

KONKURS OPUS 16
WNIOSEK
O FINANSOWANIE PROJEKTU BADAWCZEGO
W TYM FINANSOWANIE ZAKUPU LUB WYTWORZENIA APARATURY
NAUKOWO-BADAWCZEJ NIEZBĘDNEJ DO REALIZACJI TEGO PROJEKTU

[TO JEST WYDRUK ROBOCZY - NIE PRZEZNACZONY DO WYSŁANIA DO NARODOWEGO CENTRUM NAUKI]

DANE KIEROWNIKA PROJEKTU

(imię, nazwisko, tytuł lub stopień naukowy, adres zamieszkania, tel., e-mail)

prof. dr hab. Radosław Markowski

ul. Wspólna 36, 05-092 Łomianki, mazowieckie, Polska

tel: (22) 751-73-25, 694 441-750 , E-mail: rmarkowski@swps.edu.pl

DANE WNIOSKODAWCY

Status wnioskodawcy:

1. Jednostka naukowa

Nazwa i adres podmiotu realizującego:

SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie

SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities

ul. Chodakowska 19/31, 03-815 Warszawa, mazowieckie

Siedmiocyfrowy identyfikator gminy: **146507 8**

tel: **(22) 517-99-00, (22) 517-98-56**

Adres e-mail: **badania@swps.edu.pl** , Adres strony internetowej: **www.swps.pl**

NIP, REGON:

1180197245, 011947981

adres skrzynki podawczej ePUAP:

/Uniwersytet_SWPS/badania

Status organizacyjny podmiotu:

A1. Uczelnia

Podmiot sprawujący nadzór:

Uczelnia nadzorowana przez MNiSW

Profil działalności:

AUPI - uniwersytet o innym profilu (wg. kryteriów wskazanych w art. 3.3, niezależnie od stosowanej przez uczelnię nazwy)

Profil uniwersytetu:

humanistycznospołeczny

Czy podmiot stanowi jednostkę zaliczaną do sektora finansów publicznych? **NIE**

Czy podmiot pozostaje pod zarządem komisarycznym lub znajduje się w toku likwidacji bądź postępowania upadłościowego?
NIE

Czy finansowanie projektu będzie stanowić pomoc publiczną? **NIE**

Kierownik projektu i osoby reprezentujące wnioskodawcę / podmioty realizujące zapoznały się z zasadami występowania pomocy publicznej **TAK**

Kierownik podmiotu / Reprezentacja podmiotu:

prof. dr hab. Grzegorz Sędek, Prorektor ds. nauki

Nazwa i adres jednostki realizującej:

SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych

Chodakowska 19/31, 03-815 Warszawa, mazowieckie

tel: **(22) 517-98-59**

Adres e-mail: **biuro.wnhis@swps.edu.pl** , *Adres strony internetowej:* **www.swps.pl**

Czy jednostka otrzymuje dotację na działalność statutową z budżetu nauki? **TAK**

INFORMACJE OGÓLNE

Tytuł projektu:	Polskie Generalne Studium Wyborcze 2019		
Obszar badawczy:	HS - Nauki Humanistyczne, Społeczne i o Sztuce		
Panel dyscyplin:	HS5 - Prawo, nauki o polityce, polityki publiczne		
Pomocnicze określenia identyfikujące:	HS5_7 - Systemy i ruchy polityczne oraz stosunki międzynarodowe HS6_15 - Socjologia idei, władzy, norm, organizacji		
Planowany okres realizacji projektu badawczego (w miesiącach):	36	Liczba wykonawców projektu badawczego:	5
Słowa kluczowe:	wybory, zachowania wyborcze, decyzja wyborcza, frekwencja, demokracja		
Słowa kluczowe w języku angielskim:	elections, voting behaviour, vote choice, turnout, democracy		
Planowane nakłady w zł:	Ogółem:		Pierwszy rok realizacji:
	1 316 112,00		696 086,00
Czy projekt badawczy jest realizowany we współpracy międzynarodowej ¹ ?			nie

STRESZCZENIE

Summary in English

Research project objectives / Research hypothesis

This project has two objectives. The first is to carry out the next iteration of the Polish National Election Study (PNES) survey for the 2019 parliamentary elections. This survey began in 1997 and has been carried out after each of the five subsequent elections. Each PNES survey incorporates the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES) core module, providing political scientists with a rich set of data on the mode and quality of political representation and accountability, the extent and durability of political cleavages, citizens' normative visions of and evaluations of democracy, the positions of citizens on key political issues and their broad ideological leanings, retrospective and prospective evaluations of the economic situation, party identification and political preferences, socio-demographic characteristics, and the relationship between all the aforementioned factors and the key dependent variables of electoral participation and vote choice. The proposed project will continue the longitudinal tradition of the PNES, while also adding new questions that arise from recent theoretical innovations and empirical developments. In particular, the innovative part of the survey will be informed by considerations on the nature of citizens' social identities as expressed in private, informal networks rather than traditional socio-demographic cleavages, and the "heterogeneity assumption" that postulates a variety of drivers behind electoral behavior, rather than a single overarching model.

The second objective is methodological. Since the beginning, the PNES has used a traditional face-to-face (CAPI) survey based on a random sample. However, declining response rates make it increasingly difficult and expensive to conduct such surveys. Internet-based CAWI surveys are significantly cheaper to administer but remain less representative of the population. By supplementing our standard CAPI survey with two CAWI surveys which repeat the core of our CAPI questionnaire, we aim to evaluate the benefits of moving to a CAWI-based model in the future, and to develop a set of corrective tools to obtain results valid for making inferences about the general population from the quota internet panels used in CAWI surveys. The pre-election and post-election sequencing of the CAWI surveys will also provide us with a quasi-experimental context for addressing questions of interest about the causal links between party preferences and voting behavior.

Research project methodology

The research project will be carried out through the near-simultaneous fielding of surveys using a CAPI sample (n=1500) and a two-wave CAWI sample (n=1000). The CAPI face-to-face questionnaire will take approximately 1 hour to 1 hour 10 minutes. It will be based on a set of core questions derived from previous iterations of the PNES survey and module 5 of the CSES survey and will also include a variety of new questions. The CAWI questionnaire will contain around a third of the questions used in the CAPI questionnaire. Both sets of data will enable us to undertake standard multivariate modelling where the impact of substantive variables of interest are controlled for by other relevant individual-level variables, multilevel modelling which controls for the impact of environmental, contextual variables, and experimental analysis in which treatment effects are the quantity of interest.

Expected impact of the research project on the development of science

There are several ways in which this project will contribute to the advancement of political science knowledge. First, it will enable the continuation of the 20-year tradition of the PNES, which provides both the Polish and the international scholarly community with an indispensable resource for country-specific and comparative research into Polish electoral politics which is both longitudinal in character and relevant to new concerns. Second, it will contribute to the methodological evolution of the discipline of electoral surveys by providing information about the viability of CAWI surveys as a replacement for or supplement to traditional CAPI surveys. Third, the quasi-experimental character of the two-wave CAWI surveys will make it possible to explore questions about the links between socio-demographics, political preferences and vote choice that cannot be properly tested in single surveys. Finally, the project will result in significant research outputs by members of the project team.

POPULARNONAUKOWE STRESZCZENIE PROJEKTU

Popularnonaukowe streszczenie projektu

Projekt ma dwa cele. Pierwszym z nich jest przeprowadzenie siódmej edycji Polskiego Generalnego Studium Wyborczego (PGSW) podczas wyborów parlamentarnych w 2019 roku. PGSW jest powyborczym sondażem przeprowadzonym na reprezentatywnej próbie dorosłych obywateli Polski. Zawiera szereg pytań dotyczących cech społeczno-demograficznych (np. wieku, płci, wykształcenia, zawodu i dochodów), postaw i poglądów na temat demokracji oraz sytuacji gospodarczej, postaw wobec szeregu ważnych kwestii społecznych, a także udziału i głosowania w wyborach. Badanie PGSW 2019 obejmie wszystkie wyżej wymienione kwestie, a także wiele zagadnień związanych z niedawnymi wydarzeniami politycznymi i zmianami społecznymi. Naszym celem jest zbadanie wszystkich czynników istotnych dla analizy zachowań wyborczych. PGSW to jedyne badanie w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej, w którym uwzględniono wszystkie cztery moduły międzynarodowego badania systemów wyborczych CSES (Comparative Study of Electoral Systems). W wyniku tego badania powstał najbardziej kompleksowy i najszerzej stosowany zestaw danych porównawczych do badania zachowań wyborczych. Nasz projekt pozwoli kontynuować tę tradycję - nowa edycja PGSW będzie zawierała moduł 5 CSES, a także dostarcza nowych danych na temat bieżących wydarzeń.

Drugim celem jest opracowanie innowacyjnej i efektywnej kosztowo metodologii przeprowadzania badań wyborczych. Jak dotąd, w PGSW stosowaliśmy wywiad bezpośredni (CAPI) na losowej próbie populacji. Ta metodologia jest optymalna, ale natrafia na coraz poważniejsze przeszkody: respondenci są coraz mniej chętni do udziału w długich wywiadach, gromadzenie danych w ten sposób jest coraz trudniejsze i bardziej kosztowne. Internet otworzył szereg możliwości taniego i wydajnego przeprowadzania ankiet. Jednak takie badania pozostają niereprezentatywne dla całej populacji, ponieważ niektóre grupy - na przykład osoby starsze, o niższych dochodach - mają ograniczony dostęp do Internetu lub mniejszą skłonność do korzystania z niego. W ramach tego projektu przeprowadzimy dwa badania internetowe (CAWI) wraz z tradycyjnym sondażem przeprowadzoną metodą wywiadu bezpośredniego. Pozwoli nam to ocenić reprezentatywność sondaży internetowych poprzez porównanie z naszymi badaniami CAPI i opracować narzędzia do przeliczenia wyników badań CAWI, aby były reprezentatywne dla całej populacji. Naszym celem jest dostosowanie istniejących metod gromadzenia danych do zmieniających się okoliczności oraz efektywne wykorzystanie nowych technologii.

Etapy naszego projektu badawczego to: opracowanie narzędzi do badań CAPI i CAWI, realizacja tych sondaży z wykorzystaniem usług profesjonalnej firmy, stworzenie zintegrowanej bazy danych PGSW/CSES, analiza danych przez członków zespołu projektowego oraz publikacja wyników.

DESCRIPTION FOR THE GENERAL PUBLIC (IN ENGLISH)

Description for the general public

This project has two objectives. The first is the carrying out of the seventh wave of the Polish National Election Study (PNES) survey at the 2019 parliamentary elections. The PNES is a post-electoral survey of a representative sample of adult citizens of Poland which asks a range of questions about socio-demographic characteristics (for example, age, gender, education, occupation and income), attitudes to democracy, views on the performance of democracy and the economic situation, attitudes on a range of important social questions, and participation and vote choice in elections. The PNES 2019 survey will include all the aforementioned questions, as well as a variety of questions concerning recent political and social developments. This objective is motivated by the continuing importance of reliable sources of data for the analysis of electoral behavior. The PNES is the only survey in Central and Eastern Europe to have incorporated all four modules of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES), the most prestigious and comprehensive comparative dataset for the study of electoral behavior. This project will enable us to continue that tradition by funding a new round of the PNES, which will incorporate module 5 of the CSES and also provide new data about important contemporary issues.

The second objective is to find ways to make post-election surveys more innovative and cost-efficient. Until now, the PNES surveys have used a face-to-face survey methodology based on a random sample of the population. This remains the “gold standard” for the representativeness of surveys, but with people less willing than in the past to participate in long face-to-face surveys, it is increasingly difficult and expensive to collect data in this fashion. The internet has opened up a range of possibilities for administering surveys cheaply and efficiently, using increasingly widespread internet-connected devices. However, such surveys remain less representative of the entire population, as some groups – for example older people, or those on lower incomes – have less reliable access to the internet, or a lower propensity to make use of it. In this project, we will field two internet-based surveys alongside the traditional face-to-face survey. This will allow us to evaluate the representativeness of internet-based surveys by comparing them to our “gold standard” face-to-face surveys and enable us to develop tools for adjusting the results of internet surveys to make them more representative of the entire population. This objective is motivated by the need to adapt existing methods of collecting data to changing circumstances, and to make efficient use of new technologies.

The research project will consist in developing questionnaires for the face-to-face and internet surveys, employing the services of a professional polling agency to field the surveys, and then cleaning and analysis of the data by members of the project team.

JUSTIFICATION - BASIC RESEARCH

The present proposal meets the criterion of basic research within the meaning of the act of 30th April 2010 on the funding of science. The main objective and the sole purpose of the project is to extend the existing state of knowledge in political science. The project is not focused on the practical use, we do not aim to elaborate new or to improve existing products, processes nor services. Thus it does not meet the criterion of applied sciences nor industrial research. The main objective of the project is to gain scientific knowledge on electoral behavior of the Poles in 2019 parliamentary election. Polish National Election Study is a part of a long-standing tradition of post-electoral studies, realized in majority of democratic countries in the world. Albeit the issue taken in the project has already been studied, its particularity requires repetition after every election. Only such an approach enables systematic, complete and comprehensive reflection on electoral behavior. The project will provide academic, empirically tested knowledge on the most important topics in social and political sciences. It will therefore fulfill the criteria of basic research as stipulated by the law – the project is original and innovative (in terms of its subject matter, but also to the extent that its methodology is concerned), it is both theoretical and empirical, it investigates the basic nature of reality, and it does not have any direct application.

