

Political Preferences

11/2015

Editors:

**Agnieszka Turska-Kawa
Waldemar Wojtasik**

Katowice 2015

Scientific Council:

prof. dr hab. Roman Bäcker (Nicolaus Copernicus University, Poland), prof. dr hab. Tadeusz Godlewski (Kazimierz Wielki University, Poland), prof. dr hab. Iwona Jakubowska-Branicka (University of Warsaw, Poland), prof. dr hab. Slavomir Magál (University of St. Cyril and Methodius, Slovakia), prof. dr hab. Jozef Matúš (University of St. Cyril and Methodius, Slovakia), prof. dr hab. Dusan Pavlu (Higher School of Hospitality Management, Czech Republic), prof. dr hab. Libor Pavera (Higher School of Hospitality Management, Czech Republic), dr hab. Dana Petranová (University of St. Cyril and Methodius, Slovakia), prof. dr hab. Olga Prokopenko (Sumski National University, Ukraine), prof. dr hab. Teresa Sasińska-Klas (Jagiellonian University, Poland), prof. dr hab. Jerzy Sielski (University of Szczecin, Poland), dr Marcjanna Augustyn (University of Hull, England), prof. Jana Galera Matúšová (University of St. Cyril and Methodius, Slovakia)

Editorial Board:

dr hab. Agnieszka Turska-Kawa (chief editor)
mgr Maciej Marmola (journal secretary)
dr hab. Robert Alberski (theme editor: systems and voting behavior)
dr hab. Danuta Plecka, prof. UMK (theme editor: political identification)
dr hab. Łukasz Tomczak (theme editor: political parties)
dr hab. Zbigniew Widera, prof. UE (theme editor: political marketing)
dr hab. Waldemar Wojtasik (theme editor: party systems)
mgr Przemysław Grzonka (statistical editor)

Reviewers: dr hab. Agnieszka Kasińska-Metryka, prof. UJK w Kielcach (The Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Poland), dr hab. Maciej Drzonek (Szczecin University, Poland), dr hab. Jacek Surzyn (University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland), dr hab. Hana Pravdová (University of St. Cyril and Methodius, Slovakia), dr hab. Ludmila Čábyová (University of St. Cyril and Methodius, Slovakia), dr Juliána Mináriková (University of St. Cyril and Methodius, Slovakia).

Language verification: Aleksandra Jędrzejec

Coverproject: Jarosław Wichura

Original version of journal: paper.

© Institute of Political Science and Journalism at the University of Silesia and the Center for Innovation, Technology Transfer and Development Foundation of the University of Silesia, Katowice 2015

Journal published by the Institute of Political Science and Journalism at the University of Silesia and the Center for Innovation, Technology Transfer and Development Foundation of the University of Silesia.

Patronage for the project is exercised by Electoral Research Committee - Polish Political Science Association.

ISSN: 2083-327X

Desktop Publishing, prepress and printing: REMAR, www.remar-sosnowiec.pl
e-mail: wydawnictwo@remar-sosnowiec.pl

All texts are licensed under the Creative Commons BY 4.0 (CC BY 4.0).

CONTENTS

Łukasz Tomczak (Szczecin University, Poland) Leaders of Polish Political Parties and Their Scope of Power in Party Structures.....	7
Mariusz Kolczyński (University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland) „Substitute Candidate” in Polish Campaign Practice	19
Beata Słobdzian (University of Gdansk, Poland) Political Parties and Their Role in Determining a Territorial Division of Poland	35
Waldemar Wojtasik (University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland) Political Parties’ Electoral Strategies in the Context of Political Uncertainty ...	51
Agnieszka Turska-Kawa (University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland) The Role of Trust in Political Corruption: Outline of the Subject.....	61
Agata Olszanecka-Marmola (University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland) Pro-systemic Voters Versus Anti-systemic Ones: Emotional Attitude to Candidates and the Influence of TV Political Advertising in the 2015 Presidential Election in Poland	77
Szymon Kołodziej (University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland) Party Switching as a Media Phenomenon in the Election Campaign.....	93
Robert Radek (University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland) Party Behavior and the Formation of Minority Governments – Experiences in Denmark	107
Małgorzata Myśliwiec (University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland) Spain’s Party System at Times of the Economical Crisis after 2008.....	125
Anna Sroka (Warsaw University, Poland) The Spanish Party System and the Issue of Assigning Responsibility	163

