empirical basis of their study. 2. To include theoretical contributions from those engaged with criticizing the embedded assumptions of mainstream protest-centered social movement studies, and invite political scientists to embrace the relevance of social movements in party politics.
--	--

<p>Biographical notes:</p>	<p>ONDŘEJ CÍSAŘ is Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University and is also affiliated to the Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences. He is editor-in-chief of the Czech edition of Czech Sociological Review. His research focus is on political mobilization, social movements and political sociology. Among his recent publications are research papers in <i>European Union Politics</i>, <i>Democratization</i> and <i>Social Movement Studies</i>.</p>
-----------------------------------	--

	<p>SWEN HUTTER is Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the European University Institute in Florence. His research interests involve social movements, political parties and political participation. Among his recent publications are <i>Protesting Culture and Economics in Western Europe</i> (2014; University of Minnesota Press) and <i>Politicizing Europe: Integration and Mass Politics</i> (2016; Cambridge University Press, co-edited with Edgar Grande and Hanspeter Kriesi).</p>
--	--

<p>References:</p>	<p>Barnes, Samuel H. and Max Kaase. 1979. <i>Political Action. Mass Participation in Five Western Democracies</i>. Beverly Hills: Sage.</p> <p>Bermeo, Nancy and Larry M. Bartels, eds. 2014. <i>Mass Politics in Tough Times</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Beyers, Jan, Rainer Eising and William Maloney. 2008. "Researching Interest Group Politics in Europe and Elsewhere: Much We Study, Little We Know?" <i>West European Politics</i> 31(6): 1103-1128.</p> <p>Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. "Political Representation: <i>Elements of a Theory of the Political Field</i>." Pp. 171-202 in <i>Language and Symbolic Power</i>, edited by John Thompson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.</p> <p>Císař, Ondřej and Jiří Navrátil. 2015a. "At the Ballot Boxes or in the Streets and Factories: Economic Contention in the Visegrad Group." Pp. 35-53 in <i>Austerity and Protest: Popular Contention in Times of Economic Crisis</i>, edited by Marco Giugni and Maria Grasso. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.</p> <p>Císař, Ondřej and Jiří Navrátil. 2015b. "Promoting Competition or Cooperation? The Impact of EU Funding on Czech Advocacy Organizations." <i>Democratization</i> 22(3): 536–559.</p> <p>Císař, Ondřej and Kateřina Vráblíková. 2016. "At the Parliament or in the Streets? Issue Composition of Contentious Politics in the Visegrad Countries." MS.</p> <p>Císař, Ondřej. 2015. "Social Movements in Political Science." Pp. 50-67 in <i>Oxford Handbook of Social Movements</i>, edited by Donatella della Porta and Mario Diani. Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>della Porta Donatella, Fernandez Joseba, Kouki Hara and Lorenzo Mosca. 2016. <i>Movement Parties</i>. Cambridge: Polity Press.</p> <p>della Porta, Donatella. 2015. <i>Social Movements in Times of Austerity: Bringing Capitalism Back Into Protest Analysis</i>. Polity Press.</p> <p>Diani, Mario. 2015. <i>The Cement of Civil Society</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Eggert, Nina and Marco Giugni. 2015. "Migration and Social Movements." Pp. 159-172 in <i>Oxford Handbook of Social Movements</i>, edited by Donatella della Porta and Mario Diani. Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Fligstein, Neil and Doug McAdam. 2012. <i>A Theory of Fields</i>.</p>
---------------------------	--

