



Political parties and organization studies: The party as a critical case of organizing

Journal:	<i>Organization Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	OS-19-0610.R3
Manuscript Type:	X and Organization Studies
Keywords:	Political parties, Organizational politics, Inclusion and exclusion, Normative control, Commitment, Alternative organization, Intellectual activism, Democracy
Abstract:	Organization scholars have extensively studied both the politics of organization and the organization of politics. Contributing to the latter, we argue for further and deeper consideration of political parties, since: (1) parties illuminate organizational dynamics of in- and exclusion; (2) internal struggles related to the constitution of identities, practices, and procedures are accentuated in parties; (3) the study of parties allow for

DOI: 10.1177/01708406211010979

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 the isolation of processes of normative and affective commitment; (4)
5 parties prioritize and intensify normative control mechanisms; (5) party
6 organizing currently represents an example of profound institutional
7 change, as new (digital) formations challenge old bureaucratic models.
8 Consequently, we argue that political parties should be seen as 'critical
9 cases' of organizing, meaning that otherwise commonplace phenomena
10 are intensified and exposed in parties. This allows researchers to use
11 parties as magnifying glasses for zooming-in on organizational dynamics
12 that may be suppressed or concealed by the seemingly non-political
13 façade of many contemporary organizations. In conclusion, we argue
14 that organization scholars are in a privileged position to investigate how
15 political parties function today and how their democratic potential can be
16 improved in the future. To this end, we call on Organization and
17 Management Studies to engage actively with alternative parties in an
18 attempt to explore and promote progressive change within the formal
19 political system.
20

21
22 SCHOLARONE™
23 Manuscripts
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Husted E, Moufahim M & Fredriksson M, EXPRESS: Political parties and Organization Studies: The party as a
47 critical case of organizing, *Organization Studies* (Forthcoming). Copyright © The Authors 2021. Reprinted by
48 permission of SAGE Publications. Reuse is restricted to non-commercial and no derivative uses.

49 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406211010979>
50

51
52
53
54
55
56
57 DOI: 10.1177/01708406211010979
58

Author Accepted Manuscript

Political parties and organization studies: The party as a critical case of organizing

Emil Husted, PhD, Associate Professor

Department of Organization

Copenhagen Business School, Denmark

Mona Moufahim, PhD, Senior Lecturer

Stirling Management School

University of Stirling, Scotland

Martin Fredriksson, PhD, Associate Professor

Department of Culture and Society

Linköping University, Sweden

Abstract

Organization scholars have extensively studied both the *politics of organization* and the *organization of politics*. Contributing to the latter, we argue for further and deeper consideration of political parties, since: (1) parties illuminate organizational dynamics of in- and exclusion; (2) internal struggles related to the constitution of identities, practices, and procedures are accentuated in parties; (3) the study of parties allow for the isolation of processes of normative and affective commitment; (4) parties prioritize and intensify normative control mechanisms; (5) party organizing currently represents an example of profound institutional change, as new (digital) formations challenge old bureaucratic models. Consequently, we argue that political parties should be seen as 'critical cases' of organizing, meaning that otherwise commonplace phenomena are intensified and exposed in parties. This allows researchers to use parties as magnifying

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 glasses for zooming-in on organizational dynamics that may be suppressed or
5
6 concealed by the seemingly non-political façade of many contemporary organizations.
7
8 In conclusion, we argue that organization scholars are in a privileged position to
9
10 investigate how political parties function today and how their democratic potential can
11
12 be improved in the future. To this end, we call on *Organization and Management*
13
14 *Studies* to engage actively with alternative parties in an attempt to explore and promote
15
16 progressive change within the formal political system.

Keywords

17
18
19
20
21
22
23 Political parties; Organizational politics; Inclusion and exclusion; Normative control;
24
25 Commitment; Alternative organization; Intellectual activism; Democracy
26
27
28
29

Introduction

30
31
32
33 Despite recent calls for renewed engagement with 'politics-in-organization' (O'Doherty
34
35 and De Cock, 2019) and organizational conflict more broadly (Contu, 2019),
36
37 organization scholars have always been concerned with questions of power and
38
39 politics. In fact, the discipline that today calls itself *Organization and Management*
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47 *Studies* (OMS) often traces its origins back to thinkers likewise counted among the
48
49 founders of political sociology (e.g. Adler, 2009). This shared pedigree suggests that
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
60 OMS was born as a discipline dedicated at least partially to the study of political
61
62 dynamics in organized settings (Clegg et al., 2006), which is an ambition that is

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 reflected in the vast literature on organizational politics (Drory and Romm, 1990). This
4
5
6 literature often stresses the inherently contested nature of organizational identities,
7
8
9 practices, and procedures. Here, the organization is thus viewed as a 'political coalition'
10
11
12 (March, 1962), and organizational politics is understood as a struggle to influence
13
14 sanctioned and non-sanctioned means and ends (Mayes and Allen, 1977). As Fleming
15
16 and Spicer (2007: 3) note: '[i]t is this struggle that gives organizations a sense of vitality
17
18 and a life-giving political pulse'.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Recently, organization scholars have supplemented this longstanding interest in the
32
33 *politics of organization* with increased concern for what might be called the *organization*
34
35 *of politics*; that is, the internal orchestration of collectives that openly engage with
36
37 political issues. This has resulted in empirical work on different political organizations
38
39 such as worker collectives, activist networks, and social movements (e.g. Kokkinidis,
40
41 2015; Reedy et al., 2016; Reinecke, 2018). However, one type of organization has
42
43 been almost entirely neglected: *the political party*. Considering the fundamental role
44
45 that parties play in representative democracies (Rosenblum, 2008), it is surprising how
46
47 little attention has been awarded to these political behemoths within OMS. A quick
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 search through the most well-read journals in the field shows that, save for a few
4
5
6 exceptions (e.g. Moufahim et al., 2015; Husted and Plesner, 2017; Ringel, 2019; Sinha
7
8
9 et al., 2021), hardly any studies investigate parties from a truly organizational point of
10
11
12
13
14 view.