WNIOSEK NOWY/SKORYGOWANY

Czy wniosek został złożony w poprzedniej edycji konkursów PRELUDIUM, OPUS? **nie**

ANKIETA DOROBKU NAUKOWEGO KIEROWNIKA PROJEKTU**1. Imienny wykaz***(tytuł naukowy, stopień naukowy, imię, nazwisko, charakter udziału w realizacji projektu)*

Tytuł zawodowy, stopień naukowy lub tytuł naukowy	Imię i nazwisko	Charakter udziału
prof. dr hab.	Radosław Markowski	Kierownik projektu

2. Ankiety dorobku naukowego*(obowiązkowa dla Kierownik projektu)*

Kierownik projektu prof. dr hab. Radosław Markowski**1) Dane osobowe**

Imię i nazwisko: prof. dr hab. Radosław Markowski
PESEL: 57060604075

Czy kierownik projektu posiada stopień naukowy doktora? tak
Czy Pani/Pan zamierza wprowadzić informację o przerwach w karierze naukowej? nie
Typ zatrudnienia w projekcie: wynagrodzenie dodatkowe
Rodzaj stanowiska: pozostałe
Okres pobierania wynagrodzenia w projekcie (w miesiącach): 36

2) Adres zamieszkania, numer telefonu, email

Adres zamieszkania: ul. Wspólna 36, 05-092 Łomianki, mazowieckie, Polska
Adres do korespondencji: ul. Wspólna 36, 05-092 Łomianki, mazowieckie, Polska
Numer telefonu: (22) 751-73-25, 694 441-750
Adres e-mail: rmarkowski@swps.edu.pl

3) Miejsca zatrudnienia i zajmowane stanowiska

Nazwa podmiotu: SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie; Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych; Centrum Studiów nad Demokracją (SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities; Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences; Center for the Study of Democracy)
Stanowisko: profesor nadzwyczajny, Dyrektor (associate professor)
Adres: ul. Chodakowska 19/31, 03-815 Warszawa, mazowieckie, Polska

4) Informacje o liczbie cytowań oraz indeksie H dla paneli HS (nauki humanistyczne i społeczne), tam gdzie to możliwe podać

source: Publish and Perish
total number of citations excluding self-citations : 390
the H-index: 12

5) Academic and Research Career (in English)

(Institution, Department/Faculty or any other Research Unit, Academic Training, Date of obtaining Academic Degree)

Employment:

April 2009 till now, Director , Center for the Study of Democracy, University of Social Sciences and Humanities
February 1991 -2014, Head, Comparative Politics Department, Institute of Political Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences
March 2001-2009, Director, Department of Political Science, Warsaw School of Social Sciences and Humanities
1999-2000, Prorector and Vice-Chair, Department of Political Science, Collegium Civitas, School of Social Sciences
June 1994 to February 1996 , Deputy Director, Public Opinion Research Center (CBOS)
April 1988 to January 1991, Assistant Professor, Institute of Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences
April 1981 to March 1988, Researcher, Department of Sociological Analysis, Industry Institute.

Part-time Affiliation

February 1991 - May 1994, Counselor to the Minister of Labor and Social Policy
September 1985 - March 1991, Research Fellow and Lecturer, Department of Social Welfare Theory Medical Center for Postgraduate Education
September 1984 - July 1985, Lecturer of Sociology, Warsaw University

Academic Career:

1979 - MA, Institute of Social Prevention and Rehabilitation, University of Warsaw (magna cum laude).
1979 - 1981 - Postgraduate Studies for Experts in Developing Countries (specialization: Arab World);
1990 - PhD in Political Science, Faculty of Journalism and Political Science, University of Warsaw.
2007 - Habilitation, Institute of Political Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences.
2017 - Full Professorship, Institute of Political Studies of the Polish Academy of Sciences and the President of the Republic

of Poland).

Other Professional Activity (selected research projects and membership)

Other Selected Activities

- Expert and reviewer for Bertelsmann Foundation projects - BTI, SGI (2010 till now)
- Expert and reviewer for Varieties of Democracy project – V-Dem (2016 till now)
- Expert and Collaborator of Ralf Dahrendorf Forum at the Hertie School of Governance (2017 till now)
- Member of the Academic Board of Public Opinion Research Center CBOS (1991-1993 and 2008-2015)
- Member of the Executive Board of Stefan Batory Foundation, Warsaw (2012-2015)
- Member of the Executive Council of the European Political Science Network (epsNet), elected in 2005
- Executive Director of the Polish Team of the Social Costs of Economic Transformation in Central Europe project, initiated and sponsored by the Institute for Human Sciences (IWM) Vienna, (1992-1994);

Functions in international organizations:

Member of the Management Committee of European Election Studies Association, (EES-A), since 2013.
 Member of Executive Committee of European Political Science Network (epsNet), since 2005;
 Member of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems Planning Committee, (1998-2015);
 Polish Representative to the Council of Europe Steering Committee on Social Policy, elected its' Bureau member (1991 - 1995);
 Member of the Board of Directors of the European Center for Social Welfare Policy and Research, (affiliated with UN), Vienna (1991-1994);

Member of Editorial /Advisory Boards

- Populism
- Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties
- European Journal of Political Research
- European Union Politics
- Political Studies
- Journal of Political Science Education
- Perspectives on European Politics and Society
- Central European Political Science Review
- Res Publica Nowa

Journal Referee (Peer Reviewer for:)

- American Political Science Review
- Party Politics
- British Journal of Political Science
- Democratization
- European Journal of Political Research
- Comparative Political Studies
- Electoral Studies
- West European Politics
- Europe-Asia Studies
- Problems of Post-Communism
- East European Politics
- Czech Sociological Review
- Studia Polityczne
- Studia Socjologiczne

6) Publication Record for HS (Art, Humanities and Social Sciences)

3 –10 of the most important papers published over the period of 10 years prior to the submission of the proposal, including an index of publications in JCR - listed journals (the quality of the journal will be a major factor in the evaluation of achievements) and internationally recognised research monographs (if possible indicating the five-year impact factor of the journals and the number of citations per publication excluding self-citations; 3 most important publications from the list must be attached as pdf files). One may list works yet to be published as long as acceptance letters from publishers are uploaded as attachments to the electronic proposal in section I ANNEXES.

No.	Author(s)	Publication title in the original publication language [and, if applicable, title's translation into English]	Journal (volume, pages) / monograph or monograph by many authors (editor(s), place of publication, publisher, pages. Important note: please do not translate into English journals' and monographs' titles)	Year of publication	Current five-year impact factor	Total number of citations excluding self-citations
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Radosław Markowski	Creating Authoritarian Clientelism: Poland After 2015	Hague Journal on the Rule of Law 11 (1): 1-22	2019	0,629	0
2.	Radosław Markowski, Michał Kotnarowski	The relationship between European Identity and National Identity, Party Identification and Ideological Orientation	B. Westle & P. Segatti, eds, European Identity in the Context of National Identity. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 192-210	2016	0,000	0
3.	Radosław Markowski	The Polish parliamentary election of 2015: on free and fair election that results in unfair political consequences	West European Politics 39 (6): 1311 -1322	2016	2,545	31
4.	Radosław Markowski	Determinants of democratic legitimacy: liberal democracy and social justice	M. Ferrin & H. Kriesi, eds. How Europeans View and Evaluate democracy? Oxford University Press , pp. 257-282	2016	0,000	2
5.	R Markowski, M. Kotnarowski	Political Preferences in times of crisis: economic voting in the Polish 2011 elections	Acta Politica (2014), 49: 431-461	2014	0,739	8
6.	Hubert Tworzecki, Radosław Markowski	Knowledge and Partisan Bias: An Uneasy Relationship	East European Politics and Societies and Cultures 28 (4): 836-862	2014	0,817	6
7.	Gábor Tóka, Andrija Henjak, Radosław Markowski	Explaining Support for European Integration	D. Sanders, P. Bellucci, M. Torcal, G. Toka, eds., The Europeanization of National Politics? Citizenship and Support in a Post-Enlargement Union, Oxford: Oxford University Press	2012	0,000	11
8.	Radosław Markowski, Joshua A. Tucker	Euroskepticism and the Emergence of Political Parties in Poland	Party Politics 16 (4): 523-548	2010	2,412	55
9.	John E.Jackson, Bogdan W.Mach, Radosław Markowski	Party strategies and electoral competition in post-Communist countries: Evidence from Poland	Electoral Studies 29: 199-209	2010	1,961	8

7) Research projects led: both on-going and carried out in the period of 5 years prior to the submission of the proposal¹ (only those to which one contributed as the Principal Investigator, "Kierownik" in polish), funded under national and international funding schemes (in English) ¹This period does not include maternity/paternity leave or parental leave granted in compliance with the employment code.

(titles and ID numbers of projects, sources of funding, dates and places of project implementation and the list of the most important publications resulting from each project)

Manually entered data			
1.	Role in the project:	Principal Investigator	
	Project title:	The Impact of Electoral Rules on the Quality of Local Democracy in Poland	Project ID: 2014/13/B/HS5/02580
	Sources of funding:	NCN	Amount of funding: 828 230,00 PLN
	Host Institution:	SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities	
	Start date:	2014-11-18	Finish date: 2018-12-16
	List of the most important publications:	Lyubashenko Igor: Wybory samorządowe 2014, w: Demokratyczny Audyt Polski 2: Demokracja wyborcza w Polsce lat 2014-15 / Markowski Radosław (red.), 2017, Biuro Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich, ISBN 978-83-65029-36-2, ss. 211-222.	
2.	Role in the project:	Principal Investigator	
	Project title:	Polish National Election Study 2011	Project ID: PNES 2011 (last edition: 5337/B/H03/2011/40)
	Sources of funding:	NCN	Amount of funding: 330 000,00 PLN
	Host Institution:	ISP PAN	
	Start date:	2011-08-02	Finish date: 2014-11-01
	List of the most important publications:	<p>Markowski, R. ed. 2017. Demokratyczny Audyt Polski 2: Demokracja wyborcza lat 2014-2015, Warszawa: Biuro RPO</p> <p>Stanley, B. & M. Czeńnik. 2016. "Poland's Palikot Movement: Voice of the disenchanting, missing ideological link or more of the same?" Party Politics 22: 705-18</p> <p>Markowski, R. 2016. "The Polish parliamentary election of 2015: on free and fair election that results in unfair political consequences", West European Politics, 39 (6): 1311-22</p> <p>Stanley, Ben. 2016. "Defenders of the Cross". In: Marzouki, N., D. McDonnell, O. Roy, eds. Saving the People: How Populists Hijack Religion. London: Hurst Publishers: 109-28</p> <p>Bachmann, K. 2016. "Constructing a national myth - the case of the Warsaw Uprising in post-war Poland", in: K. Bachmann, J. Gieseke (eds.): The Silent Majority in Communist and Post-Communist States. Opinion Polling in Eastern and South - Eastern Europe, Frankfurt / M.: Peter Lang: 101-24</p> <p>Bachmann, K. 2016. Der Bruch. Ursachen und Konsequenzen des Umsturzes der Verfassungsordnung Polens 2015-2016, Frankfurt / M.: Peter Lang.</p> <p>Markowski, R., M. Czeńnik, M. Kotnarowski. 2015. Demokracja – Gospodarka – Polityka: perspektywa polskiego wyborcy. Warszawa: Scholar</p> <p>Kotnarowski, M. & R. Markowski. 2014. "Political Preferences in times of crisis: economic voting in the Polish 2011 elections", Acta Politica 49: 431-61</p> <p>Tworzecki, H. & R Markowski. 2014. "Knowledge and Partisan Bias: An Uneasy Relationship", East European Politics and Societies 28 (4): 836-62</p> <p>Czeńnik, M., M. Żerkowska-Balas & M. Kotnarowski. 2013. "Voting as a Habit in New Democracies – Evidence from Poland". Communist and Post-Communist Studies 46: 95-107</p> <p>Markowski, R. & M. Czeńnik. 2012. "Wybory parlamentarne w 2011 roku – kontynuacja i zmiana". Studia Polityczne 29: 285-309</p> <p>Czeńnik, M., M. Kotnarowski, I. Lyubashenko. 2016. "Kto kształtuje polską politykę – o aktywności i nieaktywności wyborczej Polaków", Studia Socjologiczne nr 4 (223): 39-66</p>	

8) Information on similar research tasks implemented or completed by projects' Principal Investigator (in English)

(project title, ID number of project, principal investigator, main research tasks, source of funding, justification of the need to fund the proposed research tasks in the light of similar tasks listed above)

Nie dotyczy

9) Research experience (longer research visits, placements, etc.) in Poland and abroad over the past 10 years (in English)

(country, institution, type of research stay, duration)

- 2006-2018 – **recurring Visiting Professor** at the Department of Political Science of the **Central European University (CEU)**: January – April 2018; January-April 2015; January – April 2011; January-April 2010;
- April-May 2015, *Visiting Fellow*, **STIAS** (Stellenbosch Institute for Advanced Study), South Africa;
- February-March 2014, **Senior Visiting Fellow**, Institute for Human Sciences, **IWM, Vienna**;
- February- June 2013, **Fellow-in-Residence**, **NIAS** ,Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study;
- January-February 2011; January-February 2012, **Visiting Fellow**, **St. Anthony's College**;

10) Most important international and prestigious Polish awards for research as well as other research activity (plenary lectures at conferences; in case of research in art, also active participation in international exhibitions, festivals, artistic events and projects in fine arts, music, theatre and film) (in English)

(type of prize/award, place and date)

2000 – American Political Science Association (APSA), Recipient of the 2000 "Best Dataset Award" in Comparative Politics" (as member of its Planning Committee)

2007 – Stefana Nowak Prize (the most important Polish sociological prize granted once per 2 years to a single scholar)– "for initiating the Polish National Election Studies Project and research on Polish electoral behavior".

2011 – Knight's Cross of Polonia Restituta Order for "significant contribution to the development of the theory and methodology of research on politics"

2015 – University of Social Sciences and Humanities Rector's Prize "for exceptional expert, research and publication activity"

PLAN BADAŃ

Lp.	Nazwa zadania badawczego		Podmiot realizujący zadanie
	w języku polskim	w języku angielskim	
1.	Przegląd dotychczasowych badań PGSW/CSES pod kątem metodologii i założeń teoretycznych	Review of previous PNES/CSES studies as regards their methodology and theoretical assumptions	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
2.	Przygotowanie narzędzia do badania CAWI	Preparation of tool for CAWI research	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
3.	Przygotowanie narzędzia do badania CAPI	Preparation of tool for CAPI research	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
4.	Pierwsza fala badań CAWI	First wave of CAWI research	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
5.	Dostosowanie narzędzia do badania CAWI do drugiej fali	Calibration of tool for the second wave of CAWI research	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
6.	Druga fala badań CAWI	Second wave of CAWI research	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
7.	Obróbka danych z badań CAWI	Processing data obtained from CAWI research	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
8.	Badanie CAPI	CAPI research	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

9.	Obróbka danych z badań CAPI	Processing data obtained from CAPI research	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
10.	Tworzenie zintegrowanej bazy danych PGSW z lat 1997 - 2015	Creation of integrated PNES database containing data from 1997 to 2015	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
11.	Łączenie danych PGSW 2019 ze zintegrowaną bazą danych	Integrating PNES 2019 data into the integrated database	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
12.	Analiza danych pod kątem przedstawionych w opisie projektu podstawowych pytań badawczych	Data analysis focused on fundamental research questions, mentioned in the project description	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
13.	Analiza danych pod kątem możliwości wykorzystania internetowych narzędzi badawczych w ramach kolejnych edycji PGSW	Data analysis focused on the possibility to utilise internet-based survey tools in the following editions of PNES	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences
14.	Formułowanie wniosków	Formulation of conclusions	SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie, Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Społecznych SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

UWAGA: Zadaniem badawczym nie jest np. zakup aparatury, udział w konferencji, przygotowanie publikacji itp. Zadania badawcze muszą zawierać tożsamą treść w języku polskim i angielskim.

