

Summary of Professional Accomplishments

1. Full name: Grzegorz Foryś

2. Diplomas, academic/artistic degrees held – with indication of the name, place and year of obtaining and the title of the doctoral dissertation:

Honours master's degree, Institute of Sociology of Jagiellonian University, 1999.

Degree of doctor of philosophy in sociology on the basis of the dissertation: *Protesty rolników w Polsce w latach 1997-2001. Próba analizy socjologicznej. (Farmer protests in Poland in the years 1997-2001 An attempt of sociological analysis.)* Faculty of Philosophy of Jagiellonian University, 2006.

3. Information on previous employment at academic/artistic units.

1999-2007 Assistant Professor at the Institute of Social Sciences (since 2002, Institute of Politology) of Pedagogical Academy of Kraków.

Since 2007 Associate Professor at the Institute of Politology of Pedagogical University of Kraków.

4. Indication of the achievement* resulting from Article 16 section 2 of the Act of 14 March 2003 – Law on Academic Degrees and Title and Degrees and Title in the Arts (Journal of Laws 2016, item 882 as amended in Journal of Laws of 2016, item 1311):

a) title of the scientific/artistic achievement:

Gospodarstwa i stowarzyszenia agroturystyczne w Polsce. W poszukiwaniu ruchu społecznego (Agritourism Farms and Associations in Poland. In search of a Social Movement),

b) (author/co-authors, title/titles, year of issue, name of the publishing house, reviewers).

Grzegorz Foryś, *Gospodarstwa i stowarzyszenia agroturystyczne w Polsce. W poszukiwaniu ruchu społecznego* (Agritourism Farms and Associations in Poland. In search of a Social Movement), 2016, Scholar Publishing House, Warsaw, p.353.

Reviewers: prof. Hanna Podedworna, prof. Andrzej Kaleta

c) discussion of the scientific/artistic aim of the above-mentioned work(s) and the obtained results and of their potential use.

Research background

The book *Agritourism farms and associations in Poland. In search of a social movement* is a sociological analysis of the social movement connected with agritourist activity in rural areas in Poland. Observation of the growing role of social movements (especially new social movements) in contemporary communities, combined with observation of the logic of changes in rural areas, has allowed to determine the overlapping area of these seemingly different phenomena. This common area is made of values pursued by new social movements, and on the other hand, agritourism farms and associations that participate in the implementation and popularization of the values. The monograph can also be said to show the specific fragment of modernization processes occurring in contemporary rural areas in Poland. For this purpose, it uses the analytical apparatus mostly proposed by social movement theories. It can be said that my research interest included in the publication, also concentrating on the issue of social movements, involves the rural areas for a purpose. The dominant tendency in research concerning these collective behaviors is the exploration of urban space, where – as claimed among others by Castells – the environment is particularly conducive to the development and functioning. I agree with this way of thinking, but I am of the opinion that rural areas are as important for the formation of social movements. Therefore, I have decided to focus on this area, which would not only allow me to study the processes of transformations in rural areas but also to contribute to knowledge on social movements.

Previous research on farms or rural areas and social movements has been made within separate sub-disciplines of sociology (rural sociology, sociology of rural areas, and sociology of social movements). The approach proposed in the book is aimed to: 1) go beyond the previous limitations and try to apply the social movement theory to analyze agritourism organizations, but first of all agritourism farms and their owners, and to find out to what extent we can approach them as a social movement. 2) explore the theories that describe and explain the development of contemporary agriculture and rural areas in Poland and abroad shows that contemporary farmers fight for (economic and social) freedom and autonomy, not limiting themselves to traditional methods of combat known from the past, sometimes referred to as peasants' wars involving peasant social movements, or – nowadays – farmers' protests. They often do it by means of everyday decisions and activities in economic activity they engage in in their farms. Hence, it is possible to approach those everyday activities as a social movement. 3) Given the contemporary developmental tendencies, rural areas can in the future become a specific territory where the ideas and values of new social movements will be pursued in a most intensive way. The research made it possible to find out whether such tendencies occurred in Poland and whether the way of approaching them presented in the monograph was legitimate. Thus, although the work mostly refers to a social movement, in a broader perspective it also shows a fragment of modernization processes in contemporary rural areas, and the the most general level it is an attempt to explain the phenomenon of processes characteristic of late modernity entering rural areas in Poland.

The book is the effect of a research project of which I was the principal investigator, funded by the National Science Centre as part of OPUS 8 programme, project no.: 2014/15/B/HS6/01228. The project involved qualitative research and included: 4 focus group interviews with the aim to gain knowledge necessary for the proper preparation of the

research tool (in-depth interview scenario). Focus group participants were experts in agritourism (leaders of agritourism associations, owners of agritourism farms, agricultural consultants in the field of agritourism). First of all, I conducted 20 in-depth interviews with the owners of agritourism farms in Małopolskie Province and 35 in-depth interviews with the leaders of agritourism associations operating in Poland. To meet one of the demands of Michael Burawoy's extended case method, which requires direct contact between the researcher and the research subject, I conducted focus group interviews and interviews with the owners of agritourism farms. The interviews with the leaders of agritourism associations were carried out by the Centre of Sociological Research of Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences.

The summary of professional accomplishments is structured as follows: research background, research aim of the monograph, a short presentation of the book structure with explanation of the topics discussed as well as some findings presented in particular chapters, the key findings of the monograph (equal to the outline of chapter six), and the monograph's contribution to theoretical and methodological reflection.

Research aim of the monograph

The research presented in the book had twofold research aims. In the empirical aspect, the goal was to confirm the existence of a new social movement in rural areas and to explain its role in the process of changes occurring in those areas. From the theoretical point of view, the aim was to use the analytical potential of social movement theory and to assess its usefulness for the description and explanation of selected processes occurring in contemporary rural areas. These goals were pursued for two reasons. The first was the little use of social movement theory in analyses connected with contemporary rural areas. So far, they have mostly been used to analyze defiant activities of peasants or farmers. They have not been much used to explain those social categories in conditions of everyday (we can say peaceful) existence. Second, thanks to the research project constructed this way, focusing on social movement, it was possible to understand the process of transferring to rural areas some processes typical of late modernity, the most important of which is probably the transition from materialistic to post-materialistic values. In the context of agritourism, hypercommodification was particularly important exemplified with selling values connected with nature, ecology, and rural culture.

The main research problem discussed in the book is: does an agritourist movement occur in rural areas, and if so, to what extent do associations and individuals who run agritourism farms combine this activity with pursuing values promoted by new social movements, and to what extent the motivation is purely economic, resulting from structural changes in rural areas and agriculture in Poland? Two hypotheses are tested. The first of them assumes that there is an organized social movement in rural areas in the form of agritourist movement. Although its participants – owners of agritourism farms and agritourism organizations – identify themselves as movement participants, they have different motivations to engage in agritourism. Running an agritourism farm is primarily determined by economic factors and based on the character of transformations in contemporary farming and rural

areas. Their combined effects cause economic pressure, which on the one hand makes individuals establish multi-function farms, where agritourism is just one of the forms of economic activity, and on the other hand, in its extreme form, leads to discontinuing production agricultural activity and replacing it with non-agricultural activity such as an agritourism farm. Therefore, we should not expect values promoted by new social movements, such as ecology, healthy lifestyle, living close to nature or preservation of rural culture and tradition, to play a significant motivational role in the owners' activity. The only exceptions may be those who come from places other than rural areas but decide to run such farms because of upholding the aforementioned values. The second hypothesis is that agritourism associations display different attitudes. Although they pursue their own and their members' economic interests, they attach great importance to promoting the values of some new social movements. That attitude, however, is bound to be instrumental, i.e. the promoted values (among other, natural values, healthy lifestyle, rural tradition, contact with nature) are the object of specific trade on the economic market, which is an example of hypercommodification mentioned before.