15
16
17
18
19
20
21 This omission is striking considering that foundational texts on parties emphasize
22
23
24 precisely the question of organization as crucial to understanding representative
25
26
27 democracy. For instance, Michels (1915) famously characterized his ‘iron law of
28
29
30 oligarchy’ as a problem of *organization* rather than a problem of ideology or
31
32
33 membership demographics. Similarly, Duverger (1954: xv) argued that modern parties
34
35
36 are distinguished not by their actual policies but by the ‘nature of their organization’.
37
38
39 Hence, for these scholars, studying the organizational dynamics of parties is a
40
41
42 precondition for understanding electoral politics altogether. As another key thinker on
43
44
45 parties notes: ‘whatever else parties are and to whatever other solicitations they
46
47
48 respond, they are above all organizations and (...) organizational analysis must
49
50
51 therefore come before any other perspective’ (Panebianco, 1988: xi).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 Political parties are fascinating organizations that have managed to remain relevant by
5
6
7 updating their central role in the 'management of democracy' (Mair, 2003: 3) and by
8
9
10 adapting to institutional developments throughout time (Dalton et al., 2011). Their
11
12
13 presence around the world in diverse forms, sizes, and governance structures,
14
15
16 alongside their ability to initiate social change, make them interesting and relevant
17
18
19 study objects for organization scholars. With an ongoing surge in new and alternative
20
21
22 party formations (see Heath, 2019), the present constitutes an exciting time for
23
24
25 organization scholars to engage with parties in an attempt to understand how they
26
27
28 govern themselves and the world around us, and how their efforts to instigate change
29
30
31 might be advanced along progressive lines.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 In this essay, we therefore urge organization scholars to study political parties more
43
44
45 closely. This is important for at least five reasons: (1) parties illuminate organizational
46
47
48 dynamics of in- and exclusion; (2) parties accentuate internal struggles related to the
49
50
51 constitution of identities, practices, and procedures; (3) parties isolate processes of
52
53
54 normative and affective commitment; (4) parties prioritize modes of normative control;
55
56
57 and (5) parties are currently facing profound institutional change. Having identified
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

these characteristics, we argue that parties should be seen as 'critical cases'

(Flyvbjerg, 2006) of organizing that expose and intensify commonplace phenomena.

This allows researchers to use parties as magnifying glasses for zooming-in on

organizational dynamics that may be suppressed or concealed in seemingly non-

political organizations. In conclusion, we encourage organization scholars to engage

with alternative parties in an attempt to explore and promote progressive change.

What is a party?

In perhaps the most widespread definition, Downs (1957: 25) identifies a political party

as 'a coalition of men [sic!] seeking to control the governing apparatus by legal means'.

In this paper, we focus on Chambers' (1967: 5) more comprehensive definition of the

party as:

... a relatively *durable* social formation which seeks office or power in government,

exhibits a structure or organization which *links leaders at the centers of*

government to a significant popular following in the political arena and its local

Author Accepted Manuscript

enclaves, and generates *in-group perspectives* or at least symbols of identification

or loyalty [our emphasis].

We believe that this definition provides a good starting point for an organizational study of parties, since it highlights the characteristics that make the political party an interesting object of study for OMS. First, it defines the party as a 'durable' entity, meaning that parties are subjected to ongoing political, social, and technological developments. Second, it indicates an organizational structure whose legitimacy and political impact depends on connecting the power at the center to local 'enclaves' and a wider popular movement, which actualizes problems of inclusion, exclusion, and representation. Indeed, while a number of organizations have served to mobilize and integrate the public into civic and political life (e.g. trade unions and social movements), parties are particular in their role of 'linking' the public directly to the government (Dalton et al., 2011), because of their 'more or less single-minded focus on mobilising for political effect' (Rogers, 2005: 606). Finally, Chambers' definition implies that the party is inherently a value community that relies on shared norms and patterns of

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

commitment. We shall return to these aspects after briefly considering the role of political parties in the history of Western democracy.

Political parties as bastard children of democracy

Although the roots of Western democracy are planted deep in ancient Greek soil, the above definition is clearly the product of a 'modernising topos' (Anastasiadis, 1999).

Back then, political leaders did indeed form small groups, but since ancient Greek city-states were direct and not representative democracies, modern conceptions of parties sit uneasily with ancient understandings of *dēmokratia* (Hansen, 2014). Furthermore, the notion of factionalism, later engrained in the word 'party' (from the Latin *partire*, meaning 'to divide'), was unanimously criticized by leading figures of ancient Greece for corrupting 'holist' understandings of the common good (Rosenblum, 2008).

These negative connotations associated with parties and factions were later solidified by Roman thinkers such as Cicero and Sallust who, perhaps even more forcefully, underscored the problems of promoting *partial* interests at the expense of society as a *whole* (Ignazi, 2017). Such holist conceptions laid the foundation for a profound

Author Accepted Manuscript

skepticism toward all kinds of partisan expression, which came to dominate political thinking for almost two millennia and shape the common understanding of state building in the early modern era. As Hume (1742: 33) later put it in his essay *Of parties in general*. '[a]s much as legislators and founders of states ought to be honored and respected among men, as much ought the founders of sects and factions to be detested and hated'.

The development of the modern party

The contours of modern party politics emerged in the middle of the seventeenth century when English politicians began forming groups in Westminster (Ostrogorski, 1902). However, parties with actual members 'on the ground' did not appear in Europe until the immediate aftermath of the French revolution, where the so-called Jacobin Clubs proliferated by organizing members of the National Assembly around a common strategy for protecting the outcome of the revolution (Brinton, 1961). Although the Jacobin Clubs were soon disbanded, the seeds for the political party as the dominant template for political organization had been sown.

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 With the expansion of male suffrage in the mid-nineteenth century, parties gradually
5
6
7 became accepted as legitimate and necessary actors in electoral politics. While parties
8
9
10 might still have been frowned upon in elite circles, they were largely regarded as
11
12
13
14 'beneficial mediators' that gave voice to 'individual and group demands' (Scarow,
15
16
17 2006: 21). In the spirit of holism, larger parties that advocated common interests were
18
19
20 generally preferred to smaller parties, which many still perceived as divisive. This
21
22
23
24 'selective rejection of parties' provided a fertile ground for the rise of several mass
25
26
27 parties that we know today (Daalder, 1992).

28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 The resurgence of European democracies in the postwar years further confirmed the
36
37
38 (pluralist) party system's role in guaranteeing democracy. At this point, the mass
39
40
41 parties gained legitimacy by manifesting a way to channel the political demands of
42
43
44 previously excluded parts of the electorate along a left-right scale based on class-
45
46
47 distinctions spawned by industrialization. This meant that 'the party' became the main
48
49
50 object of class-based identification, with some parts of the electorate (mostly trade
51
52
53 union members) automatically enrolled as rank and file (Wilson, 1974). However, with
54
55
56 the postindustrial turn of the 1970s and 80s, this logic became less evident. As children
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

of the industrial revolution, mass parties had problems reflecting concerns over gender, ethnicity, and environmentalism, and even greater difficulties responding to demands for intra-party democratization (Ignazi, 2017). This reconfiguration of the political landscape marked the end of the 'golden age' of political parties (Mair, 1994: 1).

Party decline and revival

As popular support for mass parties declined, they transformed into what has been described as 'cartel parties' (Katz and Mair, 1995). Cartel parties form stronger bonds with the state and collect more state funding, thereby becoming less dependent on the recruitment of members. The cartel party is thus less of a popular movement and more of a career route for politicians and functionaries, which has arguably contributed to the disillusionment with parties that gave rise to many 'new' social movements in the late 1960s and instances of digital activism in the early 2000s (see Gerbaudo, 2019).

