„Political Preferences", No. 13/2016 DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.4284665

**Dominik Szczepański**
University of Rzeszow, Poland

# SUBCARPATHIA IN THE PERSPECTIVE OF PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS IN 2015

## *Abstract:*

Subcarpathian voivodeship that was formed in 1999 as a result of the administrative reform preserved voting traditions from all former voivodeships that comprise the current territorial unit of the country. It is noteworthy that the most important factors that significantly influenced electoral preferences of the Subcarpathia voivodeship were dominating electoral habits after 1989; electoral system elements, selected socio-economic indicators, as well as historical and religious determinants. The abovementioned factors are also supported by the positively verified partitions hypothesis, according to which it is assumed that in each partition area different patterns of political culture as well as various dominating political and ideological orientations were formed. This process was determined by policies of partitioning powers towards Polish citizens in the annexed areas, as well as the character and way of organising state by the partitioning powers, the level of their economic and cultural development. It is by means of following tradition that the above patterns are passed from generation to generation, which firstly confirms its timelessness, and secondly finds its reflection in election results in Subcarpathia.

## *Key words:*

elections behaviour, parliamentary elections, electoral, Poland, Subcarpathian Voivodeship

## *Introduction*

Participation of the citizens of the Subcarpathia voivodeship in elections, regardless of national or European level ones, were characterised by phenomenon absent from elections organized within the remit of the whole country. The factors that distinguished Subcarpathia on the electoral map of Poland were and still are consistent electoral behaviours[1] towards preferred parties and committees, as well as relatively high level of participation in the elections. Due to this specificity, one can develop a series of various interpretations and formulate different theses concerning the reasons for the existence of such differences that distinguish Subcarpathia from the rest of the country, thus try to find a key to the understanding of the electoral specificity of this voivodeship (Szczepański 2015: 173-186; 2015a: 177-194).

The reference points that determine the distinctiveness of Subcarpathia are such factors as history, geographical structure with domination of rural areas over urban areas, social and professional structure, dominating electoral preferences, and thus, certain tradition of taking part in elections, local culture or level of religious devotion. Except for that, the conviction about collaborative settlement of particular territory also played a vital role. It is noteworthy to remind that Polish voivodeships are relatively young as they were established in the result of the administrative reform in January 1999 and their names and borders were artificial when considering history and geography, as well as internally heterogeneous in social perspective. They, however, comprised political units. They had their own institutions and local power institutions as well as elaborated structures of political parties. As indicated by Przemysław Maj, „in case of some elections their borders overlapped with the area of electoral districts" (2015: 12).

A direct consequence of the 1999 administrative reform was that it influenced the process of modelling electoral behaviour at the voivodeship level, the selection of voivodeship political representation. In the case of Podkarpacie (that was formed by joining the former Rzeszowskie, Przemyskie and Krośnieńskie voivodeships, as well as parts of Tarnobrzeskie and Tarnowskie voivodeships) the electoral behaviour had been forming well since the times of Galicia (Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria that existed in years 1772-1918), during the Second Polish Republic, People's Republic of Poland, as well as Third Polish Republic. Considering the above determinants one may speak about relative sense of citizens belonging to a particular area, which in case of other voivodeships was not so obvious.

1 The term electoral behaviour should be understood, as stated by Jacek Raciborski, „the totality of citizens behaviours that are manifested with regards to the electoral process" (Raciborski 1997:11).

The aim of the following discussion was to present Subcarpathia in the perspective of Polish parliamentary elections in 2015, with special attention paid to the political situation in Poland and the Subcarpathian voivodeship before the elections, the course of the election campaign, as well as the results and their influence on the party system.

## *The general political situation in the country and in Subcarpathia before the parliamentary elections in 2015*

Before the parliamentary elections in 2015 the Polish political scene was distinguished by several areas of activity. Firstly, by the re-entering into governmental coalition, after the elections to the Sejm and the Senate of the Polish Republic in 2011, of the Civic Platform (PO) and Polish People's Party (PSL). Donald Tusk, PO party leader became the head of the government for the second time. He held this office until 9 September 2014, when he resigned, which happened because he was approved to the post of the President of European Council for a two and a half year term. He took up his post 1 December 2014.

Secondly, the President of the Polish republic Bronisław Komorowski assigned Ewa Kopacz to the post of the Prime Minister, giving her the task of forming a new government. Formally it happened 1 October 2014, when the Sejm granted the new Cabinet Committee a vote of confidence.