Structure of the book

The monograph comprises six chapters. The first two are theoretical. The goal of chapter one is to present the process of communities' transition from modern to late-modern. This approach made it possible to grasp the broadest contexts of functioning of new social movements and their impact on the entities' way of manifestation. At this stage of the analysis, I concentrate on the transition from the phase in which materialistic values were dominating to the phase with dominant postmaterial values. The task of chapter two is to prepare an analytical scheme for the description and explanation of the phenomenon of agritourist movement. Chapter three includes a discussion of rural areas and agritourism. It is also an attempt to link these two issues with the subject of social movements. The chapter can even be regarded as a link between the theoretical and empirical parts of the book. The next two chapters are empirical and present the analysis of material collected as part of the research. The last chapter is an attempt to present a comprehensive vision of agritourist movement and the role it serves on contemporary rural areas.

Referring to issues connected with the transition from modern to late modern society in chapter one is to show in greater detail the conditions of functioning of social movements in late modern world. Processes of rationalization, commodification, differentiation and individualization are kind of points of reference for the transition. Actually, we can say that the chapter focuses on specific course of the processes in two types of society: modern and late modern ones. This approach to the subject was motivated by Jan Pakulski's thesis¹ that late modern society is affected by the same phenomena its predecessor was, only in this case they are much more intensive. In other words, rationalization, commodification,

¹ J. Pakulski, Postmodern Social Theory (in:) Bryan S. Turner (ed.), *The New Blackwell Company to Social Theory*. Blackwell Publishing. Oxford 2009, pp. 252-280.

differentiation and individualization typical of modernity are also present in the late modern phase, but they should be preceded by the prefix *hyper-*. In my opinion, the presented research shows that the set of processes listed by Pakulski needs to be supplemented with one more, institutionalization. In order to illustrate the essence of the processes, I refer both to classic concepts of modern society and to two alternative visions of the contemporary world.

Chapter two is devoted to presenting the main subject of the monograph: social movement. Obviously, at this stage of the discussion, it involves the presentation of theoretical works on this form of collective activity, predominantly with reference to new social movements. The result is an analytical scheme applied to the description and explanation of agritourist movement. The aim of this chapter is not only to outline the specificity of new social movements but also to show how useful different theoretical approaches to the phenomena are in research practice. In the chapter, I also make the first attempt to link the issue of social movements with rural areas. The starting point is a short review of definitions of social movement, concluded with a proposal of my own definition, which does not refer to any theoretical perspective, with the explanans including the most comprehensive explanation of the concept possible. The main goal of this is to point to the properties that should be the subject of analysis and evaluation in the process search for agritourist movement. Besides, the main trends of social movement theories are also discussed with special consideration of new social movement theory, so as to employ selected aspects of those theories to the study of agritourist movement. As I mentioned before, new social movement theories play the key role, but this does not mean that the presented analytical scheme cannot or should not also draw on the achievements of other theoretical approaches. I think that the proposed theoretical eclecticism makes it possible to better pursue the research objectives of the work. First of all, with a view to one of the most important research objectives, the search for agritourist movement, we need to apply the broadest possible theoretical framework to take into consideration a large set of indicators of the phenomenon.

Chapter three of the monograph is theoretical and descriptive. The theoretical aspect is present in referring to analyses of rural areas, the dynamics of changes in them, and the attempt to define the phenomenon of agritourism. Specific explanation of terms such as countryside, rural area, multifunctional development and sustainable development is also important. The last two phenomena are referred to agriculture and rural areas. The discussed subject also allows to answer the question of how much rural areas are subject to specific colonization by late modern processes, and whether it is possible to assert that the phenomenon of agritourist movement is one effect of that colonization. If so, to what extent does it anticipate the future of rural areas?

The descriptive aspect mostly refers to agritourism in Poland. Quantitative and structural characteristics are presented here, together with the outline of dynamics of changes in the field of agritourism in Poland. A more general task is to try to demonstrate, not only direct context for the functioning of agritourist movement, but first of all the connection between issues concerning rural areas, agritourism, and social movements.

Chapter four is mostly devoted to empirical issues. Two methodological sections serve the introductory function, as their aim is to present Michael Burawoy's extended case method applied in the project and the research techniques used to collect empirical material. In the

empirical part, the starting point is the general characteristics of participants of the agritourist movement (owners of agritourism farms) and the analysis of their motivations for engaging in the activity. The other issues are focused on looking for two basic properties of a social movement on the basis of the collected empirical material: interactivity, and active attitude to social and/or cultural change. Then, the book describes its secondary properties (e.g. organization, self-awareness, community of goals and opinions, spontaneity, and distinctness). This subject results from 1) the search for the answer to the question of whether an agritourist movement exists and 2) the adopted analytical scheme, which suggests systematic analysis of more properties related to the essence of social movements. The analyses refer to owners of agritourism farms, who are the core of the participants of agritourist movement.

Chapter five of the monograph follows the same structure as chapter four. The collected empirical material is analyzed from the perspective of primary and secondary properties of a social movement, i.e. interactivity and attitude to change, and the organization of a social movement, community of goals and opinions, spontaneity, and distinctness. But the information collected in that part refers to agritourism associations. The findings in the chapter enable me to find the final answer to the main question of the existence of agritourist movement, and specific questions formulated as part of research problem. They also confirm that a new social movement is involved. It may be said that the content of chapter five is a kind of complementation and specification of the discussion in chapter four. Another common element of those chapters is the analytical scheme used in the explanations.

On the basis of empirical material collected from leaders of agritourism associations, and remembering the findings from chapter four, I supplemented, specified and confirmed the characteristics of agritourist movement. The added value of the chapter is finding several properties of the movement that went unnoticed in the analyses concerning agritourism hosts.

In the last chapter, the knowledge on agritourist movement based on previous discussion is summed up. In it, I also try to decide what determines its “newness”, and to what extent it is an example of a new social movement. An equally important task is to place the agritourist movement in broader contexts: local communities, agriculture, and rural areas. This allows me to show the role of the movement in developmental processes. Finally, I think I managed to show in the chapter how much the entity has qualities specific for Poland only, and how much it copies the regularities present in movements functioning in rural areas of West European countries. The chapter also presents the most important findings of the book, evaluation of the hypotheses, and assessment of the validity of the preliminary statements. I elaborate on this topic further in the document.

Key findings of the publication

The full image of agritourist movement includes a set of characteristics such as, predominantly, interactivity and the attitude to social change. The set of secondary characteristics is organization, self-awareness, community of goals and opinions, spontaneity, and distinctness. Interactivity of the agritourist movement has external and internal aspects. The internal aspect of the relationships dominates and determines the community character of

the movement. It also proves the lean character of resources and is the expression of reduction of risk and expenses connected with participation in the movement. That is why horizontal relations are dominant, and their highest intensity is visible at the highest level. The “density” of relationships is obviously dependent on the level of development of agritourism in the area. A special role in initiating them is played by newcomers, who have decided to run agritourism farms in order to pursue and promote a set of postmaterial values. Those people can also be regarded as a kind of avant-garde of agritourist movement. External relationships, in turn, are basically limited to the close environment of the movement. Entities that interact with the movement are mostly local authorities, agricultural advisory centers, or local action groups. The contacts are constant, yet they regularly intensify, especially when the movement engages in the implementation of projects funded with European or regional resources. This makes it possible to find a more general regularity, which shows that the origin of agritourist movement is closely connected with its institutional environment. Approaching it from the perspective of collective behaviors, I can say that the movement appeared on the basis of the existing institutional and communication structures, or – according to the representatives of resource mobilization theory – it was formed in a bottom-up, spontaneous way, on the basis of the existing organizational structures. Thus, it is an unintended effect of top-down European and national policy regarding rural areas.