While many intellectuals and activists today dismiss the party as a dated organization, incapable of addressing the needs and desires of ordinary people (e.g. Tormey, 2015), Europe has recently seen an upsurge of new and alternative party formations (see

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 Heath, 2019). These include not only new left-wing parties like Podemos and SYRIZA,
5
6
7 or nationalist single-issue parties like the Brexit Party, but also wider initiatives like
8
9
10 DIEM25 and the International Pirate Party. These new party formations indicate that
11
12
13 the very organization of parties is becoming an explicit manifestation of ideological
14
15
16 positions: that the forms of interaction within the party 'prefigure' a vision of how society
17
18
19 should be organized. Hence, while organization is always a product of power and thus
20
21
22 implicitly political (Clegg et al., 2006), we maintain that the politics of organization are
23
24
25 uniquely present in political parties, as their ideological content and political form are
26
27
28 *indistinguishable* and have an *immediate* bearing on the governing of the state.
29
30
31 Consequently, we believe that parties are far too important to be left to political
32
33
34 scientists. We thus urge organization scholars to study parties as a way of contributing
35
36
37 to understanding the internal mechanisms of representative democracy. Before we
38
39
40 unfold this argument, however, we highlight some classical contributions to the party
41
42
43 organization literature that can help us comprehend the value of political parties for
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 OMS.
53
54
55
56
57

Classical contributions to the study of party organizations

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 The acceptance of parties as integral to representative democracy around the turn of
5
6
7 the twentieth century coincides with the birth of political sociology as a hybrid-
8
9
10 discipline, concerned with 'variables' previously taken for granted by political scientists
11
12
13 (e.g. organizational dynamics) and topics neglected by sociologists (e.g. party
14
15
16 organizations). Michels' (1915) canonical exposé of oligarchic tendencies in European
17
18
19 socialist parties is one example. Having personally experienced how these otherwise
20
21
22 democratic organizations slowly grew into bureaucratic machines and eventually
23
24
25 succumbed to elite-rule, Michels (1915: 365) formulated his 'iron law of oligarchy',
26
27
28 which would come to dominate party research for more than a century (see
29
30
31 Diefenbach, 2019). As he famously put it:

41 The fundamental sociological law of political parties (...) may be formulated
42
43
44 in the following terms: 'It is organization which gives birth to the domination
45
46
47 of the elected over the electors, of the mandataries over the mandators, of
48
49
50 the delegates over the delegators. Who says organization says oligarchy'.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 Michels' explanation for this seemingly inevitable drift toward elite-rule is that whenever
4
5
6
7 a party gains maturity and influence, it becomes dependent on the state. Its leaders
8
9
10 then seek to preserve their own position in the system and defend their privileges, even
11
12
13 if this requires the party to react 'with all the authority at its disposal against the
14
15
16 revolutionary currents which exist within its own organization' (Michels, 1915: 337).
17
18
19 Hence, instead of trying to overthrow the established system and realize its own radical
20
21
22 ideals, the party prioritizes the aggregation of members and the consolidation of power
23
24
25 *within* the system. According to Michels, there is thus a certain conservatism
26
27
28 embedded in the 'nature of organization', meaning that oligarchy can be found in any
29
30
31 political organization that pursues 'definite ends'. This assumption, that 'democratic
32
33
34 aristocracy' (ibid: 43) is inherent to formal political organizations, is likewise reflected
35
36
37 in other founding texts within political sociology such as Follett's (1918) work on group
38
39
40 organizations and Weber's (1919) writings on the 'politics as a vocation'.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Drawing on the work of Michels, Duverger (1954) introduces a completely new level of
53
54
55 systematism to the study of party organizations. Instead of merely pointing to certain
56
57
58 tendencies in electoral politics, he aims to develop a 'general theory of parties' to show
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 how 'present-day parties are distinguished far less by their programme or the class of
5
6
7 their members than by the nature of their organization' (ibid: xiii-xv). Duverger's main
8
9
10 argument is that all parties consist of a number of 'basic elements', four of which are
11
12
13 prevalent: caucuses, branches, cells, and militias. Whereas caucuses (small elite
14
15
16 units) are the basic elements of conservative parties as well as American parties,
17
18
19 branches (large mass units) function as building blocks in labor parties and Catholic
20
21
22 parties, while cells (clandestine occupational groups) are the *sine qua non* of
23
24
25 communist parties, and militias (highly disciplined private armies) constitute the
26
27
28 backbone of fascist parties. Duverger uses this typology to describe how organizational
29
30
31 structures distinguish parties. For instance, caucus-based parties (also called 'cadre
32
33
34 parties') are characterized as having a very small but active membership base, while
35
36
37 branch-based parties (also called 'mass parties') operate with a large but more passive
38
39
40 membership pool. Similarly, although most parties are said to exhibit some degree of
41
42
43 oligarchy, the means for legitimizing elite-rule varies, with militia-based parties openly
44
45
46 embracing it due to the 'divinity' of their leaders and cell-based parties disguising it
47
48
49 through an elaborate system of 'indirect representation' (ibid: 138).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

Several of Duverger's contemporaries shared his focus on structure as the primary unit of analysis. Many also continued to develop ideal types and categorize parties accordingly. One example is Kirchheimer's (1966) famous account of the transformation of Western European party systems, caused by the emergence of what he dubbed 'catch-all parties'. To some extent, catch-all parties resemble mass parties organizationally, in the sense that enrolling members is a key ambition. Unlike mass parties, however, catch-all parties are characterized by a weak ideological position that allows parties to cater for the 'median voter' (Downs, 1957) and secure political power by 'catching all'.

The final contribution that we wish to highlight here is Panebianco's (1988) contingency theory of party organization, which distinguishes political parties based on two factors: history and environment. In terms of history, parties tend to uphold decisions made by their founders, even when proven unwise or outdated. In terms of the environment, parties are influenced by a variety of contingencies such as changing laws, sources of finance, technological developments, as well as electoral results. This theorization introduces a new kind of dynamism to the static models developed by previous studies,

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 because it acknowledges the often neglected point that a party is 'a structure in motion',
4
5
6
7 reacting to contextual changes (ibid: 49). Based on this premise, Panebianco develops
8
9
10 a framework for measuring the level of institutionalization achieved by parties at certain
11
12
13 points in time. The more institutionalized a party is, the more autonomous it is *vis-à-vis*
14
15
16 its environment, and the less likely it is to change its organizational structure.
17
18
19 Consequently, Panebianco argues that if we want to explain political changes, we must
20
21
22 attend to structural dislocations within the organizational core of parties and to the
23
24
25 external pressures exercised upon this core.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49
50 Building upon these classical contributions, we now move to a discussion of what
51
52
53 organization scholars could learn from studying political parties, focusing on the
54
55
56 characteristics that make political parties a particular type of organization.
57
58
59
60

The value of parties for organization studies

51
52
53 Political parties provide an interesting study object for organization scholars, since their
54
55
56 ideological content and organizational form are more explicitly intertwined than in most
57
58
59 other organizations. The organizational form of a political party needs to reflect and
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 express the values it seeks to promote. Duverger (1954), for example, maintains that
4
5
6
7 the organizational configuration of parties has a direct bearing on the structure and
8
9
10 composition of democratic systems. Many of the failures of political parties that we
11
12
13 addressed in the previous section such as the party oligarchy that Michels (1915)
14
15
16 described or the cartel party thesis discussed by Katz and Mair (1995) reflect a failure
17
18
19 to reconcile the organizational structure of the party with its ideological content and
20
21
22 democratic aspirations. The inherently ideological nature of parties therefore
23
24
25 represents a number of specific characteristics that make them particularly interesting
26
27
28
29
30
31 for organization scholars.
32