Thirdly, the parliamentary elections that took place in October 2015 finished a two year period of elections during which elections to the European Parliament and municipal elections in 2014 as well as presidential elections in 2015 took place. In case of European elections PO won, winning 32.13% of votes. It was however, a virtual victory, because the competing PiS party, despite gaining 31.78% of votes, introduced exactly the same number of MPs to the European Parliament as PO, that is 19. In the third place came the Democratic Left Allience (SLD) with Labour Party (UP) gaining 9.44% of votes and 5 mandates. The result gained by Janusz Korwin-Mikke New Right turned out to be a surprise as they brought 4 representatives of the party to the Parliament in Brussels. The same number of candidates became Members of European Parliament on behalf of PSL (Szczepański 2014: 106-107). On the other hand, in municipal elections in 2014, PO won only in regional councils, whereas in powiat (county) and gmina (municipality) councils PiS and PSL won decisively. In the fourth place, as indicated in table 1, came the committee of SLD and Together party.

The abovementioned elections in 2014 revealed almost complete marginalization of Your Movement (TR), founded on the fundament of Palikot's Movement, who introduced as much as 40 MPs to the Sejm in 2011.

Due to election to the European Parliament the party founded a committee called Europe Plus Your Movement and gained only 3,58% of votes, whereas in municipal elections TR got 1% nationwide. These results showed not only the lack of social trust towards the political initiative of Janusz Palikot, but also contributed to partial marginalization of the whole group.

In presidential elections, on the other hand, 25 committees declared willingness to run for the highest office in the state, but national Election Commission (PWK) registered only 11 of them. The formal requirement was to deliver 100 000 signatures supporting a given candidacy. Eventually, the candidates were: Grzegorz Braun (non-partisan), Andrzej Duda (PiS), Adam Jarubas (PSL), Bronisław Komorowski (PO), Janusz Korwin Mikke (Congress of the New Right – called hereafter KNP), Marian Kowalski (National Movement - RN), Paweł Kukiz (non-partisan), Magdalena Ogórek (SLD), Paweł Tanajno (Direct Democracy) and Jacek Wilk (KNP).

Table 1. Results of municipal elections in 2014

| Name of the party/ committee | Voivodeship councils | Powiat councils | Gmina councils |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of mandates | | |
| PO | 179 | 747 | 490 |
| PiS | 171 | 1517 | 549 |
| PSL | 157 | 1701 | 16 |
| SLD Left Together | 27 | 234 | 127 |

Source: own compilation on the basis of data from PWK (National Electoral Commission), the PKW webpage, http://pkw.gov.pl (4.07.2016).

The main axis of political competition was revolving around three candidates, i.e. Komorowski, Duda and Kukiz (who was called by the media a „dark horse" of the election). Finally, in the second stage of presidential elections the candidate of PiS won, defeating his rival by 518 316 votes (3.1%). Detailed information was juxtaposed in table 2.

Fourthly, restructuring of the Polish political scene, that occurred at the turn of April and May 2015 were connected with political and civil initiatives. In the first of the abovementioned areas we were dealing with the creation of two new political parties, a left-wing Together Party (an alternative and competition for SLD and TR) and liberal Modern party of Ryszard Petru (that was appealing to PO voters). In the second area, the whole concept of Kukiz'15 civil movement was formalized. In parliamentary elections in 2015 he registered an electoral committee under the same name. Foundation of the abovementioned entities contributed significantly to the change of the extreme preferences, including electoral behaviour of citizens.

In case of the Subcarpathian voivodeship it should be mentioned that the local political scene was dominated by PiS, which in municipal elections in 2014 introduced as many as 14 representatives to the Voivodeship council. Władysław Ortyl (PiS) became the voivodeship marshal, and Bogdan Romaniuk (Right Wing of the Republic – PRz) and Maria Kurowska (Zbigniew Ziobro United Poland – SPZZ) became vice-marshals, and Stanisław Kruczek (Jarosław Gowin Poland Together Party – PRJG) and Lucjan Kuźniar (PiS) became board members. Nine councillors from PSL and five councillors from PO as well as Lidia Błądek (independent candidate) formed the opposition. The elections however, could not end the monopoly of power in the capital of Subcarpathia, that is Rzeszów, where since 2002 until now the post of the city mayor is run by Tadeusz Ferenc, a politician affiliated with SLD. Additionally, in the 25-person Rzeszów city council mandates were gained by 11 councillors from the Committee for the Development of Rzeszów, 10 councillors from PiS and 4 from PO.