	<p>Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Giugni, Marco and Maria Grasso, eds. 2015. <i>Austerity and Protest: Popular Contention in Times of Economic Crisis</i>, Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing.</p> <p>Giugni, Marco, Koopmans, Ruud, Passy, Florence, and Paul Statham. 2005. "Institutional and Discursive Opportunities for Extreme-Right Mobilization in Five Countries." <i>Mobilization: An International Quarterly</i> 10(1): 145 – 162.</p> <p>Goldstone, Jack, ed. 2003. <i>States, Parties, and Social Movements</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Goldstone, Jack. 1980. "The Weakness of Organization: A New Look at Gamson's The Strategy of Social Protest" <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> 85(5): 1017-1042.</p> <p>Goldstone, Jack. 2004. "More Social Movements or Fewer? Beyond Political Opportunity Structures to Relational Fields." <i>Theory and Society</i> 33(3/4): 333-365.</p> <p>Heaney, Michael T. and Fabio Rojas. 2015. <i>Party in the Street: The Antiwar Movement and the Democratic Party after 9/11</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Hutter, Swen and Hanspeter Kriesi. 2013. "Movements of the Left, Movements of the Right Reconsidered." Pp. 281-298 in <i>The Future of Social Movement Research: Dynamics, Mechanisms, and Processes</i>, edited by Jacqueliën Van Stekelenburg, Conny Rogeband, and Bert Klandermans. Mineapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.</p> <p>Hutter, Swen. 2014. <i>Protesting Culture and Economics in Western Europe. New Cleavages in Left and Right Politics</i>. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.</p> <p>Kitschelt, Herbert, Zdenka Mansfeldova, Radoslaw Markowski, and Gábor Tóka. 1999. <i>Post-Communist Party Systems: Competition, Representation, and Inter-Party Cooperation</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Koopmans, Ruud and Paul Statham. 1999. "Ethnic and Civic Conceptions of Nationhood and the Differential Success of the Extreme Right in Germany and Italy." Pp. 225-252 in <i>How Social Movements Matter</i>, edited by Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.</p> <p>Koopmans, Ruud, Paul Statham, Marco Giugni, and Florence Passy. 2005. <i>Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe</i>. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.</p> <p>Kriesi, Hanspeter, Edgar Grande, Romain Lachat, Martin Dolezal, Simon Bornschier and Timotheos Frey. 2008. <i>West European Politics in the Age of Globalization</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Kriesi, Hanspeter, Grande, Edgar, Dolezal, Martin, Helbling, Marc, Höglinger, Dominic, Hutter, Swen, and Bruno Wüest. 2012. <i>Political Conflict in Western Europe</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p>
--	--

	<p>Marks, Gary, Liesbet Hooghe, Erica Edwards, and Moira Nelson. 2006. "Party Competition and European Integration in the East and West: Different Structure, Same Causality." <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> 39(2): 155-175.</p> <p>McAdam, Doug and Sidney Tarrow. 2010. "Ballots and Barricades: On the Reciprocal Relationship between Elections and Social Movements." <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 8(2): 529-542.</p> <p>McAdam, Doug and Sidney Tarrow. 2013. "Social Movements and Elections: Toward a Broader Understanding of the Political Context of Contention." Pp. 325-346 in <i>The Future of Social Movement Research: Dynamics, Mechanisms, and Processes</i>, edited by Jacqueliën Van Stekelenburg, Conny Roggeband, and Bert Klandermans. Minneapolis, London: University of Minnesota Press.</p> <p>Meguid, Bonnie. 2005. "Competition Between Unequals: The Role of Mainstream Party Strategy in Niche Party Success." <i>American Political Science Review</i> 99(3): 347-359.</p> <p>Meguid, Bonnie. 2008. <i>Party Competition between Unequals: Strategies and Electoral Fortunes in Western Europe</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Meyer, David and Lindsey Lupo. 2007. "Assessing the Politics of Protest. Political Science and the Study of Social Movements." Pp. 111–156 in <i>Handbook of Social Movements across Disciplines</i>, edited by Bert Klandermans and Conny Roggeband. Springer.</p> <p>Meyer, David and Sidney Tarrow, eds. 1998. <i>The Social Movement Society</i>. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.</p> <p>Morales, Laura, Jean-Benoît Pilet and Didier Ruedin. 2015. "The Gap between Public Preferences and Policies on Immigration: A Comparative Examination of the Effect of Politicisation on Policy Congruence." <i>Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies</i> 41(9): 1495-1516.</p> <p>Petrova, Tsveta and Sidney Tarrow. 2007. "Transactional and Participatory Activism in the Emerging European Polity: The Puzzle of East Central Europe." <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> 40(1): 74–94.</p> <p>Rovny, Jan and Erica Edwards. 2012. "Struggle over Dimensionality: Party Competition in Western and Eastern Europe." <i>East European Politics and Societies</i> 26(1): 56-74.</p> <p>Saunders, Clare. 2014. "Anti-politics in Action? Measurement Dilemmas in the Study of Unconventional Political Participation." <i>Political Research Quarterly</i> 67(3): 574-588.</p> <p>Tarrow, Sidney. 2011. <i>Power in Movement. Social Movements and Contentious Politics, 3rd edition</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Thompson, John. 1991. "Editor's Introduction." Pp. 1–32 in <i>Language and Symbolic Power</i>, edited by John Thompson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.</p> <p>Tilly, Charles. 1995. <i>Popular Contention in Great Britain 1758-1834</i>. Cambridge, London: Harvard University Press.</p>
--	--

	Vachudova, Milada and Liesbet Hooghe. 2009. "Postcommunist Politics in a Magnetic Field: How Transition and EU Accession Structure Party Competition on European Integration." <i>Comparative European Politics</i> 7: 179-212.
--	---