Dominik Szczepański (University of Rzeszow, Poland) Subcarpathian Voivodship on the Electoral Map of Poland (1989-2014) ...	173
Kinga Sulejman (University of Rzeszow, Poland) Election to Regional Assemblies Competition in the Light Party Election. Comparative Analysis	187
Review	
Knopek Jacek: <i>Stosunki polsko-zachodnioafrykańskie</i> (eng. <i>Relations between Poland and West Africa</i>), Adam Marszałek Publishing House, Torun 2013, pp. 546 (Reviewer: Anna Ratke-Majewska)	217
Summaries.....	223

Agata Olszanecka-Marmola

University of Silesia in Katowice, Poland

**PRO-SYSTEMIC VOTERS VERSUS ANTI-SYSTEMIC
ONES: EMOTIONAL ATTITUDE TO CANDIDATES
AND THE INFLUENCE OF TV POLITICAL
ADVERTISING IN THE 2015 PRESIDENTIAL
ELECTION IN POLAND**

Abstract:

Presented article is aimed at examining the emotional attitudes to candidates for the president of Poland among pro-systemic and anti-systemic voters in 2015 presidential election and showing the influence of campaign TV ads on these groups of Polish electorate. The research conducted by author reveals that anti-systemic electorate is less interested in politics and more likely to be influenced by electoral TV spots. The study also confirms the relation between emotional attitudes to political actors and political preferences. According to the results of experiment anti-systemic voters expressed more positive feelings towards candidates from out of the political mainstream, and the other way round, the pro-systemic electorate rather liked the candidates presented by parliamentary parties.

Key words:

political advertising, electoral TV ads, emotional attitude, feelings thermometer, 2015 presidential election in Poland, anti-systemic voters

Introduction

The result of the first round of 2015 presidential election was a great success of anti-systemic candidates¹. According to the late polls carried out by IPSOS, they had the greatest support from the youngest electorate group (18-29 years old). Paweł Kukiz was unbeatable in this age group, receiving more than 40% of the votes. Janusz Korwin-Mikke also had a good result [*Presidential election 2015 - 1st round*]. What was common for these two politicians was that they skilfully shaped their political images, mostly using mass media. The success of these candidates is also connected with the dramatically low level of trust of Polish electorate in political parties as institutions representing the society's interests [CBOS 68/2014] and widespread aversion to political parties [CBOS 99/2015]. It affects the rhetoric of electoral campaigns, including more and more anti-party messages. This tendency is becoming typical not only of Polish electoral campaigns. Anti-party rhetoric is currently a constant element of political discourse in consolidated democracy conditions [Poguntke, Scarrow 1996]. Citizens' negative attitude to politicians and political parties is also reflected in the general loss of trust in political institutions characteristic of the democratic system [Putnam, Pharr, Dalton 2000: 18-20].

The aim of this article is to present the emotional attitude to candidates for the president of Poland among pro-systemic and anti-systemic voters, and to show the influence of campaign TV spots on these groups of Polish electorate.

The role of emotions in voting behaviours

In recent years, there has been an increase in the role of political science research concerning the importance of emotions in politics. In studies concerning voting behaviours, it has been shown that the emotional attitude to political entities (both candidates and political parties) is a good predictor of voting decisions [Cwalina, Falkowski 2006: 75]. Candidates who are supported in elections are considered to have attractive personal qualities and are liked by the electorate members [Lott, Lott, Saris 1993: 96].

In Polish conditions, studies on the influence of TV spots on the perception of political actors were carried out among others by Wojciech Cwalina and Andrzej Falkowski during the electoral campaign before the 1995 presidential

1 From my point of view, anti-systemic candidates are those whose groupings did not receive any mandates in the 2011 parliamentary election: Paweł Kukiz, Janusz Korwin-Mikke, Marian Kowalski, Grzegorz Braun, Jacek Wilk and Paweł Tanajno. The anti-systemic character of these candidates was also manifest in the intensified negation of the existing party system, clearly seen during the electoral campaign and in the presented campaign TV spots.

election [Cwalina 2000: 97-137]. The results of their analysis show that emotional attitude is the first reaction to a politician and shapes that politician's image [Turska-Kawa 2012: 153]. Similar conclusions result from a study by Piotr Pawełczyk and Barbara Jankowiak [2013], concerning the role of emotions in voting for B. Komorowski and J. Kaczyński in the 2010 presidential election. The authors show that cognitive judgements regarding particular features of the candidate's political image (e.g. honesty or competence) have a much weaker influence on voting preferences than the emotions the person evokes. Emotional attitude is also a very important factor that shapes the perception of political entities by the voters who display a low level of interest in politics. As pointed out by Martin P. Wattenberg [1987: 58-59], more than one in three voters know nothing about particular political figures but still have strong feelings about them.

A study by Juliana Fernandes, concerning the impact of negative political advertising and repetitive messages on the evaluation of the candidate, also provides interesting conclusions. It shows that excessive exposure to negative messages results in a loss of positive feelings about the sender and reduces the possibility of voting for the person [Fernandes 2013: 281-283].