Table 2. The results of presidential elections in Poland in 2015

| No. | Candidate for the post of the President of Polish Republic | I round of voting - 10 V 2015 | | II round of voting - 24 V 2015 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number of votes | Number of votes in % | Number of votes | Number of votes in % |
| 1 | Andrzej Duda | 5 179 092 | 34.76 | 8 630 627 | 51.55 |
| 2 | Bronisław Komorowski | 5 031 060 | 33.77 | 8 112 311 | 48.45 |
| 3 | Paweł Kukiz | 3 099 079 | 20.80 | | |
| 4 | Janusz Korwin-Mikke | 486 084 | 3.26 | | |
| 5 | Magdalena Ogórek | 353 883 | 2.38 | | |
| 6 | Adam Jarubas | 238 761 | 1.60 | | |
| 7 | Janusz Palikot | 211 242 | 1.42 | | |
| 8 | Grzegorz Braun | 124 132 | 0.83 | | |
| 9 | Marian Kowalski | 77 630 | 0.52 | | |
| 10 | Paweł Tanajno | 68 186 | 0.46 | | |
| 11 | Jacek Wilk | 29 785 | 0.20 | | |

Source: own compilation on the basis of data from PWK (National Electoral Commission), the PKW webpage, http://pkw.gov.pl (4.07.2016).

The rise of the position of PiS in the Subcarpathian voivodeship was also reinforced by two electoral results: the first one from the by-elections to the Senate in 2013, in which Zdzisław Pupa got a mandate (Szczepański 2014: 45) and the second result obtained in the elections to the European Parliament in 2014, in which Tomasz Poręba and Stanisław Ożóg got mandates and Elżbieta Łukacijewska on behalf of the Civic Platform. Getting 3 mandates

in Subcarpathia in the election to the EP was due to high turnout in relation to other voivodeships (23.99%), as well as record level of support given to PiS, which was the highest in the whole country. Higher turnout was only registered in Masovian - 28.03%, Lesser Poland – 27.59% and Pomeranian - 26.70% voivodeships.

Concentration of right-wing electorate votes in the Subcarpathian voivodeship happened also during presidential elections. In the first round of voting the candidate of PiS got 50.09% of votes, while his competitors less than half of that (B. Komorowski – 20.42%, P. Kukiz – 20.02%), and in the second round of voting A. Duda outclassed B. Komorowski by gaining 71.39% of votes. This result confirmed domination of right-wing political leanings of the citizens of the Subcarpathian voivodeship.

## *The course of the election campaign*

Elections to the Sejm and the Senate of the Republic were designated by President Bronisław Komorowski on 25 October 2015, according to the resolution of 17 July 2015, modified later by the resolution of 3 August 2015. Then, PKW (National Election Commission) prepared the electoral schedule, according to which it was necessary to give a notice about formation of electoral committees until 7 September 2015 and to provide lists with surnames of candidates for the posts of MPs and Senators.

According to the *Act of 5 January 2011 – Electoral Code* the Subcarpathian voivodeship, for the purpose of the Sejm elections, was divided into two electoral constituencies, namely constituency 22 (Krosno-Przemyśl) and constituency 23 (Rzeszów-Tarnobrzeg), where 26 MPs in total are elected. In elections to the Senate, on the other hand, Subcarpathia was divided into 5 electoral constituencies, namely constituency no 54 (it includes unitary authority – city with a county rights of Tarnobrzeg and the following counties (poviats): leżajski, niżański, stalowowolski and tarnobrzeski), constituency 55 (it includes the areas of dębicki, kolbuszowski, mielecki, ropczycko-sędziszowski and strzyżowski counties), constituency 56 (it includes city with a county rights of Rzeszów and łańcucki and rzeszowski counties), constituency 57 (it includes the area of the city with a county rights of Krosno and brzozowski, jasielski and krośnieński counties) and constituency 58 (it encompasses the area of the city with a county rights of Przemyśl nad bieszczadzki, jaroslawski, leski, lubaczowski, przemyski, przeworski and sanocki counties). In elections to the Sejm 21 campaign committees were registered in both constituencies altogether (10 in constituency 22 and 11 in constituency 23).

In elections to the Sejm 21 campaign committees were registered in both constituencies altogether (10 in constituency 22 and 11 in constituency 23). 455 candidates ran for MP post (199 in constituency 22 and 256 in constituency 23). Detailed information was juxtaposed in table 3. In elections to the Senate in all five constituencies in Subcarpathia there were 21 registered candidates (table 4).