33
34
35
36
37
38 In this section, we identify and focus on five of these characteristics and specify how
39
40
41 organization scholars might begin to explore them. Our main argument is that parties
42
43
44 should be seen as 'critical cases' in relation to all five characteristics, in the sense that
45
46
47 they contain more information about otherwise commonplace phenomena (Flyvbjerg,
48
49
50 2006). This does not mean that the themes discussed below are necessarily unique to
51
52
53 parties, but it means that parties can be used as magnifying glasses that allow us to
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 better understand organizational dynamics that may be concealed or suppressed in
4
5
6
7 other organizations.
8
9

14 **Between inclusion and exclusion**

16
17
18 All organizations rely on exclusions to demarcate themselves from their environment
19
20
21 and to maintain a sense of distinctiveness (Luhmann, 2018). Even the most inclusive
22
23
24 and permeable associations draw a distinction between inside and outside, if only to
25
26
27 exclude from the collective those who are not deemed inclusive enough. While all
28
29
30 membership organizations struggle with this 'paradox of inclusion and exclusion'
31
32
33 (Solebello et al., 2016), many attempt to conceal the limits of the collective by
34
35
36 appearing fully inclusive. This not only applies to social movements that champion
37
38
39 values of inclusivity and open-mindedness (e.g. Reinecke, 2018), but also to
40
41
42 corporations that seek to project an image of themselves as catering to all interests
43
44
45 and as working for the common good (see Rhodes and Fleming, 2020). As such, the
46
47
48 seemingly apolitical façade of many contemporary organizations makes it difficult to
49
50
51 see that organization requires exclusion and how exactly exclusionary dynamics unfold
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59 in practice.
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Political parties, on the other hand, generally reveal the exclusions that constitute them
8
9
10 as collectives. There are several reasons for this. One is that negative campaigning is
11
12
13 frequently seen as an effective tool for mobilizing risk-averse voters. Another is that
14
15
16 parties are exposed to the constant threat of elections, meaning that they must attempt
17
18
19 to maintain their distinctiveness at all times (Karthikeyan et al., 2015). Finally, since
20
21
22 parties are tasked with translating universal values into particular bills and proposals,
23
24
25 they have to add positive content to otherwise empty signifiers, thereby narrowing-
26
27
28 down the scope of political representation (Husted and Plesner, 2017). This makes
29
30
31 parties critical cases of organizational in- and exclusion, which is a point that has been
32
33
34 raised by a number of organization scholars working with parties, although it obviously
35
36
37 applies more to fringe parties than to centrist catch-all parties. One example of the
38
39
40 former is Moufahim et al.'s (2015) study of Vlaams Belang, a Flemish extreme-right
41
42
43 party. Based on an analysis of party propaganda, they show how organizational
44
45
46 identities can be manufactured almost exclusively through the 'othering' of certain
47
48
49 people (Muslim immigrants in this case), and how such identity constructions can serve
50
51
52 as objects of identification for supporters longing for ethnic and religious homogeneity.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

Such studies show how constructions of organizational identities are never ethically or politically neutral. Although this is not a novel observation, the detailed examination of party propaganda could help organization scholars illustrate more vividly the political constitution of any given organization. For instance, few business firms would readily admit to discriminating against certain groups in terms of recruitment or promotion (e.g. immigrants), although this is the unfortunate reality of many contemporary workplaces. However, studying a xenophobic party such as Vlaams Belang that deliberately moves discriminatory dynamics to center stage allows for a deeper understanding of how exclusionary processes unfold in practice, and how they can help constitute organizational identities. To develop this line of thinking, and to curb the tendency to view organizational exclusions as inherently negative, future research might inquire into exclusionary practices in parties that discriminate progressively (e.g. *against* racists, nationalists, or misogynists). This would allow scholars to theorize how 'inclusive exclusions' operate in practice, and how such boundaries may be drawn in the service of democratic ends.

Author Accepted Manuscript

Fighting in the open

Because organizations require exclusions, they also host internal struggles to decide how and where to draw the boundaries (Fleming and Spicer, 2007). Such struggles are often represented by the notion of 'organizational politics', understood as a perpetual scramble to influence sanctioned and non-sanctioned means and ends (Mayes and Allen, 1977). However, while this makes conflict 'endemic to organizations', most contemporary enterprises go to great lengths to silence internal struggles in order to appear harmonious (Contu, 2019: 1446). This is arguably why the public rarely hears about political struggles in business firms, NGOs, or public agencies until after the conflicts have been resolved.

In political parties, however, internal struggles about programs and procedures are often fought in plain sight and passionately covered by various media outlets. History is replete with examples of members who have aired the party's dirty laundry in public and used the press as a lever for influencing the organization. This obviously makes it much easier for observers to study how such conflicts unfolds in practice, and this is precisely why it makes sense to view parties as critical cases of organizational politics.

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 Additionally, since parties typically represent a highly formalized mode of organization
5
6
7 (cf. Chambers, 1967), their structural configuration is often geared to address internal
8
9
10 conflicts, providing spaces such as annual conferences where political struggles can
11
12
13
14 unfold and be observed (Faucher-King, 2005).
15
16
17

18
19
20
21 The easy access to internal struggles has not gone unnoticed by the few organization
22
23
24 scholars that study party organizations. One example is Kelly's (1990) study of
25
26
27 intergroup relations during the 1988 leadership contest in Britain's Labour Party
28
29
30 between Neil Kinnock and Tony Benn. Kelly explores how the minority group (left-
31
32
33 wingers supporting Benn) and the majority group (right-wingers supporting Kinnock)
34
35
36 stereotypically perceive each other and how the minority group is particularly
37
38
39 committed to accentuating intergroup differences in an attempt to win the contest.
40
41
42
43 Similarly, in a more recent study, Sinha et al. (2021) study what they term the
44
45
46 'dramaturgical resistance leadership' of Jeremy Corbyn in relation to his successful
47
48
49 2015 leadership campaign. They identify three core elements in Corbyn's strategy.
50
51
52
53 One of these involves a rethinking of the organizational structure of the party,
54
55
56
57
58
59 predicated on a blurring of the otherwise stable boundary between registered party
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 members and non-registered supporters. This reconfiguration of the organization
4
5
6
7 afforded a type of distributed leadership that gave Corbyn's campaign a more
8
9
10 democratic structure and an almost movement-like identity that clearly contributed to
11
12
13
14 its success.
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Both studies rely on the premise that political dynamics, which may exist in all
22
23
24 organizations, are more intense and visible in party organizations. As Kelly points out,
25
26
27 the link between ingroup identification and intergroup differentiation appears much
28
29
30 more clearly in her study of party factions than in studies of occupational groups
31
32
33 because 'in a political context, intergroup relations are inherently competitive and there
34
35
36 is no consensual status hierarchy' (Kelly, 1990: 597). This does not mean that the link
37
38
39 is non-existent in other organizations; it is simply less visible. The point is thus that
40
41
42 'politically-led organizations can provide useful insights into generic processes in
43
44
45 organizational behaviour' because they 'expose fundamental problems connected with
46
47
48
49
50
51
52 rationality and action and can teach us a great deal about problems and solutions in
53
54
55 organizations' (Morrell and Hartley, 2006: 486). Future research might thus explore
56
57
58
59 organizational conflicts within and between parties, in an attempt to understand and
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 theorize how such struggles unfold, who they involve, and what they achieve in terms
4
5
6
7 of improving or deteriorating democratic institutions.
8
9
10
11
12