A study by Agata Olszanecka-Marmola concerning emotional attitude to political parties in the 2011 parliamentary election and the 2014 European Parliament election shows that young voters had a negative attitude to all the analysed groupings. However, watching campaign spots of those entities caused some changes in the participants' emotions. The changes were both positive and negative [Olszanecka 2012, 2014].

In all the above-mentioned studies, feelings thermometers (often also referred to as affect scales) were used to measure emotions associated with candidates and political parties [Turska-Kawa 2012:153]. This instrument was first used in 1964 in an American research project National Election Study in order to investigate citizens' emotional attitudes to certain social groups and figures from the world of politics [Wilcox, Sigelman, Cook 1989: 246]. Since then, it has been the basic instrument used to measure emotional attitude to political entities and to find out how it changes with time [Nelson 2008].

Methodology

The empirical study was carried out in May 2015, in the week preceding the first round of the presidential election. The study group included 507 students (311 women and 196 men) of six universities: University of Economics in Katowice, Medical University of Silesia in Katowice, University of Silesia in Katowice, Silesian University of Technology in Gliwice, University of Wrocław and University of Warsaw.

The experimental procedure of the study involved before-and-after measures [Kaid, Chanslor 1995]. The experiment had three phases. In the first of them, the participants anonymously filled in a study questionnaire (pre-test), including e.g. questions about interest in politics², political preferences, and emotional attitude to the candidates for the position of the head of state in this year's presidential election. The feelings thermometer was used as the study tool. It is the standard method used to measure emotional attitude to people, phenomena, or things [Pieńkowski, Podlaszewska 1991]. Feelings thermometers are particularly useful in studying changes of voters' emotional attitudes towards a candidate in a specific time frame, especially in the context of studying concrete political events [Mutz 2007: 82]. They may also be useful in the process of designing an experimental study, being an indicator which shows the influence of a stimulus on the experimental group.

In the study, the respondents evaluated emotional attitude to the candidates in a scale from 0 to 100 degrees. The scores of 0 to 50 degrees meant that the participant had negative feelings towards the candidate, 50 degrees indicated a neutral attitude, and values above 50 degrees showed the participant's positive feelings for the candidate. Then the participants were shown political TV spots, randomly selected from among the spots broadcast in nationwide campaign blocks. After watching the spots, the experiment participants again filled in the study questionnaire (post-test), this time including a question concerning their knowledge of the presented spots³ and feelings thermometers.

The following hypotheses were verified as part of the study:

H1: Anti-systemic voters declare greater interest in the sphere of politics than the pro-systemic electorate.

As pointed out by the researchers studying the subject, attitudes connected with a low level of trust in indirect democracy institutions and political parties should be more common among voters who are better educated, more interested in politics and more involved in the sphere of politics [Torcal, Gunther, Montero 2001: 6]. It is so because such voters are more aware of the negative aspects related to the functioning of parties and individual political actors, such as political scandals, nepotism or bribery [Dalton 1996].

H2: Pro-systemic voters display a more positive emotional attitude to pro-systemic candidates than do anti-systemic voters.

2 Interest in politics was measured in a 1-5 scale, where 1 meant that the respondent was not interested in politics at all, and 5 meant very high interest in the subject.

3 Knowledge of the electoral spots was measured in a 1-5 scale, where 1 meant that the respondent declared no knowledge at all, and 5 meant very good knowledge of the candidate's spots.

H3: Anti-systemic voters display a more positive emotional attitude to anti-systemic candidates than do pro-systemic voters.

The hypotheses result from the above-mentioned connection between emotional attitude to the candidate and voting preferences [Cwalina, Falkowski 2006: 75-76]. Those who vote for anti-systemic candidates should display more positive emotions not only regarding the politician they vote for but also to all the candidates who negate the existing configuration in party system. A similar regularity should also be observed in the case of pro-systemic electorate.


H4: Pro-systemic voters are more susceptible to a change of emotional attitude to candidates under the influence of political TV spots.

This assumption partly results from the first hypothesis mentioned above. If pro-systemic voters express lower interest in politics, they should also be more susceptible to the influence of campaign spots. The relation between lower interest in politics and susceptibility to TV spots has been observed in previous empirical studies [Kaid, Postelnicu, Landreville, Yun, LeGrange 2007: 1139].