Table 3. Election committees registered in elections to the Sejm in 2015 in Subcarpathia, together with the number of registered candidates

| List no. | Constituency 22 Krosno-Przemyśl | Number of registered candidates | List no. | Constituency 23 Rzeszów-Tarnobrzeg | Number of registered candidates |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Committee | | | Committee | |
| 1 | Law and Justice | 22 | 1 | Law and Justice Campaign | 30 |
| 2 | Civic Platform | 22 | 2 | Civic Platform | 30 |
| 7 | Kukiz'15 | 19 | 7 | Kukiz'15 | 27 |
| 5 | Polish People's Party | 22 | 4 | KORWIN | 28 |
| 6 | United Left | 22 | 5 | Polish People's Party | 30 |
| 4 | KORWIN | 22 | 6 | United Left | 30 |
| 8 | Ryszard Petru Modern committee | 22 | 8 | Ryszard Petru Modern committee | 30 |
| 3 | Together party | 12 | 3 | Together party | 16 |
| 9 | JOW Non-party | 22 | 10 | Zbigniew Stonoga campaign committee | 19 |
| 10 | Zbigniew Stonoga campaign committee | 14 | 14 | Grzegorz Braun „God Bless" campaign committee | 16 |
| | | | 15 | Congress of the New Right | 20 |

Source: own compilation on the basis of data from PWK (National Electoral Commission), the PKW webpage, http://pkw.gov.pl (5.07.2016).

It is noteworthy that all election lists with surnames of the candidates for MPs and senators were a subjects of lively internal discussions both in case of political parties as well as Kukiz'15 movement. This process, however, was complex and it went through stages. When it comes to political parties, the initial decisions connected with the making of campaign lists were preluded by discussions concerning the possibility of participation of potential candidates in parliamentary elections in basic organisational units of a given party, namely in clubs, and then they were handed to regional authorities. Partial arrangement of electoral lists took place on the regional level, but it was the voivodeship party leader who decided who was going to get better position on the list. This measure also determined the strength of influence of such a leader in the region and could contribute to the marginalisation of the role of people with

whom he was conflicted. Many decisions concerning the form of electoral lists were consulted with party groups at central level. Thus, electoral lists of PO or PiS underwent radical changes. Controversies, however, were raised by PSL on both national and voivodeship levels.

Table 4. Candidates for posts of senators from the Subcarpathian voivodeship in 2015

| No. | Name and Surname of the candidate | Committee | Party affiliation |
|---|---|---|---|
| Constituency no 54 | | | |
| 1 | Lidia Błądek | ECV (Electoral Committee of Voters) Together with Lidia Błądek | Non-partisan |
| 2 | Marzena Kardasińska | ECV Kukiz'15 | Non-partisan |
| 3 | Janina Sagatowska | EC (Electoral Committee) Law and Justice | PiS |
| Okręg nr 55 | | | |
| 4 | Ireneusz Dzieszko | EC KORWIN | Non-partisan |
| 5 | Ryszard Kapała | EC Civic Platform (PO) | PO |
| 6 | Zdzisław Pupa | EC Law and Justice (PiS) | PiS |
| Okręg nr 56 | | | |
| 7 | Bogdan Bardzik | ECV of Bogdan Bardzik | Non-partisan |
| 8 | Stanisław Bartman | EC Polish People' Party (PSL) | PSL |
| 9 | Aleksander Bobko | EC Law and Justice (PiS) | Non-partisan |
| 10 | Tadeusz Ferenc | ECV of Tadeusz Ferenc „The Development of Subcarpathia" | SLD |
| 11 | Krzysztof Kaszuba | EC KORWIN | Non-partisan |
| Okręg nr 57 | | | |
| 12 | Joanna Bril | EC Polish People's Party | Non-partisan |
| 13 | Andrzej Guzik | ECV SMD The Non-Partisan | Non-partisan |
| 14 | Paweł Helnarski | EC Civil Democracy Equal Chances | Non-partisan |
| 15 | Agnieszka Łącka | ECV Helping Hand-Unemployment | Non-partisan |
| 16 | Stanisław Słyś | EC Civic Platform (PO) | PO |
| 17 | Edyta Wiśniowska | EC National Movement (RN) | National Movement |
| 18 | Alicja Zając | EC Law and Justice (PiS) | PiS |
| Okręg nr 58 | | | |
| 19 | Mieczysław Golba | EC Law and Justice (PiS) | SPZZ |
| 20 | Stanisław Mazurkiewicz | ECV Stanisław Mazurkiewicz | Non-partisan |
| 21 | Alicja Zając | EC Polish People's Party (PSL) | Non-partisan |

Source: own compilation on the basis of data from PWK (National Electoral Commission), the PKW webpage, http://parlament2015.pkw.gov.pl/345_senat/, (accessed on 6.07.2016).