13 14 **Commitment without contract**

15
16
17 One of the most vital resource for present-day organizations is committed members.
18

19
20
21 Without dedicated staff or devoted volunteers, no organization will be able to fulfill its
22

23
24 purpose, especially not collectives that rely on more than simple remuneration to attract
25

26
27
28 members. Although definitions vary, commitment is usually conceptualized as ‘a
29

30
31 *partisan, affective attachment* to the goals and values of an organization, to one’s role
32

33
34 in relation to goals and values, and to the organization for its own sake, *apart from its*
35

36
37
38 *purely instrumental worth*’ (Buchanan, 1974: 533, our emphasis). The italicized parts
39

40
41
42 of this definition are particularly important, as they emphasize how commitment has
43

44
45 little to do with material rewards. This, however, also makes commitment a difficult
46

47
48
49 phenomenon to study. Because, how can the ‘partisan’ and ‘affective’ aspect of a
50

51
52
53 person’s involvement with an organization be isolated from attachment based on
54

55
56 wages and benefits? This might be one reason why the literature on commitment is
57

58
59 often described as confusing and contradictory (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001).
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 In contemporary political parties, there are few instrumental benefits associated with
8
9
10 being a member, which is perhaps why so few people are today registered as rank and
11
12
13 file (van Biezen et al., 2011). In most cases, all one gets from a party membership is
14
15
16 access to events such as annual conferences and the right to call oneself a member.
17
18
19
20 Furthermore, *unlike* social movements and activist networks, parties usually charge
21
22
23 membership fees. Taken together, these two factors make the entry barriers in political
24
25
26 parties incredibly high and the exit barriers equally low. Fortunately for organization
27
28
29 scholars, however, this means that those 3-4% of the population that remain members
30
31
32 do so precisely because they are committed to the goals and values of the
33
34
35 organization, to their own role in relation to these, and/or to the organization for its own
36
37
38 sake. As such, parties could be seen as critical cases of what Meyer and Allen (1991)
39
40
41 call 'affective' and 'normative' commitment.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Within organization studies, Husted (2020) has illustrated this point through a study of
53
54
55 the relationship between organizational values and commitment in a Danish green
56
57
58 party. Husted explores how the party's claim to be guided by six core values has
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 profound consequences for how commitment is created and maintained within the
5
6
7 organization. While some of the values encourage members to pursue their own
8
9
10 political objectives, other incentivize them to remain morally inclusive toward fellow
11
12
13 members that hold different views. These two types of values produce a strong
14
15
16 combination of normative and affective commitment that motivate party members to
17
18
19 stay with the organization and realize their personal aspirations through the collective.
20
21
22
23
24 The party thereby allows its members to be 'different together', which is a finding that
25
26
27 has implications for scholars interested in alternative organization and diversity
28
29
30 management. Future research might thus use parties to investigate more closely how
31
32
33 organizational commitment is forged and maintained in voluntary associations such as
34
35
36 parties, and to theorize what (managerial) technologies that are conducive in terms of
37
38
39 building strong commitment to democracy and democratic participation.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

Modes of party discipline

49
50
51
52 Although commitment is generally seen as something positive, there is also a darker
53
54
55 side to the affective dimension of organizational attachment. Commitment comes at a
56
57
58 price, since being attached to certain goals and values, as well as to certain
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 organizations, can be both liberating and constraining. Wiener (1982: 419) describes
4
5
6
7 it like this: 'the central element in most definitions of commitment – the acceptance of
8
9
10 organizational expectations and values as guides to an individual's behavior, i.e.,
11
12
13 identification – represents a form of normative control over a person's actions'. In other
14
15
16
17 words, the values that attract people to organizations may equally tie them to a
18
19
20 particular mode of being. While normative control has been studied in occupational
21
22
23 settings (e.g. Kunda, 1992), workplace organizations also have traditional controls
24
25
26
27 such as contracts and material incentives at their disposal. This is arguably why
28
29
30 normative control was initially conceived as most prevalent in religious and political
31
32
33 communities (Etzioni, 1964), and why it can be hard to separate normative control from
34
35
36
37 other modes of control when studying organizations in general (Kärreman and
38
39
40
41 Alvensson, 2004).

42
43
44
45
46
47
48 However, just like political parties lack formal tools for *attracting* members such as
49
50
51
52 paychecks or benefits, they also lack formal mechanisms for *controlling* their members.
53
54
55 Faced with declining membership rates and a general dissolution of party loyalty
56
57
58
59 (Ignazi, 2017), parties are today forced to rely primarily on normative control to ensure
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 that members stay 'on board' and 'in line'. As Rye (2015: 1053) puts it: '[c]oercion may
4
5
6
7 not be entirely redundant, but in modern consumer-oriented societies, voluntary
8
9
10 organizations such as parties need more subtle methods to bring their members into
11
12
13 line in terms of conduct, style and message'. This is perhaps why organization scholars
14
15
16 like Willmott (1993) have emphasized the close link between normative control and the
17
18
19 notion of 'party discipline', understood as social and political cohesion sustained by
20
21
22 party members through the culture of the organization. As such, party discipline may
23
24
25 be seen as an intensified version of traditional normative control, as observed in other
26
27
28 kinds of organizations, which is why it makes sense to think of parties more generally
29
30
31 as critical cases of normative control regimes.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Organization scholars have recently realized that studies of party discipline can tell us
43
44
45 something interesting about normative control. For instance, in a study of the German
46
47
48 Pirate Party, Ringel (2019) analyzes how normative ideals of full transparency have
49
50
51 caused problems for the party's elected politicians whose parliamentary work often
52
53
54 require a certain degree of secrecy. This leads the politicians to oscillate strategically
55
56
57 between 'open' frontstage behavior and 'secret' backstage behavior, thereby carving
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 out a pocket of autonomy within an otherwise disciplining culture of panopticism.
5

6
7 Husted (2021) takes a similar approach in a study of a local party organization in South-
8

9
10 West England, which has won all town council seats for two consecutive terms on a
11

12
13 supposedly non-ideological platform. Inspired by the concept of 'neo-normative' control
14

15
16 (Fleming and Sturdy, 2009), the author investigates how an exhortation to 'just be
17