Study results

The group of voters supporting P. Kukiz was the most numerous in the study sample (Chart 1). The subsequent positions regarding the level of support were taken by: B. Komorowski, A. Duda and J. Korwin-Mikke. Support for the other candidates was negligible. These results reflect the voting preferences occurring in this voter group [*Presidential election - 1st round*]. There were 148 pro-systemic voters (29.2%) and 192 voters who supported anti-systemic candidates (37.9%). More than one fifth of the participants were not able to say which candidate they would vote for, and one eighth were not going to vote at all.

Chart 1. Distribution of voting preferences in the study sample



In the study sample, interest in politics was above the average. Contrary to hypothesis H1, it was pro-systemic voters who declared greater interest in politics. It may be the result of characteristics of voters supporting Paweł Kukiz, who attracted the greatest number of voters absent from the 2010 presidential election and the 2011 parliamentary election [Presidential election 2015 - 1st round]. A large part of this group must have been citizens with low interest in politics, only motivated to vote by Kukiz’s skilful positioning on the political scene.

Table 1. Significance of differences in the level of interest in politics between pro-systemic and anti-systemic voters (t-Student test).

group of voters	N	mean	SD	t	df	p-value (two-tailed)
pro-systemic voters	148	3.57	1.089	2.327	338	0.21
anti-systemic voters	192	3.30	1.044			

$p \leq 0,05$; n.s. = non-significant

Further, knowledge of the presented campaign spots in the pro-systemic and anti-systemic electorate was analysed. The analysis clearly shows that before the study the pro-systemic electorate better knew the spots of A. Duda, A. Jarubas, B. Komorowski, M. Ogórek and J. Palikot, who were the candidates supported by parliamentary groupings, and the other way round, anti-systemic voters were more familiar with the electoral spots of “their” candidates (Table 2). In the case of G. Braun, M. Kowalski, M. Ogórek and P. Tanajno, the differences were not statistically significant.

The fact that the spots of B. Komorowski were most known for both kinds of electorate is not surprising. First of all, he was the current president, and second, he had the greatest expenditure for the broadcasting of paid TV spots⁴.

Table 2. Significance of differences in knowledge of spots of the analysed candidates between pro-systemic and anti-systemic electorate (t-Student test).

		knowledge of TV spots					
		N	mean	SD	t	df	p-value (two-tailed)
Grzegorz Braun	pro-systemic voters	148	1.94	1.230	-1.145	338	n.s.
	anti-systemic voters	192	2.14	1.295			
Andrzej Duda	pro-systemic voters	148	3.28	1.244	4.133	338	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	2.73	1.166			
Adam Jarubas	pro-systemic voters	148	2.05	1.157	2.952	338	0.003
	anti-systemic voters	192	1.71	0.959			
Bronisław Komorowski	pro-systemic voters	148	3.40	1.292	2.839	303.004	0.005
	anti-systemic voters	192	3.01	1.193			
Janusz Korwin-Mikke	pro-systemic voters	148	2.20	1.123	-5.862	336.226	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	2.98	1.356			
Marian Kowalski	pro-systemic voters	148	1.68	1.190	-1.645	338	n.s.
	anti-systemic voters	192	1.90	1.235			
Paweł Kukiz	pro-systemic voters	148	2.30	1.153	-3.816	338	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	2.82	1.288			
Magdalena Ogórek	pro-systemic voters	148	2.39	1.307	0.666	290.274	n.s.
	anti-systemic voters	192	2.30	1.127			
Janusz Palikot	pro-systemic voters	148	2.28	1.178	2.146	338	0.033
	anti-systemic voters	192	2.02	1.114			
Paweł Tanajno	pro-systemic voters	148	1.40	0.917	-0.693	338	n.s.
	anti-systemic voters	192	1.47	0.932			
Jacek Wilk	pro-systemic voters	148	1.41	0.933	-2.032	324.654	0.043
	anti-systemic voters	192	1.63	0.989			

p≤0,05; n.s. = non-significant

Hypotheses H2 and H3, saying that anti-systemic voters valued more highly the candidates from out of the political mainstream and pro-systemic ones preferred the candidates of groupings which had their representatives in

4 Bronisław Komorowski spent PLN 5.43 million for broadcasting of TV advertising. Komorowski's campaign headquarters especially invested in spots in nationwide TV stations (TVN, TVP and Polsat) in prime time. For comparison, broadcasting of Andrzej Duda's spots cost PLN 4,815 million, those of Janusz Korwin-Mikke, PLN 94 thousand, and Paweł Kukiz did broadcast his spots only in free time on public TV [*National Electoral Commission announcement of 3rd September 2015*].

the parliament, were confirmed (Table 3). Except in the case of M. Ogórek, the differences were statistically significant. Interestingly, none of the candidates scored above the neutral value. This referred to pro-systemic and anti-systemic voters alike. The declared emotional attitude to B. Komorowski is interesting. Among the anti-systemic electorate, he evokes the most negative feelings out of all the candidates, but he had the highest score (neutral attitude) among the voters who supported pro-systemic candidates. The most extreme emotions occur in the case of P. Kukiz: from very warm feelings in the case of anti-systemic electorate (74.74) up to negative ones among pro-systemic voters (43.38). A similar tendency is observable in the case of J. Korwin-Mikke.