In case of PO the list leader changed several times; initially it was Zdzisław Gawlik, but eventually, because of the decision of Ewa Kopacz, it was Krystyna Skowrońska who was opening the list. There were also instances of condition setting in that party, that concerned placing a particular surname in the first place of the party list in the region. MP Tomasz Kulesza resigned from taking part in political competition due to not receiving such place. It was also for the same reasons that Subcarpathian Viovode, Małgorzata Chomycz-Śmigielska, withdrew her participation in elections, as she was offered the fifth place in the party list by the regional party leaders. What is more, numerous reshuffles concerning particular candidates should also be emphasized, as their position in the electoral list was often changed. The fact that undoubtedly influenced the Subcarpathian PO was the moment, when Zbigniew Rynasiewicz, who used to manage the party in the region and ran the post of the Secretary of State in the Ministry of Infrastructure and Development, left the party. Rynasiewicz explained that it was for personal reasons, but unofficially it is known that his withdrawal from public life was influenced by his involvement in the corruption scandal with gold bars (the so-called Subcarpathian scandal), with which local businessmen used to pay public officials for favourable for them decisions. Jan Tomaka was chosen as acting Chairman of the Management Board of the Subcarpathian PO.

PiS, on the other hand, changed their lists in the Rzeszów-Tarnobrzeg constituency. In the initial period W. Ortyl, the Marshall of the Subcarpathian Voivodeship was the leader of the list, and behind him was Proffesor Józefa Hrynkiewicz. Unofficially it is said that one of the PiS experts advised that it was Hrynkiewicz was should be the leader of the list, which caused marshall Ortyl resignation from elections. The expert explained this change by the lack of possibility for Hrynkiewicz to obtain a mandate for the benefit of Ortyl, and the party headquarters in Warsaw eventually believed in that. In reality it meant the list of PiS in the constituency 23 was considered by the commentators of the political scene as deprived of a ‘leading candidate’.

As it was mentioned above, controversies both in Subcarpathia, as well as in the whole country were raised by the electoral lists of PSL and it was due to the leader of voivodeship structures, Jan Bury, who together with Z. Rynasiewicz was involved in the corruption scandal with gold bars as well as in affecting an open competition for the post of the Supreme Audit Office in Rzeszów. Bury was charged with 6 charges by the Central Anticorruption Bureau. With regard to the abovementioned situation, the MPs of PiS demanded to waive the MP immunity of Bury, but eventually it did not happen. The affair was widely reported in the media, in a very unfavourable way. In the party headquarters they were considering the possibility of not allowing Bury to take

part in the elections, but during a special party gathering an electronic voting was performed in which the delegates expressed support for Bury *(Jan Bury otworzy jednak listę PSL w okręgu rzeszowskim...)*. In this way this politician became the leader of PSL in Subcarpathia.

PSL got publicity in Subcarpathian voivodeship also thanks to its party member Dariusz Dziadzio who got involved in the incident at the end of August and the beginning of September 2016. The politician was caught by the police as a consequence of interfering with the police interventions, then handcuffed and taken to the detoxification detention centre in Rzeszów. After Dziadzio identified himself, the police resigned from keeping him in the station and drove him home. As an act of repentance he publicly announced that he would not take part in the elections (although, in the end, he did). At the last moment before the parliamentary elections huge billboards appeared in Rzeszów and around it that read: „I am no saint but I am thankful to those who believe in me" (*Dariusz Dziadzio na billboardach...,*Wójcik & Lewicka 2015). Therefore, it is worth noting that both of the PSL politicians contributed in a great extent to the weakening of the party's position in the region, affecting the results at the ballot box.

