

Fundacja Demokracja Przyszłości (Future Democracy Foundation)

Democracy Research Report

Dates of the survey:

26/04/2022 - 25/05/2022

Publication date:

7/08/2022

<https://demokracjaprzyszlosci.org.pl/en/>

All rights to the above report are reserved to Fundacja Demokracja Przyszłości. However, you have a general right to quote and distribute excerpts from the report for: educational, polemical and critical purposes (under Article 29 of the Law on Copyright and Related Rights). We encourage you to do so, as one of our goals is to support the development of an open civil society. Remember, however, that as a condition of using our report, you must cite the source each time (in accordance with Article 34 of the Law on Copyright and Related Rights). The easiest way to do this is by providing the address of our website <https://demokracjaprzyszlosci.org.pl/en/> and the name of the Future Democracy Foundation. If you wish to use our report beyond the general right of citation, please contact us.

Table of contents

Introduction	4
Authors	4
Mission and vision	5
Rafał, President of the Board	5
Mission and strategy	5
Vision	5
Krzysztof, Member of the Board	6
Portal	6
Foundation activities	6
Research questions	6
Screener	7
Study group	7
Screener content	7
Study scenario	11
Part I: Democracy	15
The meaning of democracy	15
Participation in civic life	16
Development of democracy in Poland	17
Development of democracy in the world	19
Disadvantages of the democratic system	20
Advantages of the democratic system	22
Functioning of democracy in Poland	23
Threats to democracy in the world	24
Inspiration from democracies in other countries	25
Representative democracy	26
Direct democracy	28
Democracy in the European Union	28
Perceived advantages and disadvantages	29
The direction of change in the Union	29
Experts in democracy	30
Osoby zaufania publicznego	32
Desired qualities	32
General thoughts	32
How to become?	32
Awareness among Poles	33
Awareness of Poles today	33
Raising awareness	34
Sources of knowledge about the law	36
Expressing one's own opinion about changes in the law	36
Engaging in changes in Polish law	37

Social media	38
Citizens' initiatives	39
Presenting your own initiative	41
What would encourage?	41
How to work on the initiative?	41
Part II: The Portal	43
Need for a portal	43
Eagerly awaited functionalities	46
Nationwide law	48
Similar activities	49
Target group of the portal	50
Other participants	51
Non-serious proposals	53
Hate speech	55
Moderation	56
The role of a moderator	56
Recruitment of moderators	57
People on staff or volunteers	58
Promoting the portal	59
How to encourage?	59
Sense of empowerment	60
What motivates?	60
Voting	61
When to vote?	61
How to create questions?	63
Identifying users	64
How to identify?	64
Avoiding creation of multiple accounts	65
Fact-checking	66
Off-line activities	67
Part III: Final Questions	69
Portal in twenty years	69
Reflections	70
Analysis of the collected data	72
Part I: Democracy	72
Part II: Portal	77
Part III: Final Questions	81
Summary	82
Democracy	82
Recommendations	82
Portal	83
Recommendations	84

Introduction

This report was written as part of the Future Democracy Foundation's work to create an online portal to support public consultation. The research was conducted in the form of in-depth interviews with eight people, selected in such a way that they represent a broad group of people interested in the topic of democracy. Our conversations consisted of two main blocks - the first concerned democracy in Poland and around the world, while the second addressed research questions related to the creation of the portal.

Authors



Rafał Stybliński – Originator and founder of the Future Democracy Foundation. Graduate of IT studies at Silesian University of Technology and postgraduate UX studies at SWPS. Professionally a C# .NET programmer who gained experience in Poland and the UK.



Krzysztof Abramiuk – A graduate of Philosophy at the University of Warsaw and a postgraduate in UX Design at SWPS University in Katowice. Enthusiast of Design Thinking and UX research and its application to new technologies. Volunteer in university and community projects, in his free time a devourer of books, music and climbing routes.

Mission and vision

As members of the Foundation's Board of Directors, we decided to develop a mission and vision for our activities.

Rafał, President of the Board

Mission and strategy

We are people interested in User Experience who were brought together by the desire to strengthen civil society in Poland and ultimately, with the help of external partners, abroad.

We want to achieve this goal primarily through the creation of an online portal to promote public consultation on proposed legal changes at the national level, citizens' initiatives and petitions.

Our target process takes into account:

- **research**, i.e. the use of questionnaires and direct interviews with people interested in building civil society,
- **design**, i.e. the process of creating an interactive mock-up of the application, among other things,
- **implementation**, i.e. programming work to create the designed application,
- **deployment**, i.e. its launch in the computing cloud,
- **development**, i.e. implementing new ideas and responding to user needs.

According to our statute, our main goal is "to promote the ideas of direct democracy, supported by technocracy and e-democracy," and we want them to be included in the portal.

Vision

We are considering making the application's source code available as open-source, that is, usable by other organizations outside our country's borders. We intend to implement the portal within the foundation in Poland and encourage foundations or associations from abroad to do the same.

Our goal is to build a civil society in which all parties concerned could be heard, speaking freely, within the limits of the law, on issues important to them. What's more, laws proposed by citizens would have a chance to be realistically implemented in the legal system, contributing to the existence of a just law that will truly affect citizens' satisfaction in how the country they live in functions.

Ultimately, we want to have a program council to support us in making strategic decisions, and the opinion of the general public to help us further develop our project.

Krzysztof, Member of the Board

Portal

We would like the portal to create conditions for the exchange of fact-based and data-driven opinions between users as well as users and experts. It should be a space free from over-stimulation, stirring up extreme emotions and allowing joint reflection on various issues, even difficult or controversial ones. Very important is the issue of checking information, fighting fake news and the "trolls" that are bound to appear.