Table 3. Significance of differences in pre-test attitudes to the analysed candidates between pro-systemic and anti-systemic electorate (t-Student test).

		Attitudes to the analysed candidates in pre-test					
		N	mean	SD	t	df	p-value (two-tailed)
Grzegorz Braun	pro-systemic voters	148	35.95	24.351	-4.903	315.026	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	48.96	24.150			
Andrzej Duda	pro-systemic voters	148	46.15	36.131	2.543	243.082	0.012
	anti-systemic voters	192	37.40	24.096			
Adam Jarubas	pro-systemic voters	148	42.16	18.719	2.011	338	0.045
	anti-systemic voters	192	38.02	18.903			
Bronisław Komorowski	pro-systemic voters	148	51.69	32.896	9.543	252.426	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	21.35	23.160			
Janusz Korwin-Mikke	pro-systemic voters	148	25.74	24.633	-10.718	338	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	58.39	30.061			
Marian Kowalski	pro-systemic voters	148	34.59	25.405	-4.542	307.369	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	46.93	24.051			
Paweł Kukiz	pro-systemic voters	148	43.38	23.749	-13.247	271.642	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	74.74	18.559			
Magdalena Ogórek	pro-systemic voters	148	39.73	25.474	.321	338	n.s.
	anti-systemic voters	192	38.85	24.511			
Janusz Palikot	pro-systemic voters	148	33.51	25.684	2.207	338	0.028
	anti-systemic voters	192	27.71	22.697			
Paweł Tanajno	pro-systemic voters	148	36.22	21.073	-1.983	306.902	0.048
	anti-systemic voters	192	40.68	19.987			
Jacek Wilk	pro-systemic voters	148	41.08	19.902	-3.245	320.268	0.001
	anti-systemic voters	192	48.23	20.440			

p≤0,05; n.s. = non-significant

The analysis of the post-test leads to similar conclusions. In this case, anti-systemic voters also express greater liking for candidates other than those from parliamentary parties, and pro-systemic voters, for candidates from groupings present in the parliament. But this time, apart from M. Ogórek, differences in emotional attitude towards A. Duda, J. Palikot and P. Tanajno are not statistically significant.

Table 4. Significance of differences in post-test attitudes to the analysed candidates between pro-systemic and anti-systemic electorate.

		Attitudes to the analysed candidates in post-test					
		N	mean	SD	t	df	p-value (two-tailed)
Grzegorz Braun	pro-systemic voters	148	27.36	27.513	-5.744	338	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	45.00	28.487			
Andrzej Duda	pro-systemic voters	148	44.93	36.074	1.546	253.900	n.s.
	anti-systemic voters	192	39.53	25.609			
Adam Jarubas	pro-systemic voters	148	37.43	20.870	2.236	338	0.026
	anti-systemic voters	192	32.50	19.603			
Bronisław Komorowski	pro-systemic voters	148	51.08	32.974	8.964	246.921	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	22.76	22.493			
Janusz Korwin-Mikke	pro-systemic voters	148	27.43	25.047	-11,690	338	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	61.82	28.234			
Marian Kowalski	pro-systemic voters	148	27.70	24.965	-4.548	338	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	40.89	27.624			
Paweł Kukiz	pro-systemic voters	148	44.05	23.498	-12.152	287.500	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	73.33	19.956			
Magdalena Ogórek	pro-systemic voters	148	38.72	24.167	-0.213	338	n.s.
	anti-systemic voters	192	39.27	23.547			
Janusz Palikot	pro-systemic voters	148	32.97	24.674	1.267	338	n.s.
	anti-systemic voters	192	29.64	23.611			
Paweł Tanajno	pro-systemic voters	148	30.34	21.299	-1.827	338	n.s.
	anti-systemic voters	192	34.69	22.111			
Jacek Wilk	pro-systemic voters	148	34.26	21.825	-4.306	338	0.000
	anti-systemic voters	192	45.00	23.536			

$p \leq 0,05$; n.s. = non-significant

The comparison of pre-test and post-test results showed that the members of pro-systemic electorate are slightly more affected by TV campaign spots (Tables 5 and 6). In both groups, statistically significant differences were only observed in the case of G. Braun, A. Jarubas, M. Kowalski, P. Tanajno and J. Wilk. In the post-test, each of them had a much lower score on the feelings

thermometer. This might have resulted from the fact that many participants did not know these candidates and therefore chose the neutral 50 degrees in the pre-test. In the case of anti-systemic voters, one more candidate had a statistically significant result. It was J. Korwin-Mikke, whose perception improved by more than 3 degrees after watching the spots.