The situation looked a little different in case of Kukiz'15 movement. At the time of formalizing the party structures P. Kukiz designated Oskar Kochman, associated with RN movement, as the representative of the party in Subcarpathian voivodeship. He was supposed to be "number one" candidate of Kukiz'15 in Subcarpathia. Later it turned out that this decision was changed and Maciej Miłosz was to take Kochman's place. Finally, the roll opened with Maciej Masłowski – the cousin of Paweł Kukiz's. Rumour also had it that „number one" candidate of Kukiz'15 was supposed to be Zbigniew Sycz – a politician strongly involved with the party - but Masłowski denied that information. According to the press, Masłowski removed from the roll the names of all the candidates who, in his opinion, posed a threat to him, in particular those ones who were better educated or more experienced.

What is more, similar situations were in the remaining committees in Subcarpathia. One may note that the electoral campaign was held in quite a rivalrous atmosphere mainly thanks to many election debates organised both at a local and national scale during which politicians attacked one another rather that exchanged substantive arguments. There were also numerous press conferences dominated by criticism of the political rivals. It is worth noting that the political parties as well as committees represented „faked unity" which was especially evident during the presentation of electoral rolls. During the election campaign itself the candidates took individual actions. They were active in the media and the Internet, mainly on social networking sites which were a good place to post video material with interviews or photos from different

visits of both political and social nature. A number of candidates conducted the campaign themselves by distributing leaflets. Those were politicians whose names were placed on the lowest positions on electoral registers.

Less attention was paid to the candidates in Polish senatorial elections which was mainly driven by the local coverage of their actions. The situation was different in Rzeszów where the rector of the University of Rzeszów A. Bobko competed for an election mandate with the president T. Ferenc and other party representatives. Major part of the rivalry, however, took place among these two candidates. The rector received personal support from Jarosław Kaczyński who visited Rzeszów two days prior to the elections, which additionally mobilized the right-wing electorate.

## *The results of the parliamentary elections of 2015 and their impact of the party system of the Republic of Poland*

After the elections on October 25th 2015 it was obvious that the winning party was PiS. They won both on a national and local scale – in Subcarpathia. This clearly shows the correlation between the character of the constituencies no. 22 and 23 as well as the electorate and the election results. The analysis of the elections proved the right-wing character of preferences represented by the people of Subcarpathia. That same conclusion was drawn based on the earlier analyses and research (Maj 2012: 196-211; 2015a: 11-23; 2015b: 14-18; Redo 2011: 303-319; Szczepański 2015b: 46-57; Żukiewicz 2013: 179-189).

Table 5. Subcarpathian national parliamentary elections in 2015

| List number | Party/committee | Subcarpathian Voivodeship | | | National results |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Constituency no. 22 Krosno-Przemyśl | Constituency no. 23 Rzeszów-Tarnobrzeg | Summed results of the constituencies no. 22 and 23 | The Sejm |
| 1 | Law and Justice (PiS) | 53.51% | 56.11% | 54.81% | 37.58% |
| 2 | Civic Platform (PO) | 13.76% | 13.11% | 13.43% | 24.09% |
| 7 | Kukiz'15 (K'15) | 9.15% | 9.28% | 9.21% | 8.81% |
| 8 | Modern (.N) | 3.97% | 4.16% | 4.06% | 7.60% |
| 6 | United Left (ZL) | 4.56% | 4.42% | 4.49% | 7.55% |
| 5 | Polish People's Party(PSL) | 7.28% | 4.67% | 5.97% | 5.13% |
| 4 | The Coalition for the Renewal of the Republic – Liberty and Hope (KORWIN) | 4.28% | 4.96% | 4.62% | 4.76% |
| 3 | Together | 2.32% | 2.29% | 2.30% | 3.62% |

Source: own elaboration on the basis of election results, the website of the National Electoral Commission, http://pkw.gov.pl (7.07.2016).

In order to present the election results in Subcarpathia and to compare them with the results of the national elections the experts summed up all the results of the parties and the committees. The results of PiS, Kukiz'15 and KORWIN committees were 51.15% on a national scale, whereas in Subcarpathian voivodeship they were 68.64% which means they were 17.49% higher. What is important, the parties and committees identified as left-wing achieved here a much worse result than the national average. That concerned mainly ZL and PR whose results were 6.79% and 11.17% in the constituency and on a national scale respectively. The margin was 4.38%. The PSL party results in Subcarpathian voivodeship were better than on a national scale – the difference was 0.84%. On the other hand, PO and NRP parties which, by the way, court the same voters noted a worse result – 14.2% lower than on a national scale (see table 5). The right-wing nature of Subcarpathian voivodeship was also confirmed by the results obtained by the candidates for senators – in all Subcarpathian constituencies the senators were PiS politicians (see table 6).