KOSZTORYS

Pozycja	Rok 2019	Rok 2020	Rok 2021	Rok 2022	Razem
1	2	3	4	5	6
Koszty bezpośrednie realizacji projektu, w tym:	499 490	138 090	200 680	105 080	943 340
- wynagrodzenia wraz z pochodnymi i stypendia naukowe	60 000	120 000	186 000	93 000	459 000
- koszty aparatury naukowo-badawczej, urządzeń i oprogramowania	8 000	3 410	0	0	11 410
- inne koszty bezpośrednie	431 490	14 680	14 680	12 080	472 930
Koszty pośrednie	196 596	53 872	80 272	42 032	372 772
Koszty realizacji projektu ogółem	696 086	191 962	280 952	147 112	1 316 112

Kalkulacja i uzasadnienie poszczególnych pozycji kosztorysu**1) Investigator / Staff Costs**

a) Number of Investigators: 5

The number of individuals to constitute the basis for the calculation of additional remuneration budget: 3

b) Investigators: nature of their contribution in the project and a justification of investigator costs

No.	Full name / Nature of contribution in the project / Type and character of position	Employing entity	Project-related remuneration period (months)	Total salary cost on grant (PLN)
1.	prof. dr hab. Radosław Markowski Principal Investigator Position: no full-time position, other	SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences	36	72 000
	Scope of work within individual project tasks:	a) Coordination and management of the project; b) Leader of the team designing the research tools (research task 1, 2, 3, 5); c) Leader of the team responsible for data processing (research tasks 7, 9); d) Leader of the team responsible for all PNES data integration (research tasks 10, 11); e) Leader of the team analysing the data and interpreting the results (research task 12, 13, 14);		
2.	Co-investigator Co-Investigator Position: no full-time position, other	SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences	36	63 000
	Scope of work within individual project tasks:	a) Member of the team designing the research tools (research task 1, 2, 3, 5); b) Member of the team responsible for data processing (research tasks 7, 9); c) Member of the team analysing the data and interpreting the results (research task 12, 13, 14);		
3.	Co-investigator Co-Investigator Position: no full-time position, other	SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences	36	63 000
	Scope of work within individual project tasks:	a) Member of the team designing the research tools (research task 1, 2, 3, 5); b) Member of the team responsible for data processing (research tasks 7, 9); c) Member of the team analysing the data and interpreting the results (research task 12, 13, 14);		
4.	Scholar Co-Investigator Position: scholarship position, PhD student type	SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences	18	81 000
	Scope of work within individual project tasks:	a) Assistant of the project; b) Assistant of the team designing the research tools (research task 1, 2, 3, 5); b) Member of the team responsible for data processing (research tasks 7, 9); c) Member of the team analysing the data and interpreting the results (research task 12, 13, 14);		
5.	Post-doc Co-Investigator Position: full-time position, post-doc type	SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences	18	180 000
	Scope of work within individual project tasks:	a) Analyst responsible for integration of all PNES datasets (research tasks 10, 11) c) Member of the team analysing the data and interpreting the results (research task 12, 13, 14);		
Total:				459 000

2) List of equipment to be purchased and/or built

No.	Nazwa aparatury	Purchasing entity	Year of purchase	Unit Cost (PLN)	Amount	Cost (PLN)	Contribution of the NCN (PLN)
1.	Przenośny komputer osobisty	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences	2019	4 000	2	8 000	8 000
	Justification of purchase:	Two personal portable computers for the research team. Computers are expected to be able of quick and effective procession of data (large computational power, large amount of operational memory). Additionally, a package of MS Office software will be purchased for each computer. Computers will be used exclusively by the members of research teams for the the purposes related to realization of research tasks.					
2.	Oprogramowanie Mplus Base Program and Combination Add-On	Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences	2020	3 410	1	3 410	3 410
	Justification of purchase:	Analytical part of the project includes various kinds of multivariate modeling (described in details in the project description file). Such analyses require appropriate software, what makes it necessary to purchase a copy of the Mplus statistical analysis package with Combination Add-ons (the package which combines Mixture and Multilevel add-ons), which not only is able to handle planned analyses, but also is widely regarded as the gold standard for the analysis of complex structural equation models and multilevel models. Mplus Version 8.2 University Pricing for Mplus Base Program and Combination Add-On equals \$895 (according to pricing available on the software website https://www.statmodel.com/pricing.shtml), which (according to 14.12.18 NBP exchange rate 1\$=3,8095 PLN gives 3410 PLN).					
Total:						11 410	11 410

3) Other costs justification (in English)

(Please list and justify type of costs, estimated costs in accordance with the research plan)

Outsourced services

(services ordered from entities external to the Host Institution)

Cost: 421 890,00

In order to get relevant, quality data we need to outsource realization of surveys to professional public research agencies. In order to accomplish the substantive and methodological goals of the project and answer our research questions we need to realize two kinds of fieldworks: face to face postelectoral survey and online panel survey.

According to the request for proposal we have submitted to PBS and Kantar, the cost of such surveys is as follows:
the cost of two waves of CAWI survey (N=1000 per wave) equals 95 940 PLN.
the cost of CAPI survey (N = 1700) equals 325 950 PLN.

The sample size guarantees the robust analyses of electorates of political parties with various levels of support.

Previous PNES surveys and other similar surveys realized by the team were shared with the public research agencies in order to estimate the duration of each surveys and type of questions asked.

Total costs in the outsourced services category equals 421890 PLN. The cost is related to research tasks 4, 6, 8.

Conferences and business trips

(by members of the research team)

Cost: 36 240,00

The knowledge and experience gained during various stages of the project must be disseminated, thus we plan to present the project at academic conferences in Poland and abroad. Members of the project team should attend congresses, conferences, workshops and training courses.

We intend to present the results of the project at the most important political science conferences in Poland (Ogólnopolski Kongres Politologii, Ogólnopolski Zjazd Socjologiczny, thematic conferences organized by prominent Polish universities) and abroad (European Consortium of Political Research General Conference, European Political Science Association Annual Conference). Moreover we plan to participate in ECPR Joint Sessions during which young and experienced scholars have unique chance to exchange the knowledge with other researchers of the field.

The money planned for these actions (36240 PLN) will be spent on conference fees, travel, accommodation and all other expenses related to these trips. Estimated cost of one conference per person equals approximately 1160 (in Poland) – 5460 PLN (in Europe), altogether we plan 8-10 conference trips (at least one trip per team member). The detailed estimation is included in the table below.

		EURO	PLN	AMOUNT	NUMBER OF CONFERENCES	SUM
POLAND	Fee		500,00 zł	1	3	1500,00 zł
	Transport		200,00 zł	1	3	600,00 zł
	Accommodation		200,00 zł	2	3	1200,00 zł
	Diets		30,00 zł	2	3	180,00 zł
EUROPE	Fee	250*	1075,00 zł	1	6	6450,00 zł
	Transport		2000,00 zł	1	6	12000,00 zł
	Accommodation	140*	602,00 zł	3	6	10836,00 zł
	Diets	45*	193,00 zł	3	6	3474,00 zł
TOTAL						36240,00 zł

* 1 EUR = 4,3 PLN - average exchange rate from NBP (3.12.2018).

We estimate the cost of a single conference in Poland for 1160 PLN. The estimate is based on average prices for conference fees (500 PLN), accommodation (150 PLN) and transport (train ticket - 200 PLN). The conference fees in Poland (in conferences we are interested in) range from 450 PLN (Kongres Politologii) to 650 PLN (Zjazd Socjologiczny), the fee for smaller events may be cheaper). The cost of transport and accommodation is based on average estimates of such costs (hotels and train tickets) in Poland. The diets are estimates according to the MPiPS Regulation (Dz.U. 2013 poz. 167).

We estimate the cost of a single European conference for 5460 PLN. The estimate is based on average prices for conference fees (250 EUR = 1075 PLN), accommodation (140 EUR = 602 PLN) and transport (plane ticket - 2000 PLN). The conference fees in Poland (in conferences we are interested in) range from 175 EUR (ECPR Joint SESSION) to 350 EUR (EPSA Conference). Due to the limited knowledge about the localization of the conferences (we know only the localization of the next ECPR and EPSA events) we use average diets and accommodation rates for European countries (estimated on the basis of the MPiPS Regulation). The cost of transport is based on average estimates of plane tickets in Europe. The cost is related to dissemination of the results of the project (research tasks 11, 12, 13). Total costs in the conferences and business trips category equals 36240 PLN.

Visits and consultations

(travel expenses / travel expenses by external collaborators and/or consultants and costs of meetings)

Cost: 14 800,00

During the course of the project we plan to invite several scholars in order to get feedback related to substantial and methodological aspects of the project.

We plan to organize three 2 day meetings (seminars) with prominent scholars involved in electoral research, with particular focus on survey experiments. We plan to invite experts from leading (e.g. Central European University, University of Exeter, Oslo University, Oxford University, NY University), leaders in political science experiments.

The estimated cost of such visit equals 2600 PLN, on the basis of average costs of plane transport in Europe (the European plane ticket prices vary between 300-1800 PLN) and accommodation in Poland (200 PLN/night). The detailed estimation is included in the table below.

	PLN	DAYS/VISIT	NUMBER OF VISITS	SUM
Transport	2000,00 zł		3	6000,00 zł
Accommodation	200,00 zł	2	3	1200,00 zł
Diets	100,00 zł	2	3	600,00 zł
TOTAL				7800,00 zł

We plan to organize one 5 days workshop devoted to methodological issues related to electoral online research. We plan to invite at least two scholars from prominent electoral research centers, leaders in the field in order to get knowledge related among others to threats and opportunities of online electoral research, methods of combining of the CAPI and CAWI results, and methods of efficient analysis of mixed data.

The estimated cost of such visit equals 3500 PLN per person, on the basis of average costs of plane transport in Europe and accommodation in Poland.

The detailed estimation is included in the table below. The total cost of such workshop equals 7000 PLN.

	PLN	DAYS/VISIT	NUMBER OF VISITORS	SUM
Transport	2000,00 zł		2	4000,00 zł
Accommodation	200,00 zł	5	2	2000,00 zł
Diets	100,00 zł	5	2	1000,00 zł
TOTAL				7000,00 zł

The cost is related to task 2, 3, 5, 12 and 13. Total costs in the conferences and business trips category equals 14800 PLN.

4) Investigators' qualifications

(Qualifications required from investigators involved in the project)

The project includes two co-investigators, experienced in the fields of electoral research, who possess knowledge, skills and abilities to ensure project success. They have relevant methodological know-how, related to public opinion research (resulting from experience in social research and marketing projects) as well as skills in quantitative data analysis, including proficiency in using appropriate software (SPSS, R, Stata).

An open competition for cooperation in the project will involve

- a) the scholar (MA student or PhD candidate) interested in electoral studies, with quantitative analytical skills.
- b) the researcher with a PhD degree (social or political sciences) experienced in electoral research and advanced in quantitative data analysis,

The scholar and the post - doc co-investigators will be selected in fully competitive recruitment procedure, carried out in accordance with the criteria of granting scholarships (in case of the former) and criteria of employing a post-doc (in case of the latter) in projects financed by the National Science Center.