18
19 yourself' creates a culture that thrives on heterogeneity rather than conformity, and
20

21
22 how this unconventional type of party discipline allows confident councilors (often
23

24
25 males) to dominate and marginalize less assertive councilors (often females).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The main contribution of these studies is that they illuminate the political dimension of
36

37
38 normative control and commitment. When employees are subjected to particular
39

40
41 norms, their personal space of action is clearly restricted, but it is often difficult to
42

43
44 appreciate the political implications of such management techniques. However, when
45

46
47 representatives of the Pirate Party fail to enter coalitions because members expect
48

49
50 them to disclose all information, or when female councilors are barred from influence
51

52
53 in a town council, we see much clearer how (neo)normative control regimes underwrite
54

55
56 certain ideological agendas and suppress others. This insight might reinvigorate an
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 area of research sometimes accused of having reached a 'theoretical stalemate'
4
5
6
7 (Cushen, 2009: 102). Future research should therefore explore how parties develop
8
9
10 new modes of party discipline that exceed the limits of our current understanding of
11
12
13
14 normative control and examine how this development is tied to the ongoing evolution
15
16
17 in party models that we describe below.
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 **From bureaucracies to platforms**

25
26
27 The four characteristics discussed above make political parties important research
28
29
30 objects that organization scholars, in our view, cannot afford to neglect. This was true
31
32
33
34 when Michels and Duverger authored their path-breaking accounts of European
35
36
37 parties, and it remains true today. However, our claim is that the present represents a
38
39
40 particularly interesting time to reignite the 'empirically grounded study of parties as
41
42
43 organizations' (Mair, 1994: 1), since many contemporary parties have been forced to
44
45
46 reconsider their organizational structure and modus operandi in light of recent events.
47
48
49
50
51 In this section, we will consider one aspects of the present that make party studies
52
53
54
55
56 even more relevant today.
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 Like so many other organizations, parties have always adapted to their environment,
5
6
7 albeit at a much slower pace than what might be expected (Panebianco, 1988). For
8
9
10 instance, when environmentalism and second-wave feminism began to emerge in the
11
12
13 1960s, and when demands for more democratic decision-making processes were
14
15
16 voiced in the 1970s, most parties were slow to respond (Ignazi, 2017). However, with
17
18
19 the rise of digital technology and various web 2.0 platforms in the early 2000's, the old
20
21
22 party machines have gradually started to change, as these media seem to afford
23
24
25 unique opportunities for mobilizing voters and engaging members. Gerbaudo (2019)
26
27
28 chronicles this development in his work on 'the digital party', understood as a type of
29
30
31 party that resembles online corporations like Google or Facebook by following a 'logic
32
33
34 of platforms'. Examples of digital parties obviously include the Pirate Parties, but also
35
36
37 populist formations like Podemos in Spain, Movimento 5 Stelle in Italy, La France
38
39
40 Insoumise, the Momentum faction of the UK Labour Party, as well as certain alternative
41
42
43 parties at a regional level (see Barcelona En Comú et al, 2019).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 What makes these parties interesting for organization scholars is that they employ
57
58
59 online platforms in an attempt to democratize their organization, and that they often
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

redefine the meaning of party membership by involving the entire electorate in policymaking (Husted and Plesner, 2017). The technology-based democratization of 'digital' parties has hitherto been most visible in decision-making processes. Such processes have traditionally been characterized as oligarchic and opaque, but with the advent of interactive online platforms, parties are beginning to experiment with horizontal and consensus-based decision-making. For instance, based on interviews with Pirate Party members, Fredriksson (2016) shows how the pirates' preoccupation with membership participation has led them to develop digital tools for decision-making that afford a direct mode of engagement but also privilege the most active users. Gerbaudo (2019: 127) observes a similar tendency, arguing that many digital parties have failed to deliver on the 'lofty promise' of bottom-up involvement, and that online platforms work best in cases of plebiscites rather than in cases of substantial political deliberation.

Contrary to 'digital' parties, other formations such as the Dutch Freedom Party or the Brexit Party have gone in the opposite direction by creating organizations entirely devoid of rank and file. What characterizes these party organizations is the

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 uncontested power of the leader who is idealized by supporters as an entrepreneurial
5
6
7 superman. The 'memberless party' is therefore conceived as a radicalization of the so-
8
9
10 called 'business-firm party model', understood as parties that operate like profit-
11
12
13 seeking corporations and focus almost exclusively on vote maximization (Krouwel,
14
15
16 2006). However, while business-firm parties lack ideological consistency, memberless
17
18
19 parties often rely on a coherent vocabulary of populist tropes that serves to
20
21
22 compensate for their less professional mode of operation (Mazzoleni and Voerman,
23
24
25 2017).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 All these new party models are relevant for organization scholars, not only because
36
37
38 they draw inspiration from the world of business and entrepreneurship, but because
39
40
41 their success represents profound institutional change. For more than a century, party
42
43
44 organizations have predominantly assumed bureaucratic forms and resisted
45
46
47 environmental pressures to change. Regardless of whether the most dominant model
48
49
50 in the field was called 'mass party' (Duverger, 1954), 'catch-all party' (Kirchheimer,
51
52
53 1966), 'professional-electoral party' (Panebianco, 1988), or 'cartel party' (Katz and
54
55
56 Mair, 1995), the party machine was always bureaucratic. The fact that this remarkable
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 case of institutional isomorphism is beginning to fade therefore represents a watershed
4
5
6
7 moment in the history of Western democracy. Organizational changes that took
8
9
10 decades to materialize in the world of business are now unfolding at an unprecedented
11
12
13 speed in the world of party politics. Every year sees the rise of several innovative
14
15
16 formations, many of which never succeed, but some do – and when they do, they often
17
18
19 leave a lasting mark on entire democratic systems (Panebianco, 1988).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Consequently, OMS has an important role to play in helping us understand the
29
30 organizational dynamics of political parties and their role in governing contemporary
31
32 societies. In what follows, we close the paper by briefly discussing how organization
33
34 scholars might use this moment of institutional change to actively engage with
35
36
37
38 alternative parties that challenge un-democratic developments and promote
39
40
41
42 progressive change *within* the formal political system.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