These findings prove false hypothesis H4, which assumed that pro-systemic voters would be more willing to change their emotional attitudes after the presentation of the spots. Hypothesis H1 was refuted too, yet the relation observed in previous empirical studies was confirmed: the electorate with lower interest in politics proved to be more susceptible to the influence of TV political advertising.

Table 5. Significance of differences in attitudes to the analysed candidates in the segment of pro-systemic voters (t-Student test).

		Attitudes to the analysed candidates in the segment of pro-systemic voters					
		N	mean	SD	t	df	p-value (two-tailed)
Grzegorz Braun	pre-test	148	35.95	24.351	4.818	147	0.000
	post-test	148	27.36	27.513			
Andrzej Duda	pre-test	148	46.15	36.131	1.289	147	n.s.
	post-test	148	44.93	36.074			
Adam Jarubas	pre-test	148	42.16	18.719	3.529	147	0.001
	post-test	148	37.43	20.870			
Bronisław Komorowski	pre-test	148	51.69	32.896	0.640	147	n.s.
	post-test	148	51.08	32.974			
Janusz Korwin-Mikke	pre-test	148	25.74	24.663	-1.174	147	n.s.
	post-test	148	27.43	25.047			
Marian Kowalski	pre-test	148	34.59	25.405	4.151	147	0.000
	post-test	148	27.70	24.965			
Paweł Kukiz	pre-test	148	43.38	23.749	-0.524	147	n.s.
	post-test	148	44.05	23.498			
Magdalena Ogórek	pre-test	148	39.73	25.474	0.726	147	n.s.
	post-test	148	38.72	24.167			
Janusz Palikot	pre-test	148	33.51	25.684	0.452	147	n.s.
	post-test	148	32.97	24.674			
Paweł Tanajno	pre-test	148	36.22	21.073	3.818	147	0.000
	post-test	148	30.34	21.299			
Jacek Wilk	pre-test	148	41.08	19.902	4.547	147	0.000
	post-test	148	34.26	21.825			

p≤0,05; n.s. = non-significant

Table 6. Significance of differences in attitudes to the analysed candidates in the segment of anti-systemic voters (t-Student test).

		Attitudes to the analysed candidates in the segment of anti-systemic voters					
		N	mean	SD	t	df	p-value (two-tailed)
Grzegorz Braun	pre-test	192	48.96	24.150	2.873	191	0.005
	post-test	192	45.00	28.487			
Andrzej Duda	pre-test	192	37.40	24.096	-1.750	191	n.s.
	post-test	192	39.53	25.609			
Adam Jarubas	pre-test	192	38.02	18.903	4.161	191	0.000
	post-test	192	32.50	19.603			
Bronisław Komorowski	pre-test	192	21.35	23.160	-1.358	191	n.s.
	post-test	192	22.76	22.493			
Janusz Korwin-Mikke	pre-test	192	58.39	30.061	-3.473	191	0.001
	post-test	192	61.82	28.234			
Marian Kowalski	pre-test	192	46.93	24.051	4.055	191	0.000
	post-test	192	40.89	27.624			
Paweł Kukiz	pre-test	192	74.74	18.559	1.803	191	n.s.
	post-test	192	73.33	19.956			
Magdalena Ogórek	pre-test	192	38.85	24.511	-0.326	191	n.s.
	post-test	192	39.27	23.547			
Janusz Palikot	pre-test	192	27.71	22.697	-1.702	191	n.s.
	post-test	192	29.64	23.611			
Paweł Tanajno	pre-test	192	40.68	19.897	4.722	191	0.000
	post-test	192	34.69	22.111			
Jacek Wilk	pre-test	192	48.23	20.440	2.642	191	0.009
	post-test	192	45.00	23.536			

$p \leq 0,05$; n.s. = non-significant

The last element of the analysis was to check the differences in emotional attitudes of the anti-systemic electorate towards the candidates who ran in the second round of the election. As already mentioned the level of liking in this group of voters might have affected their preferences and thus determine the result of fight for the office of president of the Republic of Poland.

The results of the study show that the anti-systemic electorate had warmer feelings towards A. Duda. The difference on the feelings thermometer between the candidate from Prawo i Sprawiedliwość (Law and Justice) and B. Komorowski was 16-17 degrees. This was not, however, caused by the high score achieved by A. Duda, but by great aversion to B. Komorowski, whose mean score was around 20 degrees (Table 7).