OŚWIADCZENIA KIEROWNIKA PROJEKTU prof. dr hab. Radosław Markowski

1. Oświadczam, że stopień doktora nauk **politycznych** został mi nadany w roku **1990** przez **Uniwersytet Warszawski**.
2. Oświadczam, że zadania badawcze, objęte niniejszym wnioskiem, nie są i nie były finansowane z NCN, jak również z innego źródła.
Oświadczam, że równocześnie nie ubiegam / ~~ubiegam~~ się o finansowanie tych zadań przez NCN jak również z innego źródła.
3. Oświadczam, że w przypadku uzyskania finansowania na zadania objęte wnioskiem z innego źródła niezwłocznie poinformuję o tym fakcie NCN, i:
 - a. powiadomię osobę upoważnioną do reprezentacji podmiotu będącego wnioskodawcą o rezygnacji z ubiegania się o finansowanie zadań badawczych w tym konkursie, albo
 - b. zrezygnuję z przyjęcia finansowania zadań badawczych z innego źródła.
4. Oświadczam, że w przypadku przyznania decyzją Dyrektora NCN finansowania na zadania objęte wnioskiem:
 - a. powiadomię osobę upoważnioną do reprezentacji podmiotu będącego wnioskodawcą o rezygnacji ze środków przyznanych na realizację zadań badawczych przez Dyrektora NCN w tym konkursie, albo
 - b. zrezygnuję z ubiegania się o finansowanie zadań badawczych z innych źródeł.
5. Oświadczam, że jestem świadomy, że:
 - a. NCN z siedzibą w Krakowie przy ul. Królewskiej 57, 30-081 Kraków jest administratorem danych osobowych podanych we wniosku;
 - b. kontakt z wyznaczonym Inspektorem Ochrony Danych w NCN możliwy jest za pomocą poczty elektronicznej (e-mail: iod@ncn.gov.pl), telefonicznie pod numerem +48 12 341 91 13 lub bezpośrednio w siedzibie administratora danych osobowych;
 - c. podstawę prawną przetwarzania danych osobowych przez NCN, w celu wypełnienia obowiązków prawnych na nim ciążyących, stanowi art. 6 ust. 1 lit. c) Rozporządzenia Parlamentu Europejskiego i Rady (UE) 2016/679 z dnia 27 kwietnia 2016 r. w sprawie ochrony osób fizycznych w związku z przetwarzaniem danych osobowych i w sprawie swobodnego przepływu takich danych oraz uchylenia dyrektywy 95/46/WE (ogólne rozporządzenie o ochronie danych) (Dz. Urz. UE L 2016, Nr 119, s.1) w zw. z art. 20 ustawy z dnia 30 kwietnia 2010 r. o NCN (t.j. Dz. U. 2018, poz. 947);
 - d. dane osobowe będą przetwarzane w celu oceny wniosku o finansowanie projektu badawczego, a w przypadku przyznania środków na jego realizację w celu nadzoru, obsługi finansowo – księgowej, kontroli w trakcie jak i po zakończeniu realizacji projektu oraz oceny realizacji i rozliczenia umowy o realizację i finansowanie projektu badawczego, a także w celu ustalenia, dochodzenia lub obrony przed roszczeniami. Ponadto dane osobowe będą przetwarzane w celu przeprowadzania ewaluacji realizacji zadań NCN, sprawozdawczości, upowszechniania w środowisku naukowym informacji o ogłaszanych przez NCN konkursach oraz ich rezultatach, realizacji innych czynności regulowanych przepisami prawa powszechnie obowiązującego oraz w celach archiwalnych;
 - e. dane osobowe będą przetwarzane przez okres niezbędny do realizacji celów wskazanych w lit. d) oraz przez okres wymagany przepisami prawa powszechnie obowiązującego oraz przez okres przechowywania zgodny z instrukcją kancelaryjną NCN i Jednolitym Rzeczym Wykazem Akt;
 - f. podanie danych osobowych stanowi wymóg ustawowy i bez ich podania nie można zrealizować celów wskazanych w lit. d);
 - g. odbiorcami danych osobowych mogą być wyłącznie podmioty uprawnione do uzyskiwania danych osobowych na podstawie przepisów powszechnie obowiązującego prawa, oraz w zakresie określonym w art. 31 ustawy z dnia 30 kwietnia 2010 r. o NCN, osoby korzystające ze strony podmiotowej NCN;
 - h. dane osobowe mogą być powierzone do przetwarzania podmiotom zewnętrznym w ramach realizowanych przez nie usług, na podstawie umów o powierzenie danych osobowych, a podmioty te również zobowiązane są do zachowania poufności przetwarzanych danych;
 - i. osoba, której dane dotyczą ma prawo dostępu do treści swoich danych osobowych, sprostowania swoich danych osobowych, ograniczenia przetwarzania swoich danych osobowych;
 - j. osoba, której dane dotyczą ma prawo wniesienia skargi do Prezesa Urzędu Ochrony Danych Osobowych w przypadku gdy uzna, że przetwarzanie narusza przepisy ogólnego rozporządzenia o ochronie danych.
6. Oświadczam, że projekt badawczy obejmuje badania:
 - a. ~~wymagające zgody lub pozytywnej opinii właściwej komisji bioetycznej;~~
 - b. ~~wymagające zgody właściwej komisji etycznej ds. doświadczeń na zwierzętach;~~
 - c. ~~wymagające zgody na podstawie przepisów o mikroorganizmach i organizmach genetycznie zmodyfikowanych;~~
 - d. ~~wymagające zgody lub zezwolenia na badania na gatunkach chronionych lub na obszarach objętych ochroną;~~
 - e. ~~wymagające innych pozwoleń, zgodnie z zasadami dobrej praktyki w danej dziedzinie / dyscyplinie naukowej;~~
 - f. ~~kliniczne podlegające ustawie z dnia 6 września 2001 r. z późn. zm. o prawie farmaceutycznym lub ustawie z dnia 20 maja 2010 r. z późn. zm. o wyrobach medycznych~~

i zobowiązuję się do uzyskania wymaganych zgód, opinii, zezwoleń oraz pozwoleń przed rozpoczęciem realizacji badań, których dotyczą.

7. Oświadczam, że jestem ~~autorem~~/ współautorem szczegółowego i skróconego opisu projektu badawczego w niniejszym wniosku.

Lista współautorów

dr hab. Mikołaj Cześnik (Uniwersytet SWPS)

dr Benjamin Stanley (Uniwersytet SWPS)

8. Oświadczam, że:

- a. zapoznałam/-em się z zasadami doręczania decyzji Dyrektora NCN;
 - b. wyrażam zgodę na dokonanie weryfikacji wniosku przy pomocy oprogramowania antyplagiatowego oraz umieszczenie treści wniosku w bazie danych oprogramowania;
 - c. zapoznałam/em się z treścią *Kodeksu Narodowego Centrum Nauki dotyczącego rzetelności badań naukowych i starania o fundusze na badania* i zobowiązuję się do jego stosowania.
-

OŚWIADCZENIA OSOBY/OSÓB UPOWAŻNIONEJ/YCH DO REPREZENTOWANIA PODMIOTU BĘDĄCEGO WNIOSKODAWCĄ

SWPS Uniwersytet Humanistycznospołeczny z siedzibą w Warszawie

1. Oświadczam, że zadania badawcze, objęte niniejszym wnioskiem, nie są i nie były finansowane z NCN, jak również z innego źródła.
Oświadczam, że podmiot, który reprezentuję ~~nie ubiega~~ / ~~ubiega~~ się równocześnie o finansowanie tych zadań z NCN jak również z innego źródła.
2. Oświadczam, że w przypadku uzyskania finansowania na zadania objęte wnioskiem z innego źródła niezwłocznie poinformuję o tym fakcie NCN, i:
 - a. zrezygnuję z ubiegania się o finansowanie zadań badawczych w tym konkursie, albo
 - b. zrezygnuję z przyjęcia finansowania zadań badawczych z innego źródła.
3. Oświadczam, że w przypadku przyznania decyzją Dyrektora NCN finansowania na zadania lub staż objęte wnioskiem:
 - a. zrezygnuję ze środków przyznanych na realizację zadań badawczych przyznanych przez Dyrektora NCN w tym konkursie, albo
 - b. zrezygnuję z ubiegania się o finansowanie z innego źródła.
4. Działając w imieniu podmiotu, który reprezentuję, w przypadku przyjęcia do finansowania zobowiązuję się do:
 - a. włączenia projektu badawczego do planu zadaniowo-finansowego podmiotu;
 - b. zatrudnienia kierownika projektu badawczego na zasadach zgodnych z wnioskiem i warunkami konkursu;
 - c. zatrudniania wykonawców niezbędnych do realizacji projektu na zasadach zgodnych z wnioskiem i warunkami konkursu;
 - d. zapewnienia warunków do realizacji prowadzonych badań, w tym udostępnienia przestrzeni biurowej/laboratoryjnej oraz aparatury naukowo badawczej niezbędnej do realizacji tych badań;
 - e. zapewnienia obsługi administracyjno-finansowej realizacji projektu badawczego;
 - f. sprawowania nadzoru nad realizacją projektu badawczego i prawidłowością wydatkowanych na ten cel środków finansowych.
5. Oświadczam, że projekt badawczy obejmuje badania:
 - a. ~~wymagające zgody lub pozytywnej opinii właściwej komisji bioetycznej;~~
 - b. ~~wymagające zgody właściwej komisji etycznej ds. doświadczeń na zwierzętach;~~
 - c. ~~wymagające zgody na podstawie przepisów o mikroorganizmach i organizmach genetycznie zmodyfikowanych;~~
 - d. ~~wymagające zgody lub zezwolenia na badania na gatunkach chronionych lub na obszarach objętych ochroną;~~
 - e. ~~wymagające innych pozwoleń, zgodnie z zasadami dobrej praktyki w danej dziedzinie / dyscyplinie naukowej;~~
 - f. ~~kliniczne podlegające ustawie z dnia 6 września 2001 r. z późn. zm. o prawie farmaceutycznym lub ustawie z dnia 20 maja 2010 r. z późn. zm. o wyrobach medycznych~~
 i zobowiązuję się do uzyskania wymaganych zgód, opinii, zezwoleń oraz pozwoleń przed rozpoczęciem realizacji badań, których dotyczą.
6. W przypadku zakwalifikowania wniosku do finansowania, wyrażam zgodę na zamieszczenie, wraz z informacją o wynikach konkursu, na stronie podmiotowej NCN oraz na stronie Ośrodka Przetwarzania Informacji (OPI) popularnonaukowego streszczenia projektu.
7. Działając w imieniu podmiotu, który reprezentuję oświadczam, że:
 - a. zapoznałam/-em się z zasadami doręczania decyzji Dyrektora NCN;
 - b. zapoznałam/-em się z zasadami występowania pomocy publicznej i finansowanie projektu nie będzie stanowić pomocy publicznej dla podmiotu;
 - c. zapoznałam/em się z treścią *Kodeksu Narodowego Centrum Nauki dotyczącego rzetelności badań naukowych i starania o fundusze na badania* i zobowiązuję się do jego stosowania;
 - d. wyrażam zgodę na dokonanie weryfikacji wniosku przy pomocy oprogramowania antyplagiatowego oraz umieszczenie treści wniosku w bazie danych oprogramowania.

SKRÓCONY OPIS PROJEKTU

1. Research project objectives

Since its launch in 1997, the **key objective of the Polish National Election Study (PNES; in Polish: Polskie Generalne Studium Wyborcze, PNES)** has been to cover the most significant electoral event in Polish politics, the election to the two chambers of the National Assembly, the **Sejm and the Senate**. The PNES follows the logic of national election studies worldwide, seeking to clarify the aggregate result of elections and to explain the individual choices of citizens regarding turnout (whether to participate in an election or not), and vote choice (for whom to cast a vote). The PNES has given rise to many publications that have made a significant contribution to the study of Polish politics and democracy (see, above all, Markowski 2002; Markowski, Tucker 2005; Jasiewicz 2008; Cześnik, Żerkowska-Balas, Kotnarowski 2013; Kotnarowski, Markowski 2014; Tworzecki, Markowski 2014; Markowski, Cześnik, Kotnarowski 2015).

The project has two main goals: 1) the substantive measurement of post-electoral political attitudes (in part consistent with the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, CSES modules framework) and; 2) a methodological test of the validity of internet panel surveys for measurement of political attitudes. The first goal, i.e. the post-electoral PNES/CSES study of political attitudes, is the main substantive objective of our project. We will measure attitudes serving the comparative purpose of CSES, as well as country-specific questions related to the research agenda: the significance of social embeddedness of citizens for political behaviour, information ecosystems and the increasing fragmentation of individual-level political identities. The second goal is methodological. Classical methodology stipulates that optimal results are obtained on random samples with full response rate, conducted via face-to-face interviewing. These conditions are, for various reasons, increasingly difficult to obtain. Various alternative solutions have been explored, such as behaviour observation or mixing CATI random samples with predictive models. Another route is the development of CAWI interviewing. This avenue offers numerous advantages (economic, variety of possible interviewing tactics, potential for development, etc.). However, sampling and incomplete internet access remain major hindrances in applying this method. Our aim is therefore to use our methodological test to develop a set of corrective tools to obtain results valid for making inferences about the general population from a quota internet panel.

The major research questions the PNES has sought to answer in the past and will continue to examine in its 2019 wave, are: (1) what mode and quality of political representation and accountability is experienced by particular groups of citizens (Achen 1978; Mansbridge 2003) (2) to what extent traditional models of cleavage politics explain the behaviour of voters, compared with novel forms of social interaction such as private networks and more contingent and fluid forms of social identity (Lipset & Rokkan 1967; Knutsen & Scarbrough 1995; Rossteutscher & Stegmüller 2014; Markowski & Stanley 2016) (3) to what extent normative visions and evaluations of specific aspects of democracy influence citizens' political preferences and electoral behaviour (Ferrin & Kriesi 2016; Goodin 2008) (4) what role political knowledge, media exposure and political efficacy plays in contributing to the formation of citizens' political consciousness and choices (Althaus 2003; Luskin 1990); (5) which issue stances or specific policy proposals and which broad ideological leanings influence citizens' political preferences and voting behaviour; (6) the importance of the impact of retrospective and prospective, egotropic and sociotropic evaluations of the economic situation for determining citizens' political preferences (Lewis-Beck & Paldam 2000; Kotnarowski, Markowski 2014); (7) verification of the precise role of party identification in influencing the vote and its location in the chain of causality, and in particular: is party identification, as in the US case, the "unmoved mover" (Campbell et al 1960; Holmberg 2007), or are political preferences in Poland dependent on vote choice itself? (Thomassen 1976; Fiorina 1981); (8) exactly which configurations of "cross-pressures" have a decisive impact on citizens' political behaviour and voting preferences.

Each successive wave of the PNES has seen both continuity and change. The constant presence of key elements of the survey makes it possible to observe changes over time, while the inclusion of innovative elements ensures the PNES is responsive to the specific character of the context in which particular elections take place. The Polish political system has undergone significant changes over the last 2-3 years. The legislative majority enjoyed by the current government has enabled it to push through measures restructuring the political system in Poland, attracting the attention of Polish constitutionalists and global institutions dealing with the rule of law and the quality of democracy. These trends, which have also been observed in several other democratic countries in recent years, are a context our project cannot ignore.

Consequently, the 2019 PNES survey will maintain its tradition of continuity and change. **At the same time, it will also incorporate novel elements not yet seen in previous iterations.** While maintaining the PNES tradition, we will move towards a new approach to the study of electoral politics in Poland. This is informed by three key developments. **First**, since the 2015 election, **the dynamic of Polish politics has changed significantly, leading to qualitative differences in the character of Polish democracy** in comparison with the situation in the preceding election. **Second**, **new and influential theories of electoral behaviour require us to reconsider old assumptions about the relationship between factors which influence electoral**

outcomes (Rossteutscher & Stegmueller 2014; Achen & Bartels 2016). **Third, the increasing difficulties in using traditional face-to-face survey methods** to obtain representative, reliable and cost-effective samples of national populations require us to explore new ways of collecting data that might contribute to the future sustainability of the PNES and provide a model for other surveys to follow.