Conclusion: Engaging alternative parties

52
53 In this paper, we have advanced three related claims. First, we argued that parties are
54
55
56
57
58 intimately linked to mass democracy, but that they have failed historically in terms of
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1 realizing hopes for democratic participation invested in them. Second, we maintained
2
3
4
5
6
7 that OMS has much to learn from studying parties, because they expose and intensify
8
9
10 dynamics that may be found but concealed in other kinds of organizations. Third, we
11
12
13 suggested that we are currently living through a moment of profound institutional
14
15
16 change, in which bureaucratic party models are giving way to new and unconventional
17
18
19 configurations (e.g. digital parties, business-firm parties, and memberless parties).
20
21
22
23
24 This moment of institutional change, we believe, furthermore constitutes an opportunity
25
26
27 for organization scholars to positively influence the course of history by engaging with
28
29
30 parties that actively seek to promote democratic ideals (internally as well as societally)
31
32
33
34 at the expense of simple voter maximization and oligarchy.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 To this end, scholars might find inspiration in the burgeoning literature on alternative
43
44
45 organizations, understood as collectives that 'prefigure' progressive ideals related to
46
47
48 notions of individual autonomy, collective solidarity, and responsibility for the future
49
50
51 (Parker et al., 2014). Within this literature, it is generally recognized that research and
52
53
54 politics cannot be separated, and that researchers have to forge political alliances with
55
56
57 case organizations deemed ideologically progressive (Parker and Parker, 2017).
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4 However, this literature has entirely overlooked the possibility that certain *parties* may
5
6
7 also be considered alternative, and that they too should be seen as potential allies
8
9
10 (Husted, 2021). These would be parties that curb the oligarchic tendencies that seem
11
12
13 inherent to the formal political system by softening the homogenizing force of party
14
15
16 discipline and by allowing members to participate in decision-making processes that
17
18
19 go beyond plebiscites.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 Engaging with such alternative parties will undoubtedly allow organization scholars to
29
30
31 explore the five characteristics that we identified above, but it likewise offers a unique
32
33
34 opportunity for researchers to 'make a difference in the world' by rethinking their role
35
36
37 as 'intellectual activists' (Contu, 2020: 748) within the formal political system. This
38
39
40
41 venture entails various forms of 'building' work related to the construction of alternative
42
43
44 archives, agential capabilities, and accountability structures (ibid), and it is an
45
46
47 intellectual praxis that clearly requires a strong commitment to democratic ideals as
48
49
50 well as research ethics. Given the pivotal role that parties play in contemporary
51
52
53 society, however, it remains a venture that critical organization and management
54
55
56 scholars simply cannot afford to ignore.
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Christian de Cock, Andrew Brown, Michael Humphreys, Hallur Sigurdarson, Daniel Hjorth, and the three anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

References

- Adler, P. S. (2009). *The Oxford handbook of sociology and organization studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anastasiadis, V. (1999). Political “Parties” in Athenian Democracy: A Modernising Topos. *Arethusa*, 32(3), 313–335.
- Barcelona En Comú, Bookchin, D. and Colau, A. (2019). *Fearless cities: A guide to the global municipalist movement*. Oxford: New Internationalist Publications.
- Brinton, C. (1961). *The Jacobins: An essay in the new history*. New York: Macmillan.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building Organizational Commitment: The Socialization of Managers in Work Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19(4), 546.
- Chambers, W. N. (1967). Party development and the American mainstream. In W. N. Chambers & W. D. Burnham (Eds.), *The American Party System*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clegg, S. R., Courpasson, D., and Phillips, N. (2006). *Power and organizations*. London: SAGE.
- Contu, A. (2019). Conflict and organization studies. *Organization Studies*, 40(10), 1445-1462.

Author Accepted Manuscript

- 1
2
3
4 Contu, A. (2020). Answering the crisis with intellectual activism: Making a difference
5 as business schools scholars. *Human Relations*, 73(5), 737–757.
6
7
8 Cushen, J. (2009). Branding employees. *Qualitative Research in Accounting &*
9 *Management*, 6, 102–114.
10
11
12 Daalder, H. (1992). A Crisis of Party? *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 15(4), 269–288.
13
14
15 Dalton, R.J., Farrell, D.M. and McAllister, I. (2011), *Political Parties and Democratic*
16 *Linkage: How parties Organize Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
17
18
19
20
21 Diefenbach, T. (2019). Why Michels' 'iron law of oligarchy' is not an iron law – and
22 how democratic organisations can stay 'oligarchy-free.' *Organization Studies*,
23 40(4), 545–562.
24
25
26
27 Downs, A. (1957). *An economic theory of democracy*. New York: Harper and Row.
28
29
30
31 Drory, A., & Romm, T. (1990). The Definition of Organizational Politics: A Review.
32 *Human Relations*, 43(11), 1133–1154.
33
34
35
36 Duverger, M. (1954). *Political parties: Their organization and activity in the modern*
37 *state*. London: Methuen.
38
39
40
41 Etzioni, A. (1964). *Modern organizations*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
42
43
44
45 Faucher-King, F. (2005). *Changing parties: An anthropology of British political*
46 *conferences*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
47
48
49
50 Fleming, P., and Spicer, A. (2007). *Contesting the corporation: Struggle, power and*
51 *resistance in organizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
52
53
54
55 Fleming, P., and Sturdy, A. (2009). "Just be yourself!": Towards neo-normative
56 control in organisations? *Employee Relations*, 31(6), 569–583.
57
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

- 1
2
3
4 Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative*
5 *Inquiry*, 12(2), 219–245.
6
7
8 Follett, M. P. (1918). *The new state: Group organization the solution to of popular*
9 *government*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
10
11
12 Fredriksson, M. (2016). Pirate politics between protest movement and the parliament.
13 *ephemera*, 16(2), 97–114.
14
15
16
17 Gerbaudo, P. (2019). *The digital party: Political organisation and online democracy*.
18 London: Pluto Press.
19
20
21
22 Hansen, M.H. (2014). Political parties in democratic Athens? *Greek, Roman, and*
23 *Byzantine Studies*, 54, 379–403.
24
25
26
27 Heath, R. (2019). Europe's new political players. *Politico*, January 21.
28
29
30 Hume, D. (1742/2002). Of parties in general. In S. E. Scarrow (Ed.), *Perspectives on*
31 *political parties: Classic readings* (pp. 33–36). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
32
33
34 Husted, E. (2020). 'Some have ideologies, we have values': The relationship
35 between organizational values and commitment in a political party. *Culture and*
36 *Organization*, 26(3), 175–195.
37
38
39
40 Husted, E. (2021). Alternative organization and neo-normative control: Notes on a
41 British town council. *Culture and Organization*, 27(2), 132–151.
42
43
44
45 Husted, E., and Plesner, U. (2017). Spaces of open-source politics: Physical and
46 digital conditions for political organization. *Organization*, 24(5), 648–670.
47
48
49
50 Ignazi, P. (2017). *Party and democracy: The uneven road to party legitimacy*. Oxford:
51 Oxford University Press.
52
53
54
55 Karthikeyan, S. I., Jonsson, S., and Wezel, F. C. (2016). The Travails of Identity
56 Change: Competitor Claims and Distinctiveness of British Political Parties, 1970–
57 1992. *Organization Science*, 27(1), 106–122.
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