Table 7. Significance of differences in attitudes to Andrzej Duda and Bronisław Komorowski in the anti-systemic electorate (t-Student test).

		Attitudes to the analysed candidates in the segment of anti-systemic voters					
		N	mean	SD	t	df	p-value (two-tailed)
pre-test	A. Duda	192	37.40	24.096	6.353	191	0.000
	B. Komorowski	192	21.35	23.160			
post-test	A. Duda	192	39.53	25.609	6.343	191	0.000
	B. Komorowski	192	22.76	22.493			

$p \leq 0,05$; n.s. = non-significant

As for Paweł Kukiz's electorate, both main candidates for the presidential office evoked ambivalent emotions. Still, it is clear that the attitude to A. Duda, both in pre-test and the post-test, approximated the neutral level, while B. Komorowski achieved only a little above 20 degrees on the feelings thermometers, both before and after watching the spots.

Table 8. Significance of differences in attitudes to Andrzej Duda and Bronisław Komorowski in Paweł Kukiz's electorate (t-Student test).

		Attitudes to the analysed candidates in Paweł Kukiz's electorate					
		N	mean	SD	t	df	p-value (two-tailed)
pre-test	A. Duda	118	39.41	23.976	4.745	117	0.000
	B. Komorowski	118	23.81	23.312			
post-test	A. Duda	118	40.59	25.261	4.603	117	0.000
	B. Komorowski	118	24.83	22.748			

$p \leq 0,05$; n.s. = non-significant

The results achieved by those voting for J. Korwin-Mikke were similar. They also had a more positive view of A. Duda, both before and after the exposure to electoral spots. Both candidates evoke more negative feelings in the voters supporting the leader of KORWiN party than in those who chose P. Kukiz.

Table 9. Significance of differences in attitudes to Andrzej Duda and Bronisław Komorowski in Janusz Korwin-Mikke's electorate (t-Student test).

		Attitudes to the analysed candidates in Janusz Korwin-Mikke's electorate					
		N	mean	SD	t	df	p-value (two-tailed)
pre-test	A. Duda	55	31.27	23.018	2.779	54	0.007
	B. Komorowski	55	18.55	22.642			
post-test	A. Duda	55	33.27	24.423	2.592	54	0.012
	B. Komorowski	55	21.27	22.032			

$p \leq 0,05$; n.s. = non-significant

The above tables prove that the electorate of anti-systemic candidates had much more positive emotions towards A. Duda, which undoubtedly contributed to his winning the second round of the election and assuming the office of president. This is also confirmed by another study, indicating that a transfer of electorate from P. Kukiz to A. Duda occurred in the second round [CBOS 97/2015].

Conclusions

The current study to a great extent confirmed the relations observed in the analyses concerning emotional attitudes to political entities and the impact of TV campaign advertising on the feelings of the electorate towards those individuals. First, anti-systemic voters expressed more positive feelings towards candidates from out of the political mainstream, and the other way round, the pro-systemic electorate rather liked the candidates presented by parliamentary parties. This is confirmed by conclusions from other studies, showing a general relation between the emotional attitudes to politicians and voting preferences. Second, the analysis confirmed the fact that the voters with lower interest in the sphere of politics are more likely to be influenced by electoral TV spots. In this case, however, the difference between them and the more involved electorate was not so great. On the other hand, the hypothesis concerning the level of interest in politics among pro-systemic and anti-systemic voters was not confirmed. In the study sample, anti-systemic electorate proved to be less interested in politics. This was the result of the specific political situation and positioning of P. Kukiz, who – using slogans stressing the need to change the system – motivated for voting the people who were normally not interested in active participation in elections, usually having lower interest in politics.

Interesting conclusions also result from the analysis of emotional attitudes of anti-systemic voters to the candidates participating in the second round of the presidential election. It shows that one reason for the victory of A. Duda was the deep aversion to the current president, B. Komorowski, which – as proved by post-election analyses of electorate flow – often led to anti-systemic voters supporting the candidate of PiS (Law and Justice).