2. Significance of the project

As the PNES project has been financed from public funds, it exists to serve the public good, providing Poles with reliable information about the party-political preferences, attitudes and behaviour of their fellow citizens in comparative perspective. **It is distinguished for its temporal coverage, which runs unbroken from the parliamentary elections of 1997.** PNES data have been used in dozens of peer-reviewed articles and monograph chapters, both in Polish and in foreign languages, and the results of the PNES have been presented in extensive fashion in the major Polish political and sociological science journals *Studia Polityczne* and *Studia Socjologiczne*.

Aside from being the leading post-electoral study in Poland (awarded the Stefan Nowak Prize in 2008), the PNES is also a well-established and internationally recognized project that contributes to the comparative stock of knowledge about electoral behaviour, in particular through the **inclusion of successive modules of the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES), the major cross-national post-electoral survey available to scholars of political science. The PNES remains the only study in Central and Eastern Europe to have included all four CSES modules to date.** This project will allow us to continue the PNES series for a further iteration, maintaining the CSES data coverage by incorporating Module 5 of that series, and providing the international political science community with a tool for over-time and cross-national comparison of the preferences, attitudes and behaviour of Polish voters.

The **PNES covers the broadly conceived core concerns of electoral analysis** (van der Eijk 2002), that is, participation in elections, vote choice, party identification, attitudes towards specific parties and politicians, broad ideological leanings, and specific issue stances, and internal and external political efficacy, to name only the most important variables. This core component is repeated in each iteration of the survey using the same design and wording, making it possible to identify and compare changes in citizens' attitudes and preferences. **The non-core element covers different domains depending on more proximate and context-relevant concerns**, such as attitudes to the European Union (Markowski, Tucker 2005, 2010), political clientelism and economic voting (Kotnarowski, Markowski 2014), populism (Jasiewicz 2008; Stanley 2018) and party system development (Markowski 2008; 2016; Stanley 2014; Kwiatkowska et al. 2016).

The 2019 PNES will incorporate two innovative changes in its design, influenced by important recent theoretical reconsiderations. **The first** of these is informed by Achen and Bartels's (2016) injunction that **greater emphasis should be placed on the nature of citizens' social identities and their newly-created bonds in informal networks.** This work has attracted substantial attention and has been subjected to empirical testing in (primarily) the European context (Dassonneville & Wass 2017; Patkos 2017). Our goal is to test the relative impact of social identities and bonds as theorized by Achen and Bartels compared with that of cleavages, retrospective accountability, quality of policy representation and other traditional explanatory factors in the determination of vote choice.

Our second innovation is to embrace the long-neglected methodological insistence on the "heterogeneity assumption" in the study of electoral behaviour (cf. Rivers 1988). Fundamental changes, such as the decline of cleavages, the weakening of party identification, the increasing instability of voters' preferences, and decreasing levels of ideological and party loyalty among voters have led to significant shifts in the dominant paradigm that governs the study of elections, public opinion and vote choice. This has consequences for the continuing applicability of theories and models of these phenomena that assume a homogeneity of explanatory factors and a homogeneity of outcome. While existing theories and models may still work in some cases, as general explanations they are inadequate to the task of explaining contemporary electoral behaviour in all its variety. Citizens, the groups they organize themselves into, and the individual and collective political attachments they make are much more heterogeneous – both in space and across time – than has hitherto been assumed, and our theories and approaches to the research of electoral behaviour should reflect this.

The overall analytical frame of the PNES remains a version of the Michigan funnel of causality. However, the Michigan model is extended in important ways in accordance with the discussion above. First, the proposed PNES model will expand upon the Columbia School tradition of sociological factors (both ascribed and achieved) to **incorporate interactive relationships and identities springing from participation in new social networks.** Primarily, our objective is to estimate the relative impact of traditional cleavage politics compared with that of less formal, network-driven bonds and new social identities (Rossteutscher & Stegmueller 2014). The **second** important contribution is a focus on the quality of political representation and accountability which builds on traditional approaches to promissory and societal representation (Pitkin 1967) **to explore the impact of alternative modes of representation, in particular surrogate representation** (Mansbridge 2003), in which political representation is carried out by non-political institutions such as

prominent journalists, important newspapers, churches, trade unions and similar organizations. **Third**, in contrast to classical approaches to political accountability which concentrate mainly on the deeds of incumbents and their economic performance (Przeworski et al 1999) **we conceive of political accountability as pertaining also to axiological, symbolic and identitarian issues.**

Thus, according to the postulates of the Michigan model, the decision of citizens to vote for a particular party is typically a combination of numerous factors, operationalized as independent variables, which are grouped and related to each other according to their causal distance from the dependent variable of vote choice (Campbell et al. 1960). **In this project, our point of departure is an alternative analytical proposal based on Miller and Shanks (1996) which offers a multi-stage explanatory model:** a set of several temporally ordered stages that reliably account for vote choice.

3. Research plan and design

Political scientists have tended to approach electoral behaviour from a single perspective. **In our view, the contemporary scholar of elections, vote choice and public opinion should adopt a multi-perspective approach**, particularly in light of fundamental changes over time in the relative importance of competing causal mechanisms for the explanation of voting behaviour. **In advanced contemporary economies** that have been the most directly exposed to the revolution in communications technology that globalisation has created, we can observe a **dramatic change in the study of public opinion**. Social surveys and public opinion research are undergoing a transition from the classical face-to-face interview model to a new methodological approach based on more extensive use of telephone and internet surveys. While there are some disadvantages to this change, the harnessing of new technologies makes it significantly easier for researchers to pursue the accurate testing of complex hypotheses and arrive at a more nuanced understanding of public opinion and its electoral consequences through the use of, for example, experimental techniques hitherto less feasible, or rolling panel studies previously too expensive for all but the best resourced organisations to consider. At the same time, a **gap has opened up between the most advanced economies and the less developed and more recently democratised European countries, including Poland, with respect to the quality of social survey research capacities**. This results from a combination of de-professionalization, inadequate public investment, and lack of interest in the production of reliable social survey research. One of the key motivations of this project is to begin remedying this situation in the Polish case, in ways that could potentially be replicated elsewhere. Specifically, we propose to trial the CAWI panel research technique alongside the classical CAPI face-to-face interviews which have until now been the basis of the PNES.

Aside from the aforementioned innovations, the PNES continues to constitute a research program of significant value both domestically and internationally. As a longitudinal study which employs many cross-nationally comparative modules and questions that have been externally validated by other surveys, PNES is a uniquely rich and relevant source of information about attitudes of Poles, their preferences and political behaviour both over time and cross-nationally. The PNES 2019 will maintain this standard through the integration of the CSES Module 5 battery of questions and selected questions from the European Election Study 2019.

The main empirical task, the surveys themselves, will be undertaken before the election (first wave of CAWI) and during the period of one week to three weeks following the election day, which is most likely to occur in November 2019 (CAPI survey and the second wave of CAWI). During late 2019 and early 2020 the team will begin to produce initial analyses of the survey data, and during 2020 and 2021 will produce a series of articles for publication in internationally significant journals.

4. Methodology

To achieve our research goals, we propose a methodological experiment that consists in a near-simultaneous fielding of surveys using a CAPI sample (n=1500) and a two-wave CAWI sample (n=1000). The CAPI survey serves the core **substantive** goal of our research, while the comparison between CAPI and CAWI panel forms the basis of **methodological** innovation.

The substance of CAPI and CAWI questionnaires will overlap to a certain extent: we estimate that the CAWI questionnaire will use around a third of the modules and questions in the CAPI questionnaire. This overlap will allow us to estimate differences in the character of the sample and the nature of responses between the CAPI and CAWI procedures.

The implementation of new approaches, in particular (quasi-)experimental techniques that are more conducive to testing causal claims about the linkages between socio-demographics, values, preferences and vote choice, has led to an abundance of new findings that have both confirmed and refuted some of the “received wisdoms” of political science with respect to electoral behaviour. **By implementing similar methods in the PNES while retaining the key elements of the project’s tradition, we will be better equipped to conduct reliable tests of assumptions about the Polish voter, and better able to contribute to advancing knowledge about electoral behaviour more generally.**

The CAWI internet panel has two main goals. Firstly, CAWI will primarily serve as a comparison to the CAPI results, allowing us to observe how the two survey methods differ both in terms of the basic socio-

demographics of the sample and also with respect to the core “electoral” questions asked in the traditional CAPI wave. Our intention is for the 2019 iteration to maintain the established traditions of the PNES survey, while enabling us to take the first steps towards moving away from the CAPI method towards a more economically efficient and methodologically sustainable model in the future. This will also enable us better to integrate PNES with the sophisticated digital infrastructures that have made innovative research into public opinion in the advanced countries cheaper, more accurate and policy-relevant.

The simultaneous use of large-scale face-to-face interviews and online surveys will also allow us **to explore the possibility of using methods of multiple imputation in the case of groups that are systematically underrepresented in Polish surveys**. Multiple imputation makes it possible to obtain approximately unbiased estimates of parameters and standard errors where data are missing, based on the values of similar cases in a multivariate analysis (Lall 2016). In the case of online research, advanced models of multiple imputation will be required, since data are not missing at random.

The second goal of the CAWI internet panel is to **provide an opportunity to examine causal relationships between key variable of interest**. Here, the use of pre-election and post-election waves is crucial. As discussed above, the directionality of relationships between socio-demographic status, values and attitudes, political preferences and vote choice is both under-theorised and insufficiently empirically examined. The **quasi-experimental ‘breakpoint’** of an election makes it possible to test hypotheses relevant to these questions, in particular those which pertain to party identification and vote choice (does party identification inform vote choice, as has commonly been assumed, or does the causal arrow run in the opposite direction?). With respect to these and other questions, the two-stage CAWI survey will make it possible to analyse the vote decision-making process in the context of an electoral campaign in ways that have hitherto not been open to us.

In our analyses we will conceptualise the determinants of electoral behaviour in a variety of ways. This will involve a diversity of methodological approaches to the analysis of our data, particularly given our attention to the aforementioned “heterogeneity assumption”. The modern student of elections, voting behaviour and public opinion needs to embrace a multi-perspective approach, given fundamental changes over time in the relative importance of different causal mechanisms. **The PNES 2019 will also be ontologically and methodologically sensitive to the differentiation between macro and micro variables and the diverse contexts in which particular relationships occur, distinguishing between two sets of determinants of the vote: long-term factors** (e.g. cleavage politics, partisan attachments) **and short-term factors** (e.g. retrospective voting, evaluation of government performance). To date, the impact of macro and micro level factors – both separately and interactively – have not been subject to sufficient analysis. Most studies have focused either on the sociological or psychological determinants of voter preferences and his or her behaviour, or on the impact of aggregate national as well as institutional features of elections, with limited attempts to bridge the two. Employing approaches which stress the interdependence of micro and macro-level factors will enable us to move away from this overly restrictive approach.

Our data will enable us to undertake **standard multivariate modelling** where the impact of substantive variables of interest are controlled for by other relevant individual-level variables, **multilevel modelling** which controls for the impact of environmental, contextual variables, and **experimental analysis** in which treatment effects are the quantity of interest. This will require the use of statistical analysis software with the following capabilities: (a) regression generalized linear models, binomial and multinomial logistic regression; (b) structural equation models aimed at observing latent variables and tracing important relationships between variables that allow us to distinguish between direct and indirect effects; (c) multilevel analyses (hierarchical linear models). Statistical analyses will also be performed with MPlus, Stata, SPSS and R software.

5. References

- Achen, C.H. 1978. Measuring Representation, Measuring Representation. *American Journal of Political Science* 22: 475-510.
- Achen, C. H. & L.M. Bartels. 2016. *Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Althaus, S.L. 2003. *Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, A., P. E. Converse, H. Miller & D. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Cześnik, M., M. Żerkowska-Balas & M. Kotnarowski. 2013. Voting as a Habit in New Democracies – Evidence from Poland. *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 46: 95-107.
- Dassonneville, R. & H. Wass. 2017. It's the social identities and partisan loyalties, stupid? The bases for vote choice in Europe, Paper presented at the ECPR General Conference, Oslo, September 6-9, 2017.
- Ferrin, M. & H. Kriesi (eds.). 2016. *How Europeans View and Evaluate Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fiorina, M.P. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Goodin, R. E. 2008. *Innovating Democracy: Democratic Theory and Practice After the Deliberative Turn*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holmberg, S. 2007. Partisanship Reconsidered, in: R. Dalton & H-D. Klingemann, (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jasiewicz, K. 2008. The New Populism in Poland: The Usual Suspects? *Problems of Post-Communism* 55: 7-25.
- Knutsen, O. & E. Scarbrough. 1995. *Cleavage politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kotnarowski, M. & R. Markowski. 2014. Political preferences in times of crisis: Economic voting in the 2011 Polish elections. *Acta Politica* 49: 431–61.
- Kwiatkowska, A., M. Czeńnik & M. Żerkowska-Balas. 2016. Ideologiczna treść wymiaru lewica-prawica w Polsce w latach 1997-2015. *Studia Socjologiczne* 223: 97-129.
- Lall, R. 2016. How Multiple Imputation Makes a Difference. *Political Analysis* 24: 414–433.
- Lewis-Beck M.S. & M. Paldam. 2000. Economic voting: An introduction. *Electoral Studies*: 113-121.
- Lipset, S. M. & S. Rokkan. 1967. *Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments: An Introduction.*, In: S. M. Lipset & S. Rokkan, (eds.) *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives*. New York: Free Press.
- Luskin, R. 1990. Explaining Political Sophistication, *Political Behavior* 13: 331-361.
- Mansbridge, J. 2003. Rethinking Representation, *American Political Science Review*, 97(4),
- Markowski, R. (ed.) 2002. *System partyjny i zachowania wyborcze. Dekada polskich doświadczeń*. Warszawa: ISP PAN i Fundacja im. Friedricha Eberta, pp. 49-72.
- Markowski, R. 2008. The 2007 Polish Parliamentary Election: Some Structuring, Still a Lot of Chaos, *West European Politics* 31 (5): 1055-68.
- Markowski, R. 2016. The Polish parliamentary election of 2015: on free and fair election that results in unfair political consequences, *West European Politics* 39 (6): 1311-1322.
- Markowski, R. (ed.). 2017. *Demokratyczny Audyt Polski 2: Demokracja wyborcza lat 2014-2015*. Warszawa: Biuro RPO.
- Markowski, R. & J. A. Tucker. 2005. Pocketbooks, politics and parties: the 2003 Polish referendum on EU membership. *Electoral Studies* 24: 409-433.
- Markowski, R. & J. A. Tucker. 2010. Euroscepticism and the Emergence of Political Parties in Poland. *Party Politics* 16: 523-548.
- Markowski, R., M. Czeńnik & M. Kotnarowski. 2015. *Demokracja – gospodarka – polityka. Perspektywa polskiego wyborcy*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Markowski, R. & B. Stanley. 2016. Rozłamy socjopolityczne w Polsce: Iluzja czy rzeczywistość? *Studia Socjologiczne* 223: 14-40.
- Miller W. E. & J. Merrill Shanks. 1996. *The New American Voter*. London: Harvard University Press.
- Patkos, V. 2017. Three aspects of political sophistication – which one can be blamed for generating bias?, Paper presented at the ECPR General Conference, Oslo.
- Pitkin, H. F. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Popkin, S. 1991. *The Reasoning Voter: Communication and Persuasion in Presidential Campaigns*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Przeworski, A., S. C. Stokes & B. Manin (eds.). 1999. *Democracy, Accountability and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, D. 1988. Heterogeneity in Models of Electoral Choice. *American Journal of Political Science* 85: 737-757.
- Rossteutscher, S. & D. Stegmueller. 2014. Network Politicization and Political Integration from Grand Cleavages to Private Network Structures, in: B. Weßels, H. Rattinger, S. Roßteutscher & R. Schmitt-Beck, *Voters on the Move or on the Run?* Oxford University Press.
- Stanley, B. 2014. The Dynamics of Party-System Supply and Demand in Poland, 1997-2007. *Cleavage Change or Shapeless Shifting?* *Europe-Asia Studies* 66: 1295-322.
- Stanley, B. 2018. A New Populist Divide? Correspondences of Supply and Demand in the 2015 Polish Parliamentary Elections. *East European Politics and Societies* (online first).
- Thomassen, J. 1976. Party Identification as Cross-National Concept. Its Meaning in the Netherlands, in Budge I., Crewe I., Farlie D., (eds.) *Party Identification and Beyond*. London: John Wiley & Sons, pp. 63-79.
- Tworzecki, H. & R. Markowski, 2014. Knowledge and Partisan Bias: An Uneasy Relationship, *East European Politics and Societies* 28: 836-862.
- van der Eijk, C. 2002. Design issues in electoral research: taking care of (core) business. *Electoral Studies* 21: 189-206.