Analyzing the attitude of agritourist movement to social change, I can say that it is a quasi-reformatory movement, aiming to modernize rural areas with preservation of significant elements of the past. This is reflected in relatively high level of awareness of changes taking place in rural areas, knowledge of the directions of modernization, but also criticism of its negative effects and appreciating the main course of changes. Due to the quality of the planned change, it can be considered as a conservative movement, which stresses the preservation of elements of rural landscape, culture, or ecology. But the attitude to those issues is twofold. The first, dominant one, is actually attachment to values connected with nature and rural identity; the second, instrumental one, is less popular orientation at deriving benefits from those values. From the point of view of the subject of change, its role is hard to classify. On the one hand, it is oriented at changing structures, which is proved by its participation in the implementation of rural areas policy. This provides the basis for calling it a socio-cultural movement. On the other hand, its orientation at individuals, especially at the benefit of its members and of tourists, is obvious, too.

Based on what has already been said about the position of agritourist movement in relation to social and/or cultural change, it can be considered as an entity operating in accordance with expressive logic, whose main goals are promoting a certain set of values (environmental protection, healthy and active lifestyle, beautiful landscape, rural culture). Some similarities between agritourist movement and economical movement are visible, not only in the promoted values but also in frequent, intentional collaboration with ecological farms. Agritourist movement is also responsible for the implementation of change. It does so in a spontaneous way, when its members engage in activities to promote and explain the essence of rural identity as part of contacts with rural tourists. It also does so in an institutionalized way, when – in accordance with resource mobilization theory – changes are planned, rational and implemented as part of formal projects (e.g. landscaping, developing infrastructure, reconstructing historical buildings).

In the organizational aspect, agritourist movement is a structure whose dominant quality is collectivism. This is determined by its several properties, such as: homogeneity of movement participants, low level of tension in interpersonal relations, unclear power relationships, task-oriented leaders, scarce resources that prevent the communities in the movement from going beyond the area of the commune or powiat, and close relationships between movement participants. This causes the emergence of so-called agritourism communities, usually led by the owners of agritourism farms who are also members of associations. The activity of those communities is internal, and their operation is limited to relatively small territories, so there are no contacts between them. Collectivism is not only visible in the structure of the movement, but also in the aspect of self-awareness and community of values. They reveal a considerable level of self-identification of movement participants with the local environment.

Self-awareness and the community of goals and opinions most clearly express the existence of social movement and its character. The sense of distinctness and community is equally shared by the owners of agritourism farms and by leaders of associations. Both categories of movement participants display the belief that they belong to something that can be called a social movement. Of course in the case of hosts the bond with the movement and the sense of belonging to it are determined by two factors: The first is the level of development of agritourism in an area. Wherever the density of farms is higher, the attachment to the movement is stronger, too. The second factor is the proximity of Kraków agglomeration, which weakens the bond with the movement. This results from the fact that agritourism farms serve the role of accommodation for tourists who intend to go sightseeing nearby. Therefore, the owners of those farms often treat agritourism as a business rather than a mission, and they consider other entities from the circle as competitors, not an opportunity of cooperation. Associations are more homogeneous in this respect.

Analyzing the goals of agritourist movement, I can identify two main categories. The first of them is connected with broadly understood nature, and includes: environmental protection, landscaping, and ecological agriculture. The second dominant category of goals is connected with the preservation of traditional rural elements, culture, and tradition. As we can see, these goals are primarily postmaterial. They also include influencing the commune policy concerning projects that support agritourism, interpersonal gratifications, activity for the benefit of local communities, and their integration. All these are primary goals, just like the need of promoting the specific farm/village/region, satisfying the needs of tourists, and obtaining customers. The values shared by some rural hosts involve elements of peasant ethos (attachment to the land, or farm work). Obviously, apart from these dominant goals, there are also more particular, material ones – the development of agritourist infrastructure, improvement of standard of services, enhancing education). Those are secondary goals, categorized together with the need of development of agritourism, the development of mutual cooperation within the framework of the movement, and the implementation of sustainable development principles. If we add that not only the goals of the movement but also opinions of its participants on many issues are community-oriented, especially issues connected with

rural areas and the direction of their development, it is legitimate to agree with Klandermans² that a consensus is being formed. First, it is worked out at the local level within agritourism communities, and then, through direct and indirect contacts, it is transferred to the whole social movement. It must be added, however, that the discussed community character was not the foundation of agritourist movement, unlike in many other movements. The factors that played the key role in forming the agritourist movement were already mentioned activities of external institutions and economic reasons. The common developed later on the basis of common economic interests. The situation shows a certain unique character of the process of development of agritourist movement, i.e. transformation from individual interests, through an interest group, up to agritourist movement with its own ideology, which according to the division by Luther P. Gerlach³ at the higher level includes the issues connected with environment and landscape protection and rural culture and tradition, and at the lower, more diverse level, elements of peasant ethos and specific goals connected with the directions of development of farms, promotion of tourism and the region, and profits from the activity. The existence of original ideology of agritourist movement, combined with the sense of distinctness and solidarity among its members, show that the entity is well developed.

Spontaneity in agricultural movement manifests itself in a specific way, and it not associated with the initial phase of its development, like in most cases. Since the movement basically does not engage in any protest activities and does not organize any demonstrations or rallies, spontaneity is visible at the level of interactions between its participants. This is visible both among hosts and within associations. A special expression of spontaneity is social gatherings of the participants of the movement, but first of all the use of direct democracy principles and the presence of solidarity in daily functioning. Thus, spontaneity does not confirm the regularity mentioned by representatives of collective behavior theory: that it is connected with the initial phase of formation of the movement, which later acquires organizational properties. Agritourist movement is formed from the beginning thanks to organized activities. In a situation when spontaneity is the distinct feature of the movement (which is true in the case of agritourist movement), representatives of resource mobilization theory claim that the structure of the movement must be loose, and as a result, organizational analysis is impossible due to the lack of expressions of rational activity characteristic of organizations. But we know that the structure of agritourist movement is quite tight, not loose. Using the theoretical findings by Naomi Rosenthal and Michael Schwartz,⁴ I conclude that due to its unique organizational structure mostly based on primary groups, agritourist movement has a high level of spontaneity. In other words, a tight structure does not prevent spontaneous expression, which shows how extraordinary the movement is.

² B. Klandermans, The Formation and Mobilization of Consensus (in:) B. Klandermans, H. Kriesi, S. Tarrow (eds.), *From Structure to Action: Comparing Social Movement Research across Cultures* (vol. 1). JAI Press. Greenwich, CT 1988, pp. 173-196.

³ No. Gerlach, The Structure of Social Movements: Environmental Activism and Its Opponents (in:) J. Arquilla, D. Ronfeldt (eds.), *Networks and Netwars: The Future of Terror, Crime, and Militancy*. Rand. Santa Monica 2001, pp. 289-309.

⁴ N. Rosenthal, M. Schwartz, Spontaneity and Democracy in Social Protest (in:) *International Social Movement Research*, vol. 2: B. Klandermans (ed.), Organizing for Change. JAI Press. Greenwich, Ct 1989, pp. 33-59.

Distinctness can be diagnosed in several aspects, mainly in the ontological aspect (in a twofold way). First, like any other social movement, the agritourist movement also oscillates between organization / institutionalization and spontaneity. Second, against the background of most social movements, it has unique features, such as: specific organization, discussed mostly in chapter five, strong reference to institutional contexts, which in fact formed the social movement, the direction of evolution from communities of interest to social movement, and the fact that direct relationships dominate in it. What is new and different is the belief, quite common among rural hosts, that agritourist movement is a lifestyle. In the aspect of activity and attitude to social change, the movement tries to implement, or at least promote, another civilization paradigm. It is partially similar to the ideas of ecological movement, but it also includes an element of pragmatism, which causes one to support changes modernizing rural areas, but is also contrary to rural tradition and the set of values mentioned many times before.