- 1
2
3
4 Katz, R. S., and Mair, P. (1995). Changing models of party organization and party
5 democracy: The emergence of the cartel party. *Party Politics*, 1(1), 5–28.
6
7
8 Kelly, C. (1990). Social identity and intergroup perceptions in minority-majority
9 contexts. *Human Relations*, 43(6), 583–599.
10
11
12 Kirchheimer, O. (1966). The transformation of the Western European party systems.
13 In *Political parties and political development*. Princeton: Princeton University
14 Press.
15
16
17
18
19 Kokkinidis, G. (2015). Spaces of possibilities: Workers' self-management in Greece.
20 *Organization*, 22(6), 847–871.
21
22
23
24 Krouwel, A. (2006). Party models. In R. S. Katz and W. Crotty (Eds.), *Handbook of*
25 *party politics* (pp. 249–269). London: SAGE.
26
27
28
29 Kunda, G. (1992). *Engineering Culture: Control and Commitment in a High-Tech*
30 *Corporation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
31
32
33
34 Kärreman, D., and Alvesson, M. (2004). Cages in Tandem: Management Control,
35 Social Identity, and Identification in a Knowledge-Intensive Firm. *Organization*,
36 11(1), 149–175.
37
38
39
40 Luhmann, N. (2018). *Organization and decision*. Cambridge: Cambridge University
41 Press.
42
43
44
45 Mair, P. (1994). Party organizations: From civil society to the state. In R. S. Katz and
46 P. Mair (Eds.), *How parties organize* (pp. 1–22). London: SAGE.
47
48
49 Mair, P. (2003) Political Parties and Democracy: What sort of Future?
50 [http://www.foresightfordevelopment.org/sobipro/54/661-political-parties-and-](http://www.foresightfordevelopment.org/sobipro/54/661-political-parties-and-democracy-what-sort-of-future)
51 [democracy-what-sort-of-future](http://www.foresightfordevelopment.org/sobipro/54/661-political-parties-and-democracy-what-sort-of-future) [accessed December 21, 2020]
52
53
54
55
56 March, J. (1962). The Business Firm as A Political Coalition. *The Journal of Politics*,
57 24(4), 662–678.
58
59
60

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Mayes, B. T., and Allen, R. W. (1977). Toward a Definition of Organizational Politics. *The Academy of Management Review*, 2(4), 672–678.

Mazzoleni, O., and Voerman, G. (2017). Memberless parties: Beyond the business-firm model? *Party Politics*, 23(6), 783–792.

Meyer, J., and Allen, N. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Review*, 1(1), 61–98.

Meyer, J. P., and Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11(3), 299–326.

Michels, R. (1915). *Political Parties: A sociological study of the oligarchical tendencies of modern democracy*. New York: Dover Publications.

Morrell, K., and Hartley, J. (2006). A model of political leadership. *Human Relations*, 59(4), 483–504.

Moufahim, M., Reedy, P., and Humphreys, M. (2015). The Vlaams Belang: The Rhetoric of Organizational Identity. *Organization Studies*, 36(1), 91–111.

O’Doherty, D. and De Cock, C. (2019). Rethinking politics in organization. <https://www.cbs.dk/en/research/departments-and-centres/department-of-organization/events/rethinking-politics-in-organization> [accessed March 12, 2021].

Ostrogorski, M. (1902). *Democracy and the organization of political parties*. New York: Macmillan.

Panebianco, A. (1988). *Political parties: Organization and power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, M., Cheney, G., Fournier, V., and Land, C. (2014). *The Routledge companion to alternative organization*. New York: Routledge.

Author Accepted Manuscript

- Parker, S., and Parker, M. (2017). Antagonism, accommodation and agonism in Critical Management Studies: Alternative organizations as allies. *Human Relations*, 70(11), 1366–1387.
- Reedy, P., King, D., and Coupland, C. (2016). Organizing for Individuation: Alternative Organizing, Politics and New Identities. *Organization Studies*, 37(11), 1553–1573.
- Reinecke, J. (2018). Social Movements and Prefigurative Organizing: Confronting entrenched inequalities in Occupy London. *Organization Studies*, 39(9), 1299–1321.
- Rhodes, C., and Fleming, P. (2020). Forget political corporate social responsibility. *Organization*, 27(6), 943–951.
- Ringel, L. (2019). Unpacking the Transparency-Secrecy Nexus: Frontstage and backstage behaviour in a political party. *Organization Studies*, 40(5), 705–723.
- Rogers, B. (2005). From Membership to Management? The Future of Political Parties as democratic Organisations, *Parliamentary Affairs*, 58(3), 600-610
- Rosenblum, N. (2008). *On the side of the angels: An appreciation of parties and partisanship*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rye, D. (2015). Political Parties and Power: A New Framework for Analysis. *Political Studies*, 63(5), 1052–1069.
- Scarrow, S. E. (2006). The nineteenth-century origins of modern political parties: The unwanted emergence of party-based politics. In *Handbook of party politics* (pp. 16–24). London: SAGE.
- Sinha, P., Smolović Jones, O., and Carroll, B. (2021). Theorizing dramaturgical resistance leadership from the leadership campaigns of Jeremy Corbyn. *Human Relations*, 74(3), 354-382.

Author Accepted Manuscript

- Solebello, N., Tschirhart, M., and Leiter, J. (2016). The paradox of inclusion and exclusion in membership associations. *Human Relations*, 69(2), 439–460.
- Tormey, S. (2015). *The end of representative politics*. London: Polity Press.
- Van Biezen, I., Mair, P., and Poguntke, T. (2012). Going, going... gone? The decline of party membership in contemporary Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, 51(1), 24–56.
- Weber, M. (1919/2012). Politics as vocation. In H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills (Eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology* (pp. 396–450). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiener, Y. (1982). Commitment in Organizations: A Normative View. *The Academy of Management Review*, 7(3), 418–428.
- Willmott, H. (1993). Strength is ignorance; slavery is freedom: Managing culture in modern organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4), 515–552.
- Wilson Q., J. (1974). *Political organizations*. New York: Basic Books.

Author biographies

Emil Husted is an associate professor at the Department of Organization at Copenhagen Business School. His research centers on the internal orchestration of political parties and social movement, often with a focus on the mediating role of digital technology. Emil's research has been published in international journals such as *Organization*, *Culture and Organization*, and *The Information Society*. He is also co-author of *Digital Organizing: Revisiting Themes in Organization Studies* (with Ursula

Author Accepted Manuscript

1
2
3 Plesner). Furthermore, Emil is a member of the editorial collective at the independent
4
5
6 journal *ephemera*.
7
8
9

10
11
12 Mona Moufahim is a Senior Lecturer at the Stirling Management School at the
13
14
15 University of Stirling. Her research focuses on identity, extreme right politics, and
16
17 (political) marketing and consumption. Her research has been published in both
18
19 management and marketing journals, such as *Organization Studies*, *the Journal of*
20
21 *Business Ethics*, *Tourism Management*, *Marketing Theory* and *the journal of Marketing*
22
23 *Management*. She has edited the forthcoming book titled *Political Branding in Times*
24
25 *of Political Instability and Uncertainty* (Palgrave McMillan)
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 Martin Fredriksson is associate professor at the Department of Culture and Society
37
38 (IKOS), Linköping University. He works in the intersection between law and cultural
39
40 studies, studying areas spanning from the cultural history of copyright and the social
41
42 implications of media piracy to questions of intellectual property rights and the
43
44 protection of traditional knowledge. He has written extensively about the Pirate Party,
45
46 the digital rights movement, and the political mobilisation against restrictive intellectual
47
48 property rights regimes.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60