The direct results of the parliamentary elections were the following: 1) the creation of new political parties as well as Kukiz'15 civil movement; 2) empowerment of PiS on the political scene while reducing the role of PO and PSL and thus the rise of NRP party; 3) marginalization of the left wing ZL and 4) the creation of a new government ruled by one party for the first time in 25 years. In addition, there were also internal party changes concerning the leaders – the situation observed in PO, PSL and SLD. By looking at the above implications in the context of Subcarpathian voivodeship, one may notice the strengthening of the right wing which introduced the total of 26 members in both constituencies (in the constituency no. 22 – 7 PiS members, 2 PO members, 1 Kukiz'15 member and 1 PSL member, and in the constituency no. 23 – 12 PiS members, 2 PO members and 1 Kukiz'15 member). That strengthening was also seen in winning 5 senatorial mandates by PiS. The right-wing results in Subcarpathia influenced the personal changes applied in both widely understood public administration as well as state-owned companies.

Table 6. The results of the Polish senatorial elections in Subcarpathia in 2015

| No. | Name and surname of the candidate | Electoral Committee | Number of votes | Number of votes in % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Constituency no. 54 | | | | |
| 1 | Lidia Błądek | ECV (Electoral Committee of Voters) Together with Lidia Błądek | 28 638 | 22.39% |
| 2 | Marzena Kardasińska | ECV Kukiz'15 | 30 261 | 23.65% |
| 3 | Janina Sagatowska | EC (Electoral Committee) Law and Justice (PiS) | 69 029 | 53.96% |
| Constituency no. 55 | | | | |
| 4 | Ireneusz Dzieszko | EC KORWIN | 26 982 | 14.62% |
| 5 | Ryszard Kapała | EC Civic Platform (PO) | 39 060 | 21.16% |
| 6 | Zdzisław Pupa | EC Law and Justice (PiS) | 118 567 | 64.23% |
| Constituency no. 56 | | | | |
| 7 | Bogdan Bardzik | ECV of Bogdan Bardzik | 7 212 | 3.78% |
| 8 | Stanisław Bartman | EC Polish People' Party (PSL) | 10 172 | 5.33% |
| 9 | Aleksander Bobko | EC Law and Justice (PiS) | 81 570 | 42.74% |
| 10 | Tadeusz Ferenc | ECV of Tadeusz Ferenc "The Development of Subcarpathia" | 73 894 | 38.72% |
| 11 | Krzysztof Kaszuba | EC KORWIN | 17 790 | 9.43% |
| Constituency no. 57 | | | | |
| 12 | Joanna Bril | EC Polish People's Party | 9 961 | 7.59% |
| 13 | Andrzej Guzik | ECV SMD The Non-Partisan | 12 201 | 9.29% |
| 14 | Paweł Helnarski | EC Civil Democracy Equal Chances | 2 429 | 1.85% |
| 15 | Agnieszka Łącka | ECV Helping Hand-Unemployment | 5 079 | 3.87% |
| 16 | Stanisław Słyś | EC Civic Platform (PO) | 19 085 | 14.53% |
| 17 | Edyta Wiśniowska | EC National Movement (RN) | 5 462 | 4.16% |
| 18 | Alicja Zając | EC Law and Justice (PiS) | 77 101 | 58.71% |
| Constituency no. 58 | | | | |
| 19 | Mieczysław Golba | EC Law and Justice (PiS) | 110 155 | 57.19% |
| 20 | Stanisław Mazurkiewicz | ECV Stanisław Mazurkiewicz | 34 808 | 18.07% |
| 21 | Alicja Zając | EC Polish People's Party (PSL) | 47 659 | 24.74% |

Source: own elaboration based on NEC's data, the official website of the National Electoral Commission http://parlament2015.pkw.gov.pl/345_senat/, (dostęp 7.07.2016).

## *Conclusions*

One may say that Subcarpathia is a unique type of region when it comes to voting preferences and behaviour of its citizens. This is evidenced by the earlier as well as current election results where the right-wing groups, in particular PiS (and KORWIN or Kukiz'15) received a wider public support than at a national level. The party to follow was PO which introduced to the the Sejm four of its members, which was a worse result as compared to the national election results in 2011 when the party won 7 mandates. The conducted analyses allow one to draw the following conclusions. First, the undertaken electoral campaign was unattractive from the perspective of a voter. It was based on making a great number of promises most of which, obviously, were unfulfillable and unrealistic since their implementation would take at least a couple of years and a single-party government. Second, the local discussions and debates carried out among the candidates were subject to the lack of substantial knowledge which was substituted by personal and party attacks. In addition to that, the parties did not organise any joined group activities. Instead of that there were isolated press conferences initiated by the politicians themselves.