The above detailed presentation of the key findings concerning the characteristics of agritourist movement is also the confirmation of the hypothesis that in contemporary rural areas in Poland there is an agritourist movement. The second part of the hypothesis says that this entity has the features of a new social movement. There are several pieces of evidence for that. Obviously, the matter of the existence of entities called new social movements is a subject of discussion of scholars studying such movements. Thus, the subject is not clear, which I explain in chapter II of the monograph. Still, my opinion in the dispute is that new social movements are a fact. Claus Offe suggests some topics in his specification of “novelty” in social movements. I think that goals are the most important, both in the context of new social movements and of agritourist movement. Replacing material goals with postmaterial ones seems to be a synthetic measure of the deep changes that have occurred, not only in social movements but also in their environment. Agritourist movement as a social and cultural movement predominantly intends to promote and pursue such values (ecology, healthy lifestyle, landscape, rural character, and the idea of sustainable development). This clear image of the matter is slightly disturbed by farm owners' intention to obtain financial profit. This goal is ever-present, but the attitude to it is evolving, especially in the case of hosts. At the moment of beginning agritourist activity, this goal is of the utmost importance, but after some time their awareness grows and they begin to perceive other, post-material goals, which they can pursue thanks to agritourism, especially that it does not give very high income. The economic goal becomes a kind of tool to achieve postmaterial goals.

As already mentioned, the organizational structure of agritourist movement also proves it is one of new social movements. It is not hierarchized, and direct horizontal interactions are its dominant element. The movement strives to establish community, and that communal character is crucial for the organizational form of the movement. This type of organization helps the entity take root in local structures and actively participate in activities toward social change. Even the presence of associations in the movement does not significantly change the form of its organizational structure. Direct informal relationships, poorly developed authority structure, task-based and changeable leadership, and familiar relations in associations all confirm this. External relationships, in turn, are often political, mostly peaceful, connected with the collaboration with local authority for the benefit of the local community. But sometimes they have the form of conflict, which is confirmed by the

example of hosts from the region of Uście Gorlickie, lobbying the local authorities to include the rural and agritourist character of the commune in their modernization processes. Moreover, the movement also aims to establish broader communities whose participants are not only the owners of agritourism farms or associations but also communities of farmers; wives' associations, local action groups, folk artists, folk culture organizers, or producers of organic food. They are natural supporters of the movement, sometimes they can even be considered its members.

The way of operation of agritourist movement clearly illustrates its belonging to new social movements. The operation involves two basic trends. The first is focused on the formation of social awareness. It includes activities such as organizing and participating in conferences, printing information and promotional materials, direct contact with rural tourists enabling them to learn the rustic character, participation in environmental campaigns, promoting the idea of sustainable development, and providing the model by their own activities (a certain way of running the farm and forming the closest environment, aiming to preserve the rusticity). All these forms of activity are typical of new social movements. Obviously, in the case of agritourist movement we cannot see organizing protests, happenings or marches, but there are other, similar forms of activity, for example organizing picnics, fairs, or festivities. They are opportunities to promote farms and agritourism, but also the values that have been repeatedly mentioned.

Besides, social resources are additional features which prove that agritourist movement is a new social movement. According to Offe, new social movements, unlike old ones, are not strongly rooted in class structure. But if we really want to find it, we may point to the middle class (partly new and old), and groups out of the labor market (the unemployed, students, housewives, the retired). It can be said that this regularity is confirmed in agritourist movement. With regard to education and professions of people who run agritourism farms, as well as human capital that associations can use, we can say that most of them represent broadly understood middle class or the group out of the labor market. The majority of them have higher (especially newcomers and leaders of associations) or at least secondary education, and they work in services or the public sector. Many people who belong to the movement are housewives and the retired. As for the first group, before they began the agritourist activity, they had been unemployed. For them, the activity was not only the way to earn some extra money, but especially an opportunity to emancipate and establish interpersonal relations. Those benefits were a very important motivation for them in everyday running of the farm. This phenomenon also reveals the side effects of activity of agritourist movement, such as the activation of some social categories, which – as we can see from a broader perspective – directly contributes to the development of rural areas.

In my opinion, the new qualities of agritourist movement identified by Claus Offe should be supplemented by two others. First of all, agritourist movement distances itself from institutionalized politics. This attitude is visible at each level of the movement and is conscious. Although the theory of new social movements refers to this issue, conscious and purposeful attitude of distancing from politics, present in the analyzed movement, even more stresses its “novelty”. The movement is mainly a cultural one, and although it can hardly be called anti-political, it is definitely apolitical. Another quality I would like to point out is this actor engaging in activities for social development. The entity is not only engaged in the

sphere of agritourism or certain values, but also in activities for local communities. It is especially visible in the areas which have considerable natural values, and hence, well-developed agritourism.

The characteristics of agritourist movement presented above show that it is a real entity, which belongs to new social movements. Both these findings seem to be unquestionable, but still I would like to make some comments on them. We need to remember that the activity of agritourist movement is varied from territorially and internally. This means that it displays particular activity in areas where agritourism is developing well, and less intensively, where agritourism is vestigial. It seems quite obvious, but what is interesting is that the activity of the movement also decreases in places wherever – despite well developed agritourist activity – it is adjacent to big cities, and wherever it has to compete with commercial tourism. Then, the networks of interaction formed around agritourism are weaker, and the awareness of belonging to something that can be called a social movement is low. Attachment to postmaterial values also diminishes. Thus, it can be said that participation in the movement is gradable. Beginning with the lack of sense of affiliation to the movement, through approving its goals without real engagement in the movement, up to active implementation of the values and engagement in the development of the movement. Similar doubts about the nature of agritourism as a social movement result from the fact of special role of institutional contexts for its beginning. In this case, however, it seems to be an expression of specificity of the rural movement as compared with urban ones. Due to scarce resources available in rural areas, it simply uses institutional support.

Similar reservations can be made with reference to the statement that the movement is an example of new social movement. The main argument is the ever-present profit orientation of the participants. It is an inseparable element of agritourism. Still, the importance of this motivation for hosts has the afore-mentioned dynamics. This means that whereas in the beginning of activity, profit was the most important for all the hosts, in time for most of them it becomes equal to or even less important than other non-material benefits provided by agritourism.

I would also like to point to the role of agritourist movement for rural areas. Findings concerning this subject can be directly referred to practice, i.e. rural areas policy. Agritourist movement serves a few functions in rural areas. It initiates the formation of local networks of cooperation that affirm local resources and oppose negative effects of modernization. Thanks to the movement, a certain category of rural area residents gained greater autonomy, becoming independent from market influence and retaining the possibility of retaining one's farm, identity, and workplace. Agritourist movement is not only one of the promoters of sustainable development, but also one of its factors. This is reflected in the goals of the movement, but especially in the activities that help to achieve the goals. I mean the participation in the implementation of projects funded with European Union resources, which strengthen sustainable development. On that basis, it can be said to serve as an integrating factor, facilitating the formation of identity of rural residents, as well as the function of promoter and implementer of sustainable development, combined with the guard of nature, rural landscape, and rural culture. Furthermore, it actively participates in the construction of rural character, which is visible in the analytical category of scene. It is mainly the author of conventional scenes, referring to the essence of rural character, and sometimes also

unconventional scenes, especially in the areas where it coexists with commercial tourism. It is also worth pointing out the role of agritourist movement in increasing human and social capital. Building networks of cooperation with other organizations, and workshops in which the members of the movement participate, are a good example. It improves the hosts' chances for keeping their farms and maximizing revenue. Remembering all that, we can call the movement the developmental factor of rural areas.