SZCZEGÓŁOWY OPIS PROJEKTU

1. Research project objectives

Since its launch in 1997, the key objective of the Polish National Election Study (PNES; in Polish: *Polskie Generalne Studium Wyborcze, PGSW*) has been to cover the most significant electoral event in Polish politics, the election to the two chambers of the National Assembly, the Sejm and the Senate¹. The PNES follows the logic of national election studies worldwide, seeking to clarify the aggregate result of an election and to explain the individual choices of citizens regarding turnout (whether to participate in an election or not), and vote choice (for whom to cast a vote).

The project has two goals: 1) the substantive measurement of post-electoral political attitudes (in part consistent with the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems, CSES modules framework) and; 2) methodological test of validity of internet panel surveys for measurement of political attitudes. Goal 1, i.e. the post-electoral PGSW/CSES study of political attitudes, is the paramount substantive objective of our project. We will measure attitudes serving the comparative purpose of CSES, as well as country-specific questions related to the research agenda: significance of social embeddedness of citizens for political behavior, information ecosystems and increasing fragmentation of individual-level political identities. Goal 2 is methodological. Classical methodology stipulates that optimal results are obtained on random samples with full response rate, conducted via face-to-face interviewing. These conditions are, for various reasons, increasingly difficult to obtain. Various alternative solutions have been explored, such as behavior observation or mixing CATI random samples with predictive models. Another route is the development of CAWI interviewing. This avenue offers numerous advantages (economic, variety of possible interviewing tactics, potential for development, etc.). However, sampling and incomplete internet access remain major hindrances in applying this method. Our aim is to develop a set of corrective tools to obtain results valid for making inferences about the general population from a quota internet panel.

Specifically, the major research questions the PNES has sought to answer in the past and continues to in its 2019 wave, are: (1) what mode and quality of political representation and accountability is experienced by particular groups of citizens (Holmberg 1989; Mansbridge 2003; Eulau & Wahlke 1978; Achen 1978) (2) to what extent traditional models of cleavage politics explain the behavior of voters, compared with novel forms of social interaction such as private networks and more contingent and fluid forms of social identity (Lipset & Rokkan 1967; Bartolini & Mair 1990; Knutsen & Scarbrough 1998; Toka 1998; Markowski & Stanley 2016; Rossteutscher & Stegmüller 2014; Zuckermann 2005; Welzel 2006) (3) to what extent normative visions and evaluations of specific aspects of democracy influence citizens' political preferences and electoral behavior (Ferrin & Kriesi 2016; Goodin 2008; Hibbing & Theiss-Morse 2003) (4) what is the role of political knowledge, media exposure and political efficacy in contributing to the formation of citizens' political consciousness and choices (Fraile 2013; Toka 2010; Althaus 2003; Luskin 1990); (5) which issue stances or specific policy proposals and which broad ideological leanings influence citizens' political preferences and voting behavior (Budge & Farlie 1983; Dalton 2011); (6) how important is the impact of retrospective and prospective, egotropic and sociotropic evaluations of the economic situation for determining citizens' political preferences (Fiorina 1981; Lewis-Beck & Paldam 2000; Kotnarowski, Markowski 2014); (7) verification of the precise role of party identification in influencing the vote, and its location in the chain of causality, and in particular: is party identification, as in the US case, the "unmoved mover" (Campbell et al 1960; Holmberg 2007), or are political preferences in Poland dependent on vote choice itself? (Thomassen 1976; Schmitt 2009); (8) exactly which configurations of "cross-pressures" have a decisive impact on citizens' political behavior and voting preferences.

These research questions (RQs) are presented here in their simplest form, approximately in accordance with the successive components of the Michigan "funnel of causality". Additional innovative elements of our model which depart from the Michigan orthodoxy are discussed in the next section.

As the PNES project has been - and hopefully will continue to be - financed from public funds, it exists to serve the public good, providing Poles with reliable information about the party-political preferences, attitudes and behavior of their fellow citizens in comparative perspective. A well-functioning democracy depends on an informed population, and the PNES contributes to the stock of public knowledge about the linkage between the "supply side" of politics (the ideological and programmatic offerings of parties) and the "demand side" (the preferences, priorities and behavior of citizens). For citizens' own choices to have meaning, they must be

¹ It should also be stressed that electoral research predating PNES took place in Poland from the very beginning of the transition to democracy, and the team of researchers which inaugurated PNES undertook survey research into elections as early as the 1990 presidential election. Furthermore, while the main focus of PNES has been parliamentary elections, the team has also covered the majority of presidential elections and elections to the European Parliament.

made within a context of understanding what their compatriots think and feel about political issues, and how they act accordingly.

In light of this requirement, our task is to ensure that the PNES is not only fit for our own specific research topics, but also fits within the broadly accepted canon of electoral studies while attending to contemporary debates relevant to electoral studies. First, this requires us to ensure that the project is well conceptualised, incorporating both the historical and institutional context in which it occurs, while also attending appropriately to the immediate dynamics of the electoral situation, in particular by ensuring an adequate distinction between the pre-electoral and post-electoral contexts, which operate according to distinct logics (Franklin, Wlezien 2002).

Second, we aim to investigate one of the key ontological problems that still remains unresolved in the electoral studies literature: while we know that voting is a choice, is it a choice like any other kind of choice? We incline to the interpretation that it is not, since the effects of our decisions in elections depend also on the decisions of other citizens. Rather than seeing elections as a “market” in which what we get out of elections depends on what we put in, we employ the metaphor of a stock exchange, in which we invest time and energy in processes and decisions whose outcome depends on the decisions of others.

Third, we aim to build a parsimonious model which explains electoral turnout and vote choice. By ‘parsimonious’, we mean a model which explains the maximum possible variance in our dependent variables (turnout and vote choice) with the minimum necessary independent variables. The challenge faced by those attempting to develop such models is to (1) avoid tautological explanations, (2) avoid the collinearity of independent variables, (3) operationalise the context of the election in appropriate fashion, (4) make appropriate choices regarding the likely causal factors at work in determining the relationships between independent and dependent variables.

The research design is longitudinal and cross-nationally comparative. Our realization of the latter aim is strengthened by the inclusion of successive modules of the *Comparative Study of Electoral Systems* (CSES), the major cross-national post-electoral survey available to scholars of political science. PNES remains the only survey in Central and Eastern Europe that has included all four CSES modules to date. Moreover, the PNES is a multi-faceted research enterprise that has featured several tools: apart from a representative public opinion survey of the adult population of Poland, it has also incorporated components analyzing the attitudes, preferences, opinions and socio-demographics of Polish parliamentarians, the nature and impact of media campaigns, the contextual data and the content of party manifestos. This project will allow us to continue the PNES series for a further iteration, maintaining the CSES data coverage by incorporating Module 5 of that series, and providing the international political science community with a tool for over-time and cross-national comparison of the preferences, attitudes and behavior of Polish voters.

Each successive wave of the PNES has seen both continuity and change. The constant presence of key elements of the survey makes it possible to observe changes over time, while the inclusion of innovative elements ensures the PNES is responsive to the specific character of the context in which particular elections take place. The PNES 2019 survey will maintain this combination of continuity and change. At the same time, it will also incorporate novel elements not yet seen in previous iterations. While maintaining the PNES tradition, we will also move towards a new approach to the study of electoral politics in Poland. This is informed by three key developments. First, since the 2015 election, the dynamic of Polish politics has changed significantly, with democratic backsliding and executive capture of independent institutions leading to qualitative differences in the character of Polish democracy in comparison with the situation in the preceding election. Second, new and influential theories of electoral behavior require us to reconsider old assumptions about the relationship between factors which influence electoral outcomes (Achen & Bartels 2016; Blumenstiel 2014). Third, the increasing difficulties in using traditional face-to-face survey methods to obtain representative, reliable and cost-effective samples of national populations requires us to explore new ways of collecting data that might contribute to the future sustainability of the PNES and provide a model for other surveys to follow.

2. Significance of the project

Aside from being the leading post-electoral study in Poland, the PNES is a well-established and internationally recognized project that contributes to the comparative stock of knowledge about electoral behavior, in particular through its incorporation of each iteration of the CSES module. The PNES is distinguished for its temporal coverage, which runs unbroken from the parliamentary elections of 1997. In 2007, the Principal Investigator of the PNES was awarded the Stefan Nowak Prize – one of the two most prestigious prizes in Polish social sciences – in recognition of his achievements in setting up and maintaining the PNES (for details

see his CV). PNES data have been used in dozens of peer-reviewed articles and monograph chapters, both in Polish and in numerous foreign languages, and the results of the PNES have been presented in extensive fashion in the major Polish political and sociological science journals *Studia Polityczne* and *Studia Socjologiczne*.

The PNES covers the broadly conceived core concerns of electoral analysis (van der Eijk 2002), that is, participation in elections, vote choice, party identification, attitudes towards specific parties and politicians, broad ideological leanings, and specific issue stances, and internal and external political efficacy, to name only the most important variables. This core component is repeated in each iteration of the survey using the same design and wording, making it possible to identify and compare changes in citizens' attitudes and preferences. The non-core element covers different domains depending on more proximate and context-relevant concerns, such as attitudes to the European Union (Markowski, Tucker 2005; 2010; McManus, Miller, Markowski, Wasilewski 2003) corruption (MacManus, Miller, Markowski, Wasilewski 2004), political clientelism and economic voting (Kotnarowski, Markowski 2014), populism (Jasiewicz 2008; Stanley 2018) and party system development (Markowski 2006; 2008; 2018; Kwiatkowska et al. 2016, Stanley 2014, Żerkowska et al. 2016).

Thematically, the priority for this project is the context of “backsliding”: the gradual reversion into authoritarianism of several countries – among them, Poland - previously considered to be consolidated democracies, and the upsurge of populist parties in stable Western democracies.

Empirically, the PNES 2019 will incorporate two innovative changes in its design, influenced by important recent theoretical reconsiderations. The first of these is informed by Achen and Bartels's (2016) injunction that greater emphasis should be placed on the nature of citizens' social identities and their newly-created bonds in informal networks. This work has attracted substantial attention and has been subjected to empirical testing in (primarily) the European context (Dassonneville & Wass 2017; Langsaether et al 2017; Patkos 2017). Our goal is to test the relative impact of social identities and bonds as theorized by Achen and Bartels compared with that of cleavages, retrospective accountability, quality of policy representation and other traditional explanatory factors in the determination of vote choice. Our second innovation is to embrace the long-neglected methodological insistence on the “heterogeneity assumption” in the study of electoral behavior (cf Rivers 1988). Fundamental changes, such as the decline of cleavages, the weakening of party identification, the increasing instability of voters' preferences, and decreasing levels of ideological and party loyalty among voters have led to significant shifts in the dominant paradigm that governs the study of elections, public opinion and vote choice. This has consequences for the continuing applicability of theories and models of these phenomena that assume a homogeneity of explanatory factors and a homogeneity of outcome. While existing theories and models may still work in some cases, as general explanations they are inadequate to the task of explaining contemporary electoral behavior in all its variety. Citizens, the groups they organize themselves into, and the individual and collective political attachments they make are much more heterogeneous – both in space and across time – than has hitherto been assumed, and our theories and approaches to the research of electoral behavior should reflect this.

In other words, in the PNES 2019 we depart from the “homogeneity assumption” which leads to the pursuit of general models of the vote function and a common approach to the identification of predictors of voting decisions, and the postulation of a common causal explanation of vote choices of the electorate. Rather than assuming that voters assign similar importance to the same sets of considerations when arriving at their electoral decisions, we assert that studies of electoral behavior should seek to account for different causal factors and paths in arriving at reliable explanations of political behavior.