Almost same conclusions can be drawn when analysing the national senatorial elections, when all the possible mandates in the region – 5 of them – were won by PiS. This situation demonstrated the fact that in single-seat constituencies the voters had the tendency to support the politicians representing the party which dominated the whole region. In the case of such strong right--wing affinities displayed by the citizens of Subcarpathia one can be sure that a choice of a senator belonging to a party different that PiS would not have been possible. The gains made by the party and its actions proved one more time that Subcarpathia is its most important bastion from which it is unlikely to resign in the future.

### *References:*

*Dariusz Dziadzio na billboardach: „Święty nie jestem"*, http://wiadomosci.onet.pl/rzeszow/dariusz-dziadzio-na-bilboardach-swiety-nie-jestem/bd2cq1 (6.07.1016).

Dz. U. 2011, No. 21, item 112. Ustawa z dnia 5 stycznia 2011 r. - Kodeks wyborczy.

*Jan Bury otworzy jednak listę PSL w okręgu rzeszowskim*, http://rzeszow-news.pl/jan-bury-otworzy-jednak-liste-psl-w-okregu-rzeszowskim/ (6.07.2016).

Maj, P. (2012). *Województwa podkarpackie i zachodniopomorskie: „bastiony peryferyjne" Prawa i Sprawiedliwości i Platformy Obywatelskiej*. [In:] A. Pawłowska, Z. Rykiel (eds), *Region i regionalizm w socjologii i politologii*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.

Maj, P. (2015). Specyfika podkarpackiego okręgu nr 9 w wyborach do Parlamentu Europejskiego w 2014 roku. *Polityka i Społeczeństwo*, *1*, 58-70.

Maj, P. (2015a). *Podkarpacie na tle ogólnopolskich wyborów do Parlamentu Europejskiego w 2014 roku*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.

Maj, P. (2015b). *Podkarpacie na tle ogólnopolskich wyborów do Parlamentu Europejskiego w 2014 roku*. Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego.

Państwowa Komisja Wyborcza, http://pkw.gov.pl (4.07.2016).

Raciborski, J. (1997). *Polskie wybory: zachowania wyborcze społeczeństwa polskiego w latach 1989-1995*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Scholar.

Redo, J. (2011). *Wybory samorządowe w województwie podkarpackim w 2010 roku*. [In:] M. Kolczyński, W. Wojtasik (eds), *Wybory samorządowe 2010*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo REMAR.

Szczepański, D. (2014). Wybory uzupełniające do Senatu na Podkarpaciu w 2013 roku. *Polityka i Społeczeństwo*, *2*, 37-48.

Szczepański, D. (2015), Subcarpathian Voivodeship on the Electoral Map of Poland (1989-2014). *Political Preferences*, *11*, 173-186.

Szczepański, D. (2015a). Wybór opcji czy osoby? Determinanty zachowań wyborczych mieszkańców województwa podkarpackiego w wyborach do Parlamentu Europejskiego w 2014 r. w świetle badań empirycznych. *Preferencje Polityczne*, *10*, 181-198.

Szczepański, D. (2015b). Instytucjonalizacja form rywalizacji politycznej w wyborach do Parlamentu Europejskiego w województwie podkarpackim w 2014 roku. *Polityka i Społeczeństwo*, *1*, 46-57.

Wójcik, K., & Lewicka, S. (2015). *Poseł Dziadzio okłamał wyborców? Nie złożył rezygnacji*, http://rzeszow-news.pl/posel-dziadzio-oklamal-wyborcow-nie-zlozyl-rezygnacji/ (10.01.2016).

Wybory do Senatu RP. Państwowa Komisja Wyborcza. http://parlament2015.pkw.gov.pl/345_senat/ (7.07.2016).

Żukiewicz, P. (2013). *W koalicji siła... - o pozornym zwycięstwie PiS. Wybory do sejmiku województwa podkarpackiego*. [In:] R. Alberski, M. Cichosz, K. Kobielska (eds), *Gra o regiony: wybory do sejmików województw w 2010 r.* Sosnowiec: Wydawnictwo REMAR.