The book's contribution to theoretical reflection and methodology

At the end of the presentation of what I consider as the key findings of the work, I would like to point to several unique properties of agritourist movement, which make it distinct from other new social movements. It is also the contribution of this publication into a theoretical discussion on social movements and rural areas, as well as research methodology. First, the movement is deeply rooted in the local environment, and its resources are located at that level. Although it also functions nationwide, its everyday operation is connected with the local level. What provides the basis for going beyond that level and is a common denominator for all its participants is the goals and shared ideology. Second, direct relations between its participants closed in many agritourism communities dispersed all over the country are another unique property. This situation revealed a specific feature concerning the role of the Internet in the functioning of the movement. Usually, the Internet plays an important motivational role for members of social movements. In the case of agritourist movement, its role is mostly reduced to information exchange, and it is perceived by the participants as a tool that weakens the communal nature of agritourist movement, i.e. the element that is essential for it. The Internet deprives us of the opportunity to maintain direct relationships, reduces the number of meetings, eliminates opportunities for strengthening communal bonds, and emancipates movement participants. So it plays a kind of destructive role in agritourist movement, which is an unusual situation. Third, the reactive organization of agritourist movement is also unusual. The reactivity involves associations becoming a participant or a representative of the movement depending on the situation. Fourth, the process of formation of agritourist movement, as well as the dynamics of its development, seem quite original. It is mostly because institutional contexts played the key role in the formation of the movement, which is rare. The evolution from individual economic interests of its potential members, through an interest group, up to the social movement, is atypical as well. Fifth, its role in the commodification of values is less than in movements in Western countries. It seems this is unavoidable, and the movement itself participates in the process, at the same time counteracting the process. This results from the fact that it is largely permeated with rural character, rural tradition, local character, and sometimes also peasant ethos, and in part, it is the consequence of backwardness of rural areas in Poland.

With reference to social movement theory, the publication seems to contribute several new topics or at least show the known ones in a different light. I mean particularly the dynamics of formation of the social movement and the role of institutional contexts in that process. In the case of agritourist movement, those contexts had an especially great importance, and are still responsible for the dynamics of the entity. That area has already been the subject of study, but usually in the context of external relations of a social movement with

other entities. However, the studies did not prove the decisive role of the aspect in the formation of a social movement. In a sense, agritourist movement can even be said to have been directly evoked by the policy of sustainable development of rural areas. This topic can be the subject of further exploration to find out whether this is a universal property or whether it results from the specific conditions of rural areas.

As we know, in the monograph, I analyze a social movement in rural areas. Social movements functioning in that territory have been explored many times, but in most cases they were protest-oriented and connected with the protection of economic interests of peasants or farmers. In other words, slightly different analytical tools were used in that context, for example the theory of social movements, but the theory of new social movements had rarely been used to study rural social movements. The agritourist movement confirms that all the applied theories of movements have a descriptive and explanatory potential, which means that they are also useful for other existing and potential rural social movements.

The results of empirical studies and the conclusions formulated on their basis may also have a practical application. Presentation of the role of agritourist movement played in rural areas allows to consciously include this entity in planning developmental processes of those areas, especially those based on the idea of sustainable development. Its integration and capital-creation function, building the identity and creating workplaces, makes it an important subject in rural areas, which should be strengthened.

In the context of the applied extended case method I can say that it confirmed its advantages, three of which are especially important. First, it allowed to add up single cases to obtain social process(es). It is visible when I discuss the transition of societies from the modern to late modern phase and its effects in rural areas. It is also evident in direct contact with agritourist movement, when I characterize the dynamics of its formation and the role it plays in modernization processes. Second, the method in a way allowed a broad application of theoretical accomplishments, especially in terms of social movements. This allowed a kind of theoretical eclecticism, which I consider to be the proper attitude to the study of social movements. Third, the method made it possible to include in the analyses the social processes and forces that would otherwise remain invisible. Thanks to that, I was able to show their mutual relation, which in turn allowed me to approach the entity from a broader and deeper perspective, and as a result, better discuss the current knowledge on the topic and identify the elements that should be further explored. Therefore, the proposed analytical scheme was a response to the demand for extended case method, and it actually did its task. The identified “unique” qualities of agritourist movement can be regarded as a contribution to the improvement of the existing theories of social movements.

5. Description of other scientific research (artistic) achievements

My research interests concentrate on broadly understood subject of social movements, and date back to the year 2000, when I began to prepare my doctoral dissertation. That period and the later activity were reflected in the study of farmer protests, agritourist movement, and theoretical works on the position of social movements in institutionalized politics. The research also resulted in works published before and after the doctorate, participation in research grants of Ministry of Science and Computerization (MNiI) or Ministry of Science

and Higher Education (MNiSW) (research project no. 2 H02E 013 23 – principal investigator, research project NN 116 127334 - investigator), and National Science Center (NCN) (2014/15/B/HS6/01228 – principal investigator) and research projects carried out in collaboration with national and local government institutions in Małopolskie province.

As for the output from the period after the doctorate, I identify two main subject areas, both connected with social movements:

1. Social movements in the context of rural areas and protest activity of the social category of farmers
2. Social movements as an element of institutionalized policy

Ad1. The issue of collective activities of farmers is discussed in a most comprehensive way in the original monograph *Dynamika sporu. Protesty rolników w III Rzeczypospolitej (The dynamics of dispute. Farmer protests in the 3rd Polish Republic)*⁵. It is a publication prepared on the basis of the doctoral dissertation using the set of empirical data included in it, but significantly changed. The work was written as part of a grant from the contemporary Ministry of Science and Computerization, titled *W obliczu zmiany: wybrane strategie działania mieszkańców polskiej wsi (Facing change: selected strategies of activity of Polish rural residents)* (No. 2 H02E 013 23). The publication is a comprehensive attempt to describe and explain farmer protests in Poland during the system transformation. Social movement theories are the theoretical framework for the analysis of empirical data. The issue of modernization processes in rural areas, as well as evolution of the social category of peasants, are an equally important topic discussed in the book. The most important part of the discussion, however, focused on the analysis of empirical data concerning farmer protests in Poland, collected using the method of protest events analysis. The method was applied as early as in the 1960s by political science researchers. It gained importance among others thanks to research conducted by Charles Tilly and his colleagues in the 1970s⁶. My research, in turn, was the first autonomous attempt to apply the method and publish the outcome in Poland. Before, a book by Grzegorz Ekiert and Jan Kubik, *Rebellious Civil Society. Popular Protest and Democratic Consolidation in Poland, 1989-1993*, had been published in English. The researchers had also applied this method. My research, unlike the research of other authors, was based on the assumption that the dynamics of farmer protest activity differs from that of protests of other social categories, so it should be studied independently of studying the protests of other social groups. In addition, apart from data collected by me on farmer protests in the years 1997-2001, upon the consent of Ekiert and Kubik I used for comparison

⁵ Grzegorz Foryś, *Dynamika sporu. Protesty rolników w III Rzeczypospolitej*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar. Warszawa 2008, p. 242.

⁶ B.M. Russett, *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators*. Yale University Press, New Heaven Conn., 1964; D. Snyder, Ch. Tilly, Hardship and Collective Violence in France. *American Sociological Review*, no. 37, 1972, pp. 520-532; Ch. Tilly, L. Tilly, R. Tilly, *The Rebellious Century, 1830-1930*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1975; Ch. Tilly, *Popular Contention in Great Britain 1758-1834*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1995; S. Tarrow, *Democracy and Disorder. Protest and Politics in Italy 1965-1975*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1989.

selected data on farmer protests from their research published in the quoted monograph, carried out in the years 1989-1993.