These innovations are keeping with the governing spirit of the PNES, which since its inauguration has been intended to serve the broader public interest as a collaborative and collective project open to new theoretical contributions and the testing of diverse theories of electoral behavior. As a consequence, the project has always been rich in opportunities for the assessment of competing theories and hypotheses. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized that the Michigan funnel of causality has remained at the core of the PNES, consisting of measures of socio-economic status, parental characteristics and domestic circumstances, party identification, issue stances and policy preferences, ideological leanings and cross-pressures. At the same time, significant new elements of the empirical design have been designed with the purpose of enabling the testing of alternative predictions, such as those derived from theories of political representation, political accountability and responsiveness, or economic voting. This theoretically-informed empirical richness makes it possible to analyze many facets of the *folk theory of democracy*, an approach whose governing assumption is that the actions of politicians, in the shape of policy decisions, is determined mainly with reference to the preferences of citizens (Campbell et al 1960; Dahl 1998; Miller & Shanks 1996; Thomassen 2005; Pitkin 1967;

Mansbridge 2003). Empirical studies that proceed from the folk theory assumptions can take the form of simple proximity analyses (Achen 1978), directional or proximity-based analyses (Rabinowitz, MacDonald 1989), spatial models of party competition (Enelow & Hinich 1984; Robertson 1976), or focus on more demanding issues of political representation such as responsiveness (Achen 1978; Converse and Pierce 1986; Kitschelt et al 1999; Roberts 2010). The folk theory of democracy comes closest to the vision of electoral democracy embodied in the Lincolnian dictum “of the people, by the people and for the people”, according to which the purpose of elections is to ensure that there obtains a persistent responsiveness of governing elites to the preferences of citizens.

The design of the PNES makes it possible to evaluate the applicability of theories of retrospective accountability, according to which citizens’ electoral behavior can primarily be explained by their assessment of the deeds and performance of politicians. This is an approach associated mainly with Fiorina’s (1981) oft-cited work, although its wider roots can be traced back to propositions made by Key (1966) and Kramer (1971). This approach is rooted in the assumption that even if average voters know very little about the complex details of policy formation and implementation, they can nevertheless exert effective control over their leaders simply by assessing the performance of incumbents, penalizing ineffective politicians through their removal from office, and rewarding successful ones through the prolongation of their mandates. This approach assumes that citizens possess high levels of rationality, calculation, and the ability to deliberate on alternatives.

In their recent monograph “Democracy for Realists”, Achen and Bartels (2016) argue that most citizens, even the most sophisticated voters, do not make political choices in accordance with their positions on policy issues; as a consequence, politicians experience significant difficulties in the adequate interpretation of voters’ preferences. Moreover, voters’ also have limited capacity to ‘correctly’ evaluate the accomplishments of governments, struggle to accurately attribute responsibility to political elites for the effects of policies on their own circumstances and on society more broadly, frequently punishing incumbents for phenomena that are unrelated to decisions made by government, and more likely to be the product of factors over which political elites have no direct control. In such circumstances, political accountability is dependent on emotion and heavily influenced by a myopic focus on recent socio-economic developments, such as the few months preceding an election, rather than a more expansive view of the term in office as a whole.

As recent studies of European politics suggest it is necessary to remedy the deficiencies of the folk theory of democracy by incorporating into our explanatory models knowledge from political psychology and social psychology pertaining to such phenomena as group identities, social bonds and reference groups. This requires that we bring social identities and social interactions to the center of our analysis and from regarding the putatively rational individual preferences of citizens as the main factors which explain their electoral behavior. The two preceding PNES waves (2011 and 2015) already incorporated attention to the social interactions of close circles of family and friends, the political knowledge generated within, and the impact of these factors on political attitudes, preferences, and ultimately participation and vote choice (Markowski 2017; Tworzecki, Markowski 2014; Żerkowska-Balas, Lyubashenko, Kwiatkowska 2016).

Achen and Bartels’s critique of the folk theory of democracy two-fold. First, they claim that voters primarily choose parties not on the basis of issue stances or policy preferences but on the basis of bonds, loyalties and a sense of identification with a party or candidate. If true, this phenomenon contradicts the idealized vision of politically sophisticated, reasoning voters (Luskin 1987) whose making vote choices are based on issue preferences or policy opinions. Second, they argue that in relying on cues and heuristic shortcuts such as partisanship, voters’ biases lead them to make irrational voting decisions. The notion that cognitive shortcuts are of low utility for voters in electing parties which will carry out their preferences and operate in their best interests is in direct conflict with an established strain of political science research (Popkin 1991; Lau and Redlawsk 2006).

Achen and Bartels’ ideas can easily be transformed into empirically testable hypotheses. However, the concepts their theoretical model employs require careful conceptualization, in particular the key concept of social identity, which embraces ethnic, occupational, religious and myriad other groups. As Schwennicke (2017: 150 ff) has observed, the very process of identity construction requires more elaboration. We share this concern, and the 2019 PNES project will be designed to allow us to test the impact of the size of social groups, their nature (“offline” or “online”?; “inherited” or chosen”) as well as to investigate the problem of multiple, conflicting social identities? In operationalizing social identities for the purpose of this survey, particular emphasis will be placed on differentiating “shallow” group belonging (often purely formal in character) from the deep emotional linkage and normative identification with an important reference group.

If we follow the arguments of Achen and Bartels (2016), the causal sequence between the three factors is thus relatively straightforward: social identity shapes partisanship and partisan attachments subsequently inform the policy positions that citizens defend. According to a “realist view of elections”, this means that “voters choose a party validating their social and political identities, then rationalize their decisions with appropriate party-supplied reasons” (p. 311). Furthermore, they argue that “[e]ven when fluctuation from partisanship occurs, it often reflects the heightened salience of specific religious, racial, or gender identities instead of issue preferences among voters” (p. 312). This suggests that while social identity may occasionally displace partisanship as a primary cause for vote choice, issue preferences remain of secondary importance.

The picture of the connections between social identities, partisanship, policy preferences and the vote choice that Achen and Bartels draw thus resembles the theoretical model presented in Figure 1. From this figure, it is clear that social identities are thought to inform partisan loyalties, and these party attachments subsequently affect both the vote choices that citizens make as well as the policy preferences they defend. Furthermore, it is expected that social identities can affect the vote choice in a more direct way as well. What is missing from this theoretical model, however, is an arrow from policy preferences to the vote choice. Achen and Bartels indicate that policy preferences and vote choices might well correlate, but this correlation is a result of both being affected by partisan loyalties. In addition, it is possible that in order to avoid cognitive dissonance, voters adjust their preferences in line with their voting behavior – which would be an arrow from the vote choice to policy preferences. While different paths might thus explain a correlation between policy preferences and the vote choice, key to Achen and Bartels’ criticism of “populist” views of democracy is their claim that policy preferences do not inform vote choice. If this model is an accurate description of how citizens decide what parties and candidates to vote for, and what factors inform this choice, the conclusion should indeed be that representative democracy is not functioning optimally, at least from the demand side.

Partisanship can basically be understood as a deep-rooted identification, a lasting tie between an individual and the party she feels closest to (see Campbell et al. 1960). Achen and Bartels (2016: 234) further note that for most scholars, partisanship is both a form and a product of social identity. In line with the theoretical model in Figure 1, Achen and Bartels also consider partisanship a significant factor in shaping policy preferences. They argue, and empirically demonstrate, that partisan loyalties “strongly color citizens’ views about candidates, issues, and even ‘objective’ facts” (p. 269). In short, the assumption of this “realist” model is that policy preferences are endogenous to partisanship.

In Figure 1 we present the original Achen-Bartels schema, with the direction of relationships denoted by the continuous lines and arrows, and our amendments, denoted by dotted lines and arrows.

Figure 1 about here

Our amendments to the Achen-Bartels schema can be summarized as follows: (1) first and most importantly – both in the European context and in Poland in particular, the causal arrow between party identification (PID) and vote choice is an matter for empirical investigation, with the causal impact of vote on PID an entirely plausible alternative hypothesis; (2) contrary to Achen and Bartels, we contend that issue stances and policy preferences can realistically be expected to have a significant impact on vote choice; (3) aside from directly influencing vote choice, social identities also exert an impact on issue stances and policy preferences; (4) we have a strongly plural conception of social identities, assuming that individuals potentially belong to and identify with a multiplicity of groups, some of which may be in conflict with each other,) that these identities (for example, religious and professional) are ontologically divergent, to the extent that the mechanisms by which they exert an influence on self-consciousness of group belonging and group loyalty differ.

The overall analytical frame of the PNES remains a version of the Michigan funnel of causality. However, the Michigan model is extended in important ways in accordance with the discussion above. First, the proposed PNES model will expand upon the Columbia School tradition of sociological factors (both ascribed and achieved) to incorporate interactive relationships and identities springing from participation in new social networks. Primarily, our objective is to estimate the relative impact of traditional cleavage politics compared with that of less formal, network-driven bonds and new social identities (Rossteutscher & Stegmueller 2014). The second important contribution is a focus on the quality of political representation and accountability which builds on traditional approaches to promissory and societal representation (Pitkin 1967) to explore the impact of alternative modes of representation, in particular surrogate representation (Mansbridge 2003) in which

political representation is carried out by non-political institutions such as prominent journalists, important newspapers, churches, trade unions and similar organizations. Third, in contrast to classical approaches to political accountability which concentrate mainly on the deeds of incumbents and their economic performance (Przeworski et al 1999) we conceive of political accountability as pertaining also to axiological, symbolic and identitarian issues.

According to the postulates of the Michigan model, the decision of citizens to vote for a particular party is typically a combination of numerous factors, operationalized as independent variables, which are grouped and related to each other according to their causal distance from the dependent variable of vote choice (Campbell et al. 1960). In this project, our point of departure is an alternative analytical proposal based on Miller and Shanks (1996) which offers a multi-stage explanatory model: a set of several temporally ordered stages that reliably account for vote choice.

3. Research plan and design

Political scientists have tended to approach electoral behavior from a single perspective. In our view, the contemporary scholar of elections, vote choice and public opinion should adopt a multi-perspective approach, particularly in light of fundamental changes over time in the relative importance of competing causal mechanisms for the explanation of voting behavior.

In advanced contemporary economies that have been the most directly exposed to the revolution in communications technology that globalisation has created, we can observe a dramatic change in the study of public opinion. Social surveys and public opinion research are undergoing a transition from the classical face-to-face interview model to a new methodological approach based on more extensive use of telephone and internet surveys. While there are some disadvantages to this change, the harnessing of new technologies makes it significantly easier for researchers to pursue the accurate testing of complex hypotheses and arrive at a more nuanced understanding of public opinion and its electoral consequences through the use of, for example, experimental techniques hitherto less feasible, or rolling panel studies previously too expensive for all but the best resourced organisations to consider.

At the same time, a gap has opened up between the most advanced economies and the less developed and more recently democratised European countries, including Poland, with respect to the quality of social survey research capacities. It results from a combination of de-professionalization, inadequate public investment, and lack of interest in the production of reliable social survey research. One of the key motivations of this project is to begin remedying this situation in the Polish case, in ways that could potentially be replicated elsewhere. Specifically, we propose to trial the CAWI panel research technique alongside the classical CAPI face-to-face interviews which have, until now, been the basis of the PNES.

Aside from the aforementioned innovations, the PNES continues to constitute a research program of significant value both domestically and internationally. As a longitudinal study which employs many cross-nationally comparative modules and questions that have been externally validated by other surveys, PNES is a uniquely rich and relevant source of information about Polish attitudes, preferences and political behavior both over time and cross-nationally. The PNES 2019 will maintain this standard through the integration of the CSES Module 5 battery of questions, as well as selected questions from the European Election Study 2019.

The measurement of the attitudes, preferences and behavior of Polish voters have, since the outset of the PNES survey, been the crux of our research endeavor. As mentioned in the preceding section, we also envisage two additional components which will complement our empirical surveys: a parliamentary elite study and an analysis of party manifestos. **However, these two projects are not part of this application; the team will seek funds from other sources to finance these objectives.**

The main empirical task, the surveys themselves, will be undertaken before the election (first wave of CAWI) and during the period of one week to three weeks following the election day, which is most likely to occur in November 2019 (CAPI survey and the second wave of CAWI). During late 2019 and early 2020 the team will begin to produce initial analyses of the survey data, and during 2020 and 2021 will produce a series of articles for publication in internationally significant journals.

4. Methodology

To achieve our research goals, we propose a methodological experiment that consists in a near-simultaneous fielding of surveys using a CAPI sample ($n=1500$) and a two-wave CAWI sample ($n=1000$). The CAPI survey serves the core **substantive** goal of our research, while the comparison between CAPI and CAWI panel forms the basis of **methodological** innovation.

The CAPI face-to-face questionnaire will take approximately 1 hour to 1 hour 10 minutes, using a randomly selected sample of 1500 adult Poles. In order to achieve diachronic comparability, the core of the questionnaire to be used in the 2019 questionnaire will be based on the previous iterations of the PNES survey and CSES module 5, but the survey will also contain a number of new questions that reflect new issues or the greater current salience of old ones.

The substance of CAPI and CAWI questionnaires will overlap to a certain extent: we estimate that the CAWI questionnaire will use around a third of the modules and questions in the CAPI questionnaire. This overlap will allow us to estimate differences in the character of the sample and the nature of responses between the CAPI and CAWI procedures.

The implementation of new approaches, in particular (quasi-)experimental techniques that are more conducive to testing causal claims about the linkages between socio-demographics, values, preferences and vote choice, has led to an abundance of new findings that have both confirmed and refuted some of the “received wisdoms” of political science with respect to electoral behavior. By implementing similar methods in the PNES while retaining the key elements of the project’s tradition, we will be better equipped to conduct reliable tests of assumptions about the Polish voter, and better able to contribute to advancing knowledge about electoral behavior more generally.

The CAWI internet panel has two main goals. Firstly, CAWI will primarily serve as a comparison to the CAPI results, allowing us to observe how the two survey methods differ both in terms of the basic socio-demographics of the sample and also with respect to the core “electoral” questions asked in the traditional CAPI wave. Our intention is for the 2019 iteration to maintain the established traditions of the PNES survey, while enabling us to take the first steps towards moving away from the CAPI method towards a more economically efficient and methodologically sustainable model in the future. This will also enable us better to integrate PNES with the sophisticated digital infrastructures that have made innovative research into public opinion in the advanced countries cheaper, more accurate and policy-relevant.