References:

- CBOS 68/2014, *Stosunek do instytucji państwa oraz partii politycznych po 25 latach*, Komunikat z Badań nr 68/2014, Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej, Warszawa.
- CBOS 97/2015, *Przepływy elektoratów i strategie wyborcze w wyborach prezydenckich*, Komunikat z Badań nr 97/2015, Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej, Warszawa.
- CBOS 99/2015, *Sympatia i niechęć do partii i inicjatyw politycznych*, Komunikat z Badań nr 99/2015, Centrum Badania Opinii Społecznej, Warszawa.
- Cwalina W. (2000), *Telewizyjna reklama polityczna: emocje i poznanie w kształtowaniu preferencji wyborczych*, Lublin: Wyd. Naukowe KUL.
- Cwalina W., Falkowski A. (2006), *Marketing polityczny – perspektywa psychologiczna*, Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Dalton R. J. (1996), *Partisanship and Voting*, [in:] R. J. Dalton (ed.), *Citizen Politics: Public Opinion and Political Parties in Advanced Western Democracies*, Chatham, NJ: Chatham House.
- Fernandes J. (2013), *Effects of Negative Political Advertising and Message Repetition on Candidate Evaluation*, „Mass Communication and Society”, vol. 16.
- Kaid L. L., Chanslor M. (1995), *Changing candidate images: The effects of political advertising*, [in:] K. L. Hacker (ed.), *Candidate images in presidential election*, Westport: Praeger.
- Kaid L. L., Postelnicu M., Landreville K., Yun H. J., LeGrange A. G. (2007), *The Effects of Political Advertising on Young Voters*, „American Behavioral Scientist”, vol. 9.
- Lott B., Lott A., Saris R. (1993), *Voter preference and behavior in the presidential election of 1988*, „Journal of Psychology”, vol. 127 (1).
- Mutz D. C. (2007), *Political psychology and choice*, [in:] R. J. Dalton, H. D. Klingemann (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- National Electoral Commission announcement of 3rd September 2015* - Komunikat Państwowej Komisji Wyborczej z dnia 3 września 2015 r. w sprawie sprawozdań finansowych komitetów wyborczych uczestniczących w wyborach Prezydenta RP, przeprowadzonych w dniach 10 maja 2015 r. i 24 maja 2015 r., <http://pkw.gov.pl/wybory-prezydenta-rp-2015/komunikat-panstwowej-komisji-wyborczej-z-dnia-3-wrzesnia-2015.html> (25.09.2015).
- Nelson S. C. (2008), *Feeling thermometer*, [in:] P. Lavrakas (ed.), *Encyclopedia of survey research methods*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Olszanecka A. (2012), *Rola telewizyjnych reklam wyborczych w procesie postrzegania partii politycznych przez młodych ludzi*, [in:] A. Turska – Kawa (ed.), *Polityka w opinii młodych. Idee-Instytucje-Obywatele*, Katowice: REMAR.
- Olszanecka A. (2014), *Wpływ telewizyjnych reklam wyborczych z kampanii wyborczej do PE 2014 na postrzeganie partii politycznych*, [in:] A. Olszanecka (ed.), *Polityka-Media-Relacje interpersonalne. Małe formy eksperymentalne z zakresu komunikowania*, Katowice: REMAR.
- Pawelczyk P., Jankowiak B. (2013), *Cechy wizerunku politycznego a emocje w głosowaniu na Bronisława Komorowskiego i Jarosława Kaczyńskiego w wyborach prezydenckich w 2010 roku. Raport z badań postaw politycznych studentów*, „Przegląd Politologiczny”, nr 2.
-

- Pieńkowski R., Podlaszewska K. (1991), *Raporty z Sopotu*, [in:] M. Grabowska, I. Krzemiński (eds.), *Bitwa o Belweder*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Myśl.
- Poguntke T., Scarrow S. E. (1996), *The Politics of Anti-Party Sentiment: Introduction*, „European Journal of Political Research”, vol. 29.
- Presidential election 2015 - 1st round* Wybory prezydenckie 2015 – I tura, <http://www.tvn24.pl/wybory-prezydenckie-2015,117,m> (20.09.2015).
- Putnam R. D., Pharr S. J., Dalton R. J. (2000), *Introduction: What's Troubling the Trilateral Democracies?*, [in:] S. J. Pharr, R. D. Putnam, *Disaffected Democracies: What's Troubling the Trilateral Democracies?*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Torcal M., Gunther R., Montero J. R. (2001), *Anti-party sentiments in Southern Europe*, Working Paper 2001/170, Madryt: Instituto Juan March de Estudios e Investigaciones, Centro de Estudios Avanzados en Ciencias Sociales.
- Turska-Kawa A. (2012) *Emocjonalny odbiór kampanii wyborczych w poszczególnych elektoratach w wyborach parlamentarnych 2011*, [in:] A. Turska-Kawa, W. Wojtasik (eds.), *Wybory parlamentarne 2011*, Katowice: REMAR.
- Wattenberg M. P. (1987), *The hollow realignment: Partisan change in a candidate-centered era*, „Public Opinion Quarterly”, vol. 51.
- Wilcox C., Sigelman L., Cook E. (1989), *Some like it hot: Individual differences in responses to group feeling thermometers*, „Public Opinion Quarterly”, vol. 53 (2).