The most important findings of the monograph was the reconstruction of the dynamics of farmer protests in Poland in the years 1989-1993 and 1997-2001. Both periods correspond to two protest waves, which can be referred to as “Solidarity” and “post-Solidarity” waves respectively, with consideration of the main organizers of protests. The analysis also involved detailed characteristics of protest activities of farmers, such as e.g. protesters' demands and addressees of those demands, protest strategies and methods, intensity of the protests, collaboration with other protest organizers and their relationships with the environment, especially with the state. This allowed me to verify the hypothesis of economic basis for farmer protests, connected not only with subjective deprivation in the social group, just like in other social groups, but also with objective deprivation resulting from the economic crisis in agriculture in the discussed periods. Thus, the specific nature of farmer protests in Poland was confirmed against the background of protests of other social categories. A more general approach to farmer protests showed the process of their specific institutionalization, reflected in the increase in importance of organizations initiating and conducting protest actions, and collaboration between them. An extreme expression of that process was the introduction of agricultural problems into the main stream political debate thanks to protests. This way, they were transferred to the forum of institutionalized politics. This observation later became the object of my closer study, which translated into three texts on the relations between non-institutional politics represented by social movements and institutional politics with political parties.

My interests concerning social movements and farmers' collective activities, most evident in the presented monograph, were also pursued in other publications. This can be confirmed e.g. by an article discussing the activity of Rural Solidarity during the first and second wave of protests (*Co nam zostało z tamtych lat. Aktywność NSZZ RI Solidarność w trakcie pierwszej i drugiej fali protestów rolniczych w Polsce (What has remained of the past? Activity of Rural Solidarity during the first and second wave of farmer protests in Poland)*⁷. It is the effect of a scientific conference organized by Warsaw University of Life Sciences in 2006, on the 25th anniversary of the formation of NSZZ RI Solidarność. The article shows the role of the trade union in protest activities in the 1990s. It particularly focuses on the evolution of the entity (methods of operation, symbols it refers to, or demands), showing its transition from a social movement referring to the roots of the original Solidarity and the peasant ethos to a trade union fighting for the economic interests of farmers. In the process of transformation of Rural Solidarity, an important role was played by the formation of Samoobrona, which was a competitor to that trade union. So against the background of farmer protests, I managed to grasp the process of changes occurring in farmers' organizations.

In the text *Interesy rolnicze. Pomiędzy modelem a praktyką (Farmer interests: model vs practice)*⁸ farmer protests are used as a specific example of a more general relationship between economic development and the development of political democracy and civic

⁷ G. Foryś, Co nam zostało z tamtych lat? Aktywność NSZZ RI Solidarność w trakcie pierwszej i drugiej fali protestów rolniczych w Polsce. *Rocznik Socjologii Wsi*, vol. 27, Warszawa 2007, pp. 284-294.

⁸ G. Foryś, *Interesy rolnicze. Pomiędzy modelem a praktyką* [in:] K. Łabędź (ed.) *Bariery aktywności publicznej*, Adam Marszałek, Toruń 2008, pp. 105-121.

society. Two topics dominate in the paper. The first of them is mutual relations between economic development and democracy, and the other confronts those findings with possible forms or models of the system of representation of interests. The latter topic includes farmer protests treated as a kind of impulse for the development of a model of institutionalized collaboration. It cannot be ignored, however, that the first wave of protests rather involved farmer protests which followed the model of class confrontation, when interests of farmers were opposed to the interests of other social categories, and only in the second wave of farmer protests did they become an example of a model of institutionalized collaboration. Thus, the article approaches farmer protests from the perspective of the formation of the system of representation of interests in Poland and a more general relation between economy and democracy. In this sense, it fits an important topic of discussion of democratization processes in Poland and shows what role in the process was played by farmers' protest activity.

The report from research on farmer protests in Poland is included in the text published in *Wieś i Rolnictwo* quarterly *Z badań nad protestami rolniczymi w Polsce (Report from research on farmer protests in Poland)*⁹. It presents preliminary findings concerning both the theoretical framework of the study of those collective behaviors and the key findings resulting from empirical data. It highlights the main tendencies in farmers' protest activity, later developed in the monograph on farmer protests presented before. I mean not only the wave but also cyclical character of farmer protests, the tendency to politicization, professionalization, routinization and economization. The article also presents a thesis on future Europeanization of farmer protests in Poland.

A somewhat different approach to farmer protests is presented in the text written in collaboration with Krzysztof Gorlach (*Analiza protestów rolników polskich w latach 1989-2001. Przyczynek do teorii ruchów chłopskich (Analysis of Polish farmer protests in the years 1989-2001: a contribution to the theory of peasant movements)*)¹⁰. Our main intention was to answer the question of whether classic theories of peasant movements are a good starting point for the analysis of collective behaviors of contemporary farmers. At first glance, the answer to this question seemed obvious. If Polish peasant farms, and hence also the peasants and their families, are subject to radical changes as a result of modernization processes, and the category of peasants is transforming into the category of farmers, then referring to the theory of peasant movements in the analysis of that social group is pointless. Using data on contemporary farmer protests, the article tries to undermine this way of thinking, pointing out that the theories still have the descriptive and explanatory potential.

Two other texts referred to farmer protests as well. The first of them, written together with Krzysztof Gorlach and titled *Defending Interests. Polish Farmers' Protests under Postcommunism*¹¹ is the response to an invitation to collaboration from Bert Klandermans, one of the world's leading scholars studying social movements, and the main creator and

⁹ G. Foryś, *Z badań nad protestami rolniczymi w Polsce* [in:] *Wieś i Rolnictwo*, no. 4 (141), IRWiR PAN, Warszawa 2008, pp. 9-28.

¹⁰ G. Foryś, K. Gorlach, *Analiza protestów rolników polskich w latach 1989-2001. Przyczynek do teorii ruchów chłopskich* [in:] A. Kolasa-Nowak, W. Misztal (eds.) *Spoleczne światy wartości*, Wydawnictwo UMCS, Lublin 2012, pp. 247-268.

¹¹ G. Foryś, K. Gorlach, *Defending interests: Polish Farmers' Protests under Postcommunism* [in:] Bert Klandermans, Cornelis van Stralen (eds.), *Movements in Times in Democratic Transition*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia 2015, pp. 316-340.

representative of the Dutch school of studying social movements. The text was first of all an opportunity to internationalize the problems. This time, farmer protests were situated in the context of the democratization process in Poland at a specific historical and political moment of Polish transformation, and referred to the transformation of Polish agriculture. Their role as one of the methods of civic participation in contemporary democracies was also stressed.

A new approach to farmers' protest activities was included in the other text, published in *Studia Socjologiczne*¹². The analyses presented there are qualitative and refer to cultural aspects of protest activities. Previous articles ignored that topic, which seems to be as interesting as the conclusions formulated on the basis of quantitative analyses. The theoretical context of the article is theories of new social movements, in particular the framing theory – both in the basic version by David A. Snow and Robert D. Bedford, and concepts by later authors who developed that theoretical trend, e.g., Patrick Mooney and Scott A. Hunt. The publication made it possible to identify three sources of meanings which the protesters referred to: national, religious, and peasant. They became the reason for specifying three basic master frames – national, religious and peasant, respectively. The study of those aspects of protests, not only farmers', allows greater insight into the motivations of protesters, but first of all to understand the awareness and cultural properties of such activities.