The problem of discrepancies between the obtained sample and the studied population is usually observable in studies to which the sample is selected in a non-random manner and/or based on sampling lists which fail to meet requisite conditions of procedural representativeness. Samples obtained for online surveys are particularly prone to strong overrepresentation of some social groups (the young, the more affluent) and underrepresentation of others (older respondents, those who cannot afford or otherwise do not have access to a reliable internet connection), but online survey modes are becoming increasingly popular thanks to their relatively low cost and the speed with which they can be administered, and continuing improvements in internet access for hard-to-reach socio-demographic groups.

According to the data of the Digital Economy and Society Index, only 65% of Poles regularly use the Internet, which puts Poland at one of the last places in Europe (European Commission 2016). In addition to access restrictions, the representativeness of on-line surveys is limited by strong distortions in sample characteristics due to the varied level of self-selection for research in particular groups, primarily due to age, education and gender (Blasius and Brandt 2010, Bethlehem 2010).

The simultaneous use of large-scale face-to-face interviews and online surveys will also allow us to explore the possibility of using methods of multiple imputation in the case of groups that are systematically underrepresented in Polish surveys. Multiple imputation makes it possible to obtain approximately unbiased estimates of parameters and standard errors where data are missing, based on the values of similar cases in a multivariate analysis (Lall 2016). In the case of online research, advanced models of multiple imputation will be required, since data are not missing at random.

The second goal of the CAWI internet panel is to provide an opportunity to examine causal relationships between key variable of interest. Here, the use of pre-election and post-election waves is crucial. As discussed above, the directionality of relationships between socio-demographic status, values and attitudes, political preferences and vote choice is both under-theorised and insufficiently empirically examined. The quasi-experimental ‘breakpoint’ of an election makes it possible to test hypotheses relevant to these questions, in particular those which pertain to party identification and vote choice (does party identification inform vote

choice, as has commonly been assumed, or does the causal arrow run in the opposite direction?). With respect to these and other questions, the two-stage CAWI survey will make it possible to analyze the vote decision-making process in the context of an electoral campaign in ways that have hitherto not been open to us.

In our analyses we will conceptualise the determinants of electoral behaviour in a variety of ways. This will involve a diversity of methodological approaches to the analysis of our data, particularly given our attention to the aforementioned “heterogeneity assumption”. The modern student of elections, voting behavior and public opinion needs to embrace a multi-perspective approach, given fundamental changes over time in the relative importance of different causal mechanisms. The PNES 2019 will also be ontologically and methodologically sensitive to the differentiation between macro and micro variables and the diverse contexts in which particular relationships occur, distinguishing between two sets of determinants of the vote: long-term factors (e.g. cleavage politics, partisan attachments) and short-term factors (e.g. retrospective voting, evaluation of government performance). To date, the impact of macro and micro level factors – both separately and interactively - have not been subject to sufficient analysis. Most studies have focused either on the sociological or psychological determinants of voter preferences and his or her behavior, or on the impact of aggregate national as well as institutional features of elections, with limited attempts to bridge the two. Employing approaches which stress the interdependence of micro and macro-level factors will enable us to move away from this overly restrictive approach.

Our data will enable us to undertake standard multivariate modelling where the impact of substantive variables of interest are controlled for by other relevant individual-level variables, multilevel modelling which controls for the impact of environmental, contextual variables, and experimental analysis in which treatment effects are the quantity of interest. This will require the use of statistical analysis software with the following capabilities: (a) regression generalized linear models, binomial and multinomial logistic regression; (b) structural equation models aimed at observing latent variables and tracing important relationships between variables that allow us to distinguish between direct and indirect effects; (c) multilevel analyses (hierarchical linear models). These requirements make it necessary for us to purchase a copy of the Mplus statistical analysis package with Mixture and Multilevel add-ons, widely regarded as the gold standard for the analysis of complex structural equation models and multilevel models, and also fully capable of undertaking the less computationally demanding analyses we will require. Statistical analyses will also be performed with Stata, SPSS and R software (it is not necessary to budget for these items, as the licences are free or already at the disposal of SWPS University).

5. References

- Achen, C. H. & L.M. Bartels. 2016. *Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Achen, C.H. 1978. “Measuring Representation”, *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 33, No. 3.
- Althaus, S.L. 2003. *Collective Preferences in Democratic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartolini, S. & P. Mair. 1990. *Identity, Competition, and Electoral Availability. The Stabilization of European Electorates 1885-1985*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bethlehem, J. 2010. “Selection bias in web surveys”, *International Statistical Review*, 78(2): pp. 161-188.
- Blasius, J. & M. Brandt. 2010. “Representativeness in online surveys through stratified samples”, *Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 107: 5–21.
- Blumenstiel, J. E. 2014. “Voter Fragmentation and the Differentiation of Vote Functions”, in: B. Weßels, B. Rattinger, S. Roßteutscher and R. Schmitt-Beck, (eds.) *Voters on the Move or on the Run?*, Oxford University Press, Oxford Scholarship Online, pp. 1-22.
- Budge, I. & D. Farlie. 1983. *Explaining and Predicting Elections: Issue Effects and Party Strategies in Twenty-three Democracies*. London/Boston: Allen & Unwin.
- Campbell, A. & P. E. Converse, H. Miller, D. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Rivers, D. 1988. “Heterogeneity in Models of Electoral Choice”, *American Journal of Political Science*, 85 (3), 737-57.

- Converse, P. & R. Pierce. 1986. *Political Representation in France*. Cambridge – London: Harvard University Press.
- Dahl, R. 1998. *On Democracy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Dalton, R. J. 2011. „Left-right orientation, context, and voting choices”, in: R. J. Dalton & C. J. Anderson *Citizens. Context, and Choice: How Context Shapes Citizens' Electoral Choices*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 103-25.
- Dassonneville, R. & H. Wass. 2017. "It's the social identities and partisan loyalties, stupid? The bases for vote choice in Europe", Paper presented at the ECPR General Conference, Oslo, September 6-9, 2017
- Enelow, J. M & M. J. Hinich. 1984. *The Spatial Theory of Voting. An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eulau, H. & J. C. Wahlke. 1978. *The politics of representation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ferrín, M. & H. Kriesi. 2016. eds. *How Europeans View and Evaluate Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fiorina, M.P. 1981. *Retrospective Voting in American National Elections*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fraile, M. 2013. “Do information-rich contexts reduce knowledge inequalities? The contextual determinants of political knowledge in Europe”, *Acta Politica*, · Vol. 48, Issue 2.
- Franklin, M. & Ch. Wlezien. 2002. eds. *The Future of Election Studies*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- Goodin, R. E. 2008. *Innovating Democracy: Democratic Theory and Practice After the Deliberative Turn*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hibbing, J. & E. Theiss-Morse. 2003. *Stealth Democracy: Americans' Beliefs About how Government Should Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmberg, S. 1989. “Political Representation in Sweden”, *Scandinavian Political Studies*, Vol.12.
- Holmberg, S. 2007. “Partisanship Reconsidered”, in: R. Dalton & H-D. Klingemann, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jasiewicz, K. 2008. “The New Populism in Poland: The Usual Suspects?” *Problems of Post-Communism*, Vol. 55, No. 3, pp. 7-25.
- Key, V. O. 1968. *The Responsible Electorate: Rationality in Presidential Voting, 1936-1960*, New York: Vintage Books.
- Kitschelt, H. & Z. Masfeldova, R. Markowski, G. Toka. 1999. *Post-Communist Party Systems. Competition, Representation, and Inter-Party Cooperation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Knutsen, O. & E. Scarbrough. 1998. “Cleavage politics”, in: J. van Deth & E. Scarbrough, eds. *The Impact of Values*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kotnarowski, M. & Markowski R 2014. “Political preferences in times of crisis: Economic voting in the 2011 Polish elections”, *Acta Politica* 49 (4): 431–61.
- Kramer, G. H. 1971. “Short-Term Fluctuations in U.S. Voting Behavior, 1896-1964, ”*American Political Science Review*, 65 (1): 131-143.
- Kwiatkowska, A., Cześnik M. & Żerkowska-Balas M. 2016. „Ideologiczna treść wymiaru lewica-prawica w Polsce w latach 1997-2015 [The ideological content of the left-right dimension in Poland in the period of 1997-2015]”, *Studia Socjologiczne*, Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, Komitet Socjologii PAN, No. 4 (223), pp. 97-129.
- Lall, R. 2016. “How Multiple Imputation Makes a Difference”, *Political Analysis*, 24(04): 414–433.
- Langsaether, P., H. Gjerlow, & M. Soyland. 2017. “Separating the Wheat from the Chaff. Using media exposure and preferential voting to assess voter competence”, *Paper presented at the ECPR General Conference*, Oslo.
- Lau, R. R. & D. P. Redlawsk. 2006. *How Voters Decide: Information Processing During Election Campaigns*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lewis-Beck, M.S. & M. Paldam, 2000. "Economic voting: An introduction.", *Electoral Studies*, 19(2-3): 113-121.
- Lipset, S. M. & Rokkan, S. 1967. "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments: An Introduction.", in: S. M. Lipset & S. Rokkan, eds. *Party Systems and Voter Alignments: Cross-National Perspectives*. New York: Free Press.
- Luskin, R., 1987. "Measuring Political Sophistication", *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 31, No. 4.
- Luskin, R. 1990. "Explaining Political Sophistication", *Political Behavior*, Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 331-361.
- McManus Czubińska, C., W. L. Miller, R. Markowski & J. Wasilewski. 2004. „When does Turnout Matter? The Case of Poland”, *Europe-Asia Studies*, 56(3): 401-420.
- Mansbridge, Jane. 2003. „Rethinking Representation”, *American Political Science Review*, 97(4): 515-28.
- Markowski, R. & B. Stanley. 2016. „Rozłamy socjopolityczne w Polsce: Iluzja czy rzeczywistość?”, *Studia Socjologiczne*, 4:15-38.
- Markowski, R. 2006. „Political Accountability and Institutional Design in New Democracies”, *International Journal of Sociology*, 36 (2): 45-75.
- Markowski, R. 2008. „The 2007 Polish Parliamentary Election: Some Structuring, Still a Lot of Chaos”, *West European Politics*, 31 (5): 1055-68.
- Markowski, R ed.. 2017. *Demokratyczny Audyt Polski 2: Demokracja wyborcza lat 2014-2015 [Democratic Audit of Poland 2: Electoral democracy of 2014-2015]*, Warszawa: Biuro RPO, 2017
- Markowski, R. 2018. "Supply Side Revolution: The Consequences of the 2015 Polish Elections", in: J.M. Kovács and B. Trencsényi, eds., *Brave New Hungary: Mapping the "System of National Cooperation"*. Lexington: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Markowski, R. & J. A. Tucker. 2005. „Pocketbooks, politics and parties: the 2003 Polish referendum on EU membership”, *Electoral Studies* 24, pp. 409-433.
- Markowski, R. & J. A Tucker. 2010. "Eurocepticism and the Emergence of Political Parties in Poland", *Party Politics*, Vol. 16 (4).
- McManus, C., W. Miller, R. Markowski & J. Wasilewski. 2003. „Understanding Dual Identities in Poland”, *Political Studies* 51: 121-143.
- Miller W. E. & J. Merrill Shanks 1996 *The New American Voter* London: Harvard University Press.
- Patkos, V. 2017. „Three aspects of political sophistication – which one can be blamed for generating bias?”, *Paper presented at the ECPR General Conference*, Oslo.
- Pitkin, H. F. 1967. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Popkin, S. 1991. *The Reasoning Voter: Communication and Persuasion in Presidential Campaigns*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Przeworski, A., S. C. Stokes & B. Manin. eds. 1999. *Democracy, Accountability and Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rabinowitz, G. & S. E. Macdonald. 1989. „A Directional Theory of Issue Voting”, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 83, pp. 93-121.
- Roberts, A. 2010. *The Quality of Democracy in Eastern Europe. Public Preferences and Policy Reforms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, D. B. 1976. *A Theory of Party Competition*, New York: J. Hiley.
- Rossteutscher, S. & D. Stegmüller. 2014. „Network Politicization and Political Integration From Grand Cleavages to Private Network Structures”, in: B. Weßels, H. Rattinger, S. Roßteutscher & R. Schmitt-Beck, *Voters on the Move or on the Run?*, Oxford University Press.
- Schmitt, H. 2009. "Partisanship in Nine Western Democracies: Causes and Consequences", in: J. Bartle & P. Bellucci, eds. *Political Parties and Partisanship: Social Identity and Individual Attitudes*. London: Routledge: pp. 75-57.

- Schwennicke, A. 2017. „A Discussion of Christopher H. Achen and Larry M. Bartels' Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government.” *Perspectives on Politics*, 15(1): 148–151.
- Stanley, B. 2014. „The Dynamics of Party-System Supply and Demand in Poland, 1997–2007. Cleavage Change or Shapeless Shifting?” *Europe-Asia Studies*, 66 (8):1295-322.
- Stanley, B. 2018. „A New Populist Divide? Correspondences of Supply and Demand in the 2015 Polish Parliamentary Elections.” *East European Politics and Societies*, (online publication).
- Thomassen, J. 1976. “Party Identification as Cross-National Concept. Its Meaning in the Netherlands”, in: I. Budge, I. Crewe & D. Farlie, eds. *Party Identification and Beyond*. London: John Wiley Sons, pp. 63-79.
- Thomassen, J. 2005. *The European voter: a comparative study of modern democracies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Toka, G. 1998. „Party Appeals and Voter Loyalty in New Democracies”, *Political Studies*, Vol. 46, Issue 3.
- Tworzecki, H. & R. Markowski, 2014. “Knowledge and Partisan Bias: An Uneasy Relationship,” *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures* , 28 (4): 836-862.
- van der Eijk, C. 2002. „Design issues in electoral research: taking care of (core) business” *Electoral Studies* 21 (2): 189-206.
- Welzel, C. 2006. “Democratization as an Emancipative Process”, *European Journal of Political Research*, 45(6): 871-896.
- Zuckermann, A. ed., 2005. *The Social Logic of Politics*, Temple. Philadelphia: University Press.
- Żerkowska-Balas. M., I. Lyubashenko & A. Kwiatkowska. 2016. „Determinanty preferencji wyborczych: Polska w latach 1997-2015”, *Studia Socjologiczne*, Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, Komitet Socjologii PAN, Vol. 4 (223), pp. 69-96.

ZAŁĄCZNIKI

Poniżej wymienione załączniki są załączone do niniejszego wniosku.