To sum up this area of research, I can say that with reference to empirical data I try to approach farmer protests from different theoretical perspectives and I show them in different contexts. They are a pretext to in-depth analyses of selected elements of transformation and democratization processes in Poland, the role of particular entities in those processes and the changes of institutional participants of the protests, and I try to assess from the perspective of the protests some of the theoretical concepts describing the origin and course of those collective behaviors. The basic context of this discussion is rural areas. They are analyzed most comprehensively in two monographs. Both of them are kind of review of the processes occurring in Polish rural areas in the last twenty-five years. In the former case, the main object of analysis is farmers and their protest activities, in the latter, it is the owners of agritourism farms. In a way, both publications present some indicator phenomena characteristic of the studied moment of changes. In the 1990s, farmers' protests were such a typical element resulting from changes in rural areas. Currently, the typical element is the processes of rural areas and rural residents adjusting to the phenomena occurring beyond them, in broadly understood society. Agritourism and agritourist movement is an example of this. Rural areas as a place of formation of new social movements are also analyzed in three texts submitted for publication. Two are the effect of my participation in a congress or convention: the first was written after the International Rural Sociology Association (IRSA) Congress in Toronto¹³, and the second, after the Convention of Polish

¹² G. Foryś, Kulturowe aspekty aktywności protestacyjnej rolników w Polsce [in:] *Studia Socjologiczne* no. 1 (216), pp. 19-44.

¹³G. Foryś, Rural Areas in Poland as a Place Where New Social Movements Are Formed. The Example of Agritourism [in:] J. Devlin (ed.) *Social Movements Contesting Natural Resource Development*. Earthscan. London 2017 (in printing).

Sociological Association (PTS) in Gdańsk¹⁴. And third is reported for the printing in *Studia Socjologiczne*¹⁵.

Ad.2. The other area I am interested in is connected with social movements in the context of institutionalized politics. This issue seems especially important, mostly because the role of non-institutional politics is growing in contemporary democratic political systems. This direction of my research is basically in the initial stage, and its presence results from experiences connected with studying farmer protests, collaboration with Bert Klandermans in preparing a text published in a book he edited, and participation as the principal investigator in a research project funded by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education (NN 116 127334) concerning parliamentary opposition. The study of farmer protests showed that protest is a factor that significantly affects decision-making processes and at the same time is a way of civic participation in contemporary democracies. Remembering that social movements are the entities that most often resort to protest, and that they play the role of non-parliamentary opposition, I made an attempt to combine the issues of social movements, protests, and opposition.

The first text leading to that was *Wielokierunkowa opozycja parlamentarna w okresie rządów Kazimierza Marcinkiewicza i Jarosława Kaczyńskiego (2005-2007)* (*Multidirectional parliamentary opposition during the terms of office of Kazimierz Marcinkiewicz and Jarosław Kaczyński*)¹⁶. Basically, it refers to parliamentary opposition and its activities oriented at the government and parliamentary majority, but just like the research carried out as part of the grant, it was an opportunity to study closely the mechanisms of operation of political parties as part of institutionalized politics and to reflect on whether it is possible to study the opposition of social movements. The effect is e.g. another text titled *Polityka sporu. Poza polityką instytucjonalną?* (*Contentious politics: non-institutional politics*)¹⁷. In the text I tried to include protest activities in institutional politics, defining the conditions that would make it possible. In this context, it is crucial to refer to the term “contentious politics” formulated by Doug McAdam, Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly¹⁸, which is based on the terms “protest” and “collective protest activity”. The review of the definition of politics, in turn, enabled me to choose the subject approach as the approach that allows to treat contentious politics as an element of institutional politics. This approach introduces non-institutional activities into the sphere of proper politics, but they follow a pattern and an order. It also maintains the interest in the state and authority – the elements that are present in the narrower, classic, or

¹⁴ G. Foryś, Nowy ruch społeczny na obszarach wiejskich. Między typowością a swoistością [w:] M. Kowalewski, M. Rakusa-Suszczewski, A. Rozalska (red.) *W świecie protestu. Idee i narzędzia współczesnych ruchów społecznych*. Wydawnictwo USz. Szczecin 2017 (in printing)

¹⁵ G. Foryś, Ruch agroturystyczny w Polsce jako nowy ruch społeczny. Implikacje teoretyczne i empiryczne, Reported for the printing in: *Studia Socjologiczne*.

¹⁶ G. Foryś, Wielokierunkowa opozycja parlamentarna w okresie rządów Kazimierza Marcinkiewicza i Jarosława Kaczyńskiego (2005-2007) [in:] K. Łabędź (ed.) *Opozycja parlamentarna w Polsce w latach 1997-2010*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe UP, Kraków 2012, pp. 130-163.

¹⁷ G. Foryś, Polityka sporu: poza polityką instytucjonalną? [in:] *Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis. Studia Politologica*, no. 165, Kraków 2014, pp. 191-205.

¹⁸ D. McAdam, S. Tarrow, CH. Tilly, *Dynamic of Contention*. Cambridge University Press, New York 2001.

institutional understanding of politics. Thus, the text is the first attempt to transfer protests and social movements to the sphere of institutional politics.

The next step towards the aforementioned goal was the text *Ruchy społeczne. Pomiędzy oporem i opozycją? (Social movements: between resistance and opposition?)*¹⁹. The aim of the text is to prove that social movements can be regarded as political opposition. Hence, I try to polemicize with the more and more popular belief of political scientists that social movements are an expression of resistance rather than an example of opposition. If we were to treat them as opposition, this would only be possible for political movements. Such approach seems to me to be too restrictive and actually erroneous. It explained that when analyzing in the text several aspects of functioning of the movements, and especially their relationship with state authority. It turns out that social movements can only be considered as opposition on condition of broad, inclusive definition of state authority and regarding social movements as the expression of contentious politics discussed in the previous text. Then, we can say that the movements have a permanent, not incidental relationship with state authority, which is normal in the case of opposition. In practice, the intensity of that relationship is gradable, depending on the type of social movement. Political movements oriented at changing structures are bound to have intensive contacts with the authority, and cultural movements focused on the benefit of their own members, weaker.

This way of thinking is developed in the text *Potencjał opozycyjny ruchów społecznych. Wprowadzenie do dyskusji (Opposition potential of social movements. Introduction to discussion)*²⁰. There I elaborate on the analyses of topics present in previous publications. An example of this is the discussion of processes occurring in a broader, social environment of social movements, which are also responsible for the increase in importance of so-called non-institutional politics. Furthermore, I briefly review political issues present in the theory of social movements. In that sense, the discussion more fully presents social movements as political entities, and contentious politics as an expression of opposition activity.

As mentioned before, this area of my interest is in the phase of conceptualization. The texts that have been written on this topic mostly refer to the search of lasting relations between social movements, protests, and politics. The phenomenon of “contentious politics” seems to be of key importance in the search. So far, the discussion is basically theoretical, with no empirical examples. That is why I am planning to develop the issues in further texts and empirical studies. First, I would like to link the problem of social movements with political parties, following Bert Klandermans. Then, I wish to place both entities in the context of contemporary representative democracy, which is currently in crisis. In this sense, I can see a vital role of social movements in with overcoming that crisis. In other words, I intend to study the processes of social movements influencing the development of democracy.

¹⁹ G. Foryś, *Ruchy społeczne. Pomiędzy oporem i opozycją?* [in:] *Polityka i Społeczeństwo* no. 1(14), Wydawnictwo UR, Rzeszów 2016, pp. 47-56.

²⁰ G. Foryś, *Potencjał opozycyjny ruchów społecznych. Wprowadzenie do dyskusji* [in:] Krzysztof Łabędź (ed.) *Rola opozycji w systemach demokratycznych*. Wydawnictwo Ignatianum. Kraków 2016, pp. 23-42.

Finally, I want to mention two other publications that are not closely connected with my main areas of interest. One text is entitled *Dania (Denmark)*²¹ and refers to the dynamics of changes in Danish local authorities. The text is the effect of my short employment at the Institute of Territorial Governments and Local Communities (before, I worked at the Chair of Theory and Sociology of Politics, where I work now as well), resulting from structural transformations at my workplace. Although the text does not fit the subjects I deal with every day, its advantage is that it is one of few texts in Polish which analyze territorial authorities of Denmark. Therefore, it is often used by teachers of the Administration course in my Institute, and by scholars studying local authority systems.

The book *Politics, Society and Economy in Contemporary Poland. An Introduction*²², written together with Dominika Kasproicz and Dorota Murzyn, includes the characteristics of contemporary Poland in terms of politics, society and economy. It outlines the dominant tendencies of the last twenty-five years in each of the fields. We intended to prepare a publication in English that would fill the gap caused by the lack of a synthetic study of the key issues of political, social and economic change in Poland. The main intended recipients of the book are international scholars that look to basic information about Poland, as well as Erasmus students that study in Poland.

After the doctorate, I have prepared 15 publications, including 2 monographs in Polish, 1 anthology in English, 2 chapters (one in English), and 10 other texts. At the moment, 3 texts are in printing. H-index = 3, number citations 27 (Publish or Perish). I have taken part in 3 research grants – in two of them as an investigator, in one, as the principal investigator, as well as in a research project of the Agricultural Advisory Center in Brwinów as an expert preparing the research, research tools, and the report (*Potrzeby szkoleniowo-edukacyjne kwaterodawców wiejskich – raport z badań (Educational and training needs of rural hosts: a report)*). I have participated in 11 conferences (including 5 international conferences), 10 times presenting a paper.

6. Teaching and organisational activity

Teaching activity

I began my teaching activity in October 1999 at the Institute of Social Sciences of Pedagogical Academy of Kraków. Initially, I conducted classes in *Introduction to sociology*, *Sociology of social structures*, and *Methods of social research* (Politology). After obtaining the doctoral degree, I also began to give lectures in the following courses: *Introduction to sociology* (Politology), *Contemporary sociological problems* (Politology), *Methods of social research* (Politology, Administration), *General sociology* (Administration, Internal security), *Social communication* (Administration), and *Statistics with elements of demographics* (International relations). Apart from these, I have also introduced to the Institute's offer a course I have been conducting since 2006, *Analysis of social movements and collective*

²¹ G. Foryś, *Annales Academiae Paedagogicae Cracoviensis, Studia Politologica IV*, no. 72. Wydawnictwo UP Kraków, pp. 61-74.

²² D. Kasproicz, G. Foryś, D. Murzyn, *Politics, Society and the Economy in Contemporary Poland. An Introduction*. Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar. Warszawa 2016, 220 pages.

activities (Politology). Moreover, I have an opportunity to conduct my original optional courses, such as: *Institutions and organizations of a civic society* (Politology, Administration), *Sociology of unemployment* (Administration), and *Sociology of labor* (Social economy). In the next semester, I am going to conduct an original optional course, *Contemporary Polish society* (Administration). Besides, I treat in a special way the classes I conduct at post-graduate courses (*Contemporary sociological problems*) and, first of all, classes for doctoral students conducted since 2007, *Methods and techniques of politological research*.

A separate kind of teaching activity is bachelor's seminars I have been conducting since 2007 at Politology and Administration. In the case of Politology, the subjects of the seminar involve issues such as: social movements in Poland and abroad, social protests, functioning of local communities, voting behaviors, social conflict, relations of the authority and the society at the local level, social change, and local elites. In the case of Administration, the seminars include: patterns of participation in public life of urban and rural residents, local civic society, sustainable development of local communities, human and social capital in local and regional development, the role of local authorities in reducing negative social phenomena in the time of social change. The seminars have resulted in supervising approximately 200 graduates. Besides, I have served as a reviewer for a similar number of bachelor's degree works and 53 master's degree works.

As part of teaching activity, in the years 2013-20, I organized and supervised the work of students carrying out intra-university research I had designed. It concerned, on the one hand, the characteristics of students beginning the study at Pedagogical University and their motivations and expectations connected with the studies, and on the other hand, evaluation of the quality of work of the teachers and administration staff. Nearly 3,600 persons took part in the research. My teaching and popularization activity also includes the translations of two texts on social movements (from English into Polish), published in collections of source texts: K. Gorlacz, Patrick H. Mooney *Dynamika życia społecznego. Współczesne koncepcje ruchów społecznych*. In 2015, my teaching activity was rewarded with a medal of the Commission of National Education.

Organizational activity

Since the beginning of work at the Pedagogical University, I have been participating in organizational activity of the Institute of Social Sciences, and later, Institute of Politology. The activity was largely the result of intensive development of the Institute, which in the 1990s only offered the course of Politology. Now it has six courses. Since 2001, I have been a member of the Council of the Institute, and in the years 2001-2008, I served as the minutes secretary. Since, 2012, I have also been the representative of non-independent researchers at the Council of the Faculty of Humanities of the University. Moreover, I have served as a tutor of several years of students. First, in the years 2001-2006, I was a tutor of full-time Politology students. In the years 2012-2015, I served this function for part-time Administration students, and now I am the tutor of 2nd cycle part-time Administration students. Meanwhile, I was also the tutor of more years of part-time Politology students studying at a branch of the Pedagogical University in Brzesko. In the years 2005-2008, there was one group of students, in the years 2008-2011, three groups, up to the end of the course in 2016. My responsibilities

included the preparation of annual schedules of classes and being an intermediary between the Dean's office and the students. In the years 2015-2016, I was the manager of the branch of the teaching center of the University in Brzesko.

Apart from these responsibilities, since 2003, I have been conducting annual evaluation of workers of the Institute of Politology, usually including 3-4 thousand questionnaires providing the basis for evaluation sheets of the employees. Therefore, I have been a member of the Institute team for evaluation and quality of education. That experience was also used by the University authorities in the years 2013-2015, when I prepared and implemented together with my students the above-mentioned research project concerning the motivations and expectations of Pedagogical University students and the evaluation of University employees. The work resulted in preparing two research reports (one of nearly 70 pages, and one of 20 pages), which I was able to present in front of the Senate of the University. Furthermore, I am the manager of a team for the promotion of the Institute. I have been working with the team since 2011. The activities as the manager involve annual preparation of promotional materials, contact with the media, and sending promotional materials to a set of recipients twice a year. Apart from that, we monitor the candidates for the course with a questionnaire.

I have also been active in organizing scientific conferences both before and after the doctorate. An example is the year 2010, when I was the co-organizer of the conference prepared by the Chair of Territorial Authorities and Local Communities of the Institute of Politology on territorial authorities in European countries, and 2013, with a conference prepared by the Institute of Politology as well, titled *Lider społeczny w XXI wieku (Asocial leader in the 21st century)*. I have been a co-organizer of one working group during the all-Polish Convention of Polish Sociological Association (PTS) in Gdańsk in 2016 (*Protesty społeczne w Polsce (Social protests in Poland)*). I have also had an opportunity to work as an expert preparing, implementing and analyzing part of the research carried out by the Agricultural Advisory Center in Brwinów, Kraków Branch, done at the request of the Marshal's Office in 2015, completed by the participation in a scientific seminar. Since 2014, I have worked as a statistical editor for journals: *Annales Universitatis Paedagogicae Cracoviensis. Studia Politologica* oraz *Rocznik Administracji Publicznej*. Moreover, since 2001, I have been a member of Polish Sociological Association (in the years, 2002-2003 a member of the management board of Section on Rural and Agriculture Sociology of PSA) and a member of the European Society for Rural Sociology.

In 2009, I received 3rd degree award of the Rector of Pedagogical University of Kraków for research activity, and in 2014, Rector's award for organizational activity.