Given the portal's goal of working for public participation and civic education, among the topics to be discussed could be currently pending legislation and those just in the conceptual stage; in addition, a function for reporting citizen initiatives could be introduced, although a mechanism for filtering serious initiatives from those done for a joke would have to be considered.

Foundation activities

The portal is, of course, the flagship "product" of the foundation. However, in the future, in addition to the day-to-day management of the portal, the foundation may face other tasks. Where there is talk that modern education should teach cooperation, new technologies, etc. there is also room for development, when, for example, there is mention of teaching responsibility for common issues, cooperation in dealing with problems that affect us all and building a culture of compromise.

Research questions

Before preparing the research scenario, we posed several research questions.

We wanted to hear from active citizens:

1. Who are they? What is the perception of democracy among them?
2. How do they participate in the creation of democracy?
3. Where do they see weaknesses in the functioning of democracy?
4. How would they like to see democracy develop in Poland and around the world?
5. Could and how could an Internet portal help in the development of democracy?

Screener

Before starting the interviews, we had to recruit the people we wanted to talk to. For this purpose, a screener was prepared for us by the recruitment agency, based on our requirements, with questions that were asked to potential respondents.

Study group

- 50% women, 50% men
- 100% of people interested in domestic and world events: politics, law, finance, events, culture (regularity of reading at min. 5 days a week, thematic, general-information portals e.g. TVN24, Gazeta.pl, NaTemat.pl, etc.).
- 3 people in the age group 18-26
- 3 people in the age group 27 - 60
- 2 persons in the 60+ age group
- Minimum secondary or higher education (no assumptions)
- 100% of people using the Internet and smartphone min. 7 times a week

Screener content

1. Do you or someone close to you (family, friends) work or have worked in any of the industries?

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
Marketing / market research	End
Psychology / sociology	
Advertising agencies / public relations	
None of the above	Continue

2. What is your professional situation?

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
I run my own business	Continue
I work on the basis of a work contract / commission / contract - full time	
I work on the basis of an employment contract	
None of the above	End

3. Gender

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
Female	50% men; 50% women
Male	

4. Age

Parametr	Continue/End - how many people
18-26 years	3 people
27-60 years	3 people
over 60 years old	2 people

5. What city do you live in?

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
up to 100 thousand	Continue 2 people
300-450 thousand	Continue 2 people
above 500 thousand	Continue 4 people

6. What kind of education do you have?

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
Higher (completed master's / bachelor's / engineering degree)	Continue
Secondary (including a passed high school diploma)	
Basic	End
Other	

7. How often do you use the Internet?

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
At least 1 x a day for at least 30 minutes	Continue
Several times a week	End

8. Are you interested in national and world events?

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
Yes	Continue
No	End

9. What type of events are they? (You can choose several)

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
Politics	Continue, marked at least 3
Law	
Finance	
General events	
Culture	
Other. What kind of events?	End

10. What sources do you use to learn about these events? (You can choose several)

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
Internet thematic and information portals	Necessary to indicate + answer openly what kind of portals/persons with different sources - right and left views, centrist
Social networks - Twitter, FB, Instagram or others	Continue, only if the indicated answer 1, + open answer what kind of media it is
Television - evening news, news channels	
Radio	
Press, newspapers	

11. How often do you read about these events on online portals?

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
1-3 times a week, at least 10 minutes	End
4-5 times a week, at least 10 minutes	Continue (diversified group)
6-7 times a week, at least 10 minutes	
More than 7 times a week, at least 10 minutes	

12. What device do you use when familiarizing yourself with events? (You can indicate several)

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
Phone / Smartphone	The group is to be diverse
Tablet	
Computer / Laptop	

13. Have you ever participated in market research (focus groups or one-on-one interviews held in your company or at home) conducted by any market research companies?

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
Yes	Ask another question
No	Continue

14. When was the last time you participated in market research (focus groups or one-on-one interviews held in a company or at home) conducted by any market research companies?

Parameter	Continue/End - how many people
Within the last 6 months	End
Earlier than in the last 6 months	Follow up, ask about the date and scope of your most recent examination

Study scenario

We also prepared a survey scenario with general and supporting questions.

Category	General questions	Supporting questions
Przywitanie	Who are we?	Introducing the two people involved in the conversation on the foundation's side. Explaining who the other person is and what their role is
	Introducing the foundation	The Future Democracy Foundation was founded in November 2021 and has adopted the promotion of democracy as its goal. Today we would like to talk about how we can engage people in civil society.
	Information about recording	We inform the person that we are now turning on audio and video recording. <i>(After such information and turning on the recording, we ask the person officially to give permission to do so).</i>
	Could you tell us something about yourself?	What is your professional occupation?
Democracy	What does democracy mean to you?	
	How do you participate in civil society?	Do you participate in elections? Do you sign petitions or participate in initiatives (local or national)? (How did you find out about them?) Are you active in or supportive of any NGOs? (How did you learn about these organizations or needs?)
	How should democracy develop and function in Poland?	How can democracy be supported? How do we develop it? What can we do to make it develop?
	And what should this development and operation look like on a global scale?	
	What flaws in the democratic system do you see?	How can these flaws be counteracted?
	And what advantages do you see in this system?	How can they be strengthened, cared for and developed?
	How do you assess the	

	functioning of democracy in Poland?	
	What threats do you see to democracy in the world?	
	What do you see inspiring about democracies in other countries?	What citizen engagement activities are you aware of?
	What do you think about representative democracy?	What are the advantages and disadvantages?
	What do you think about direct democracy?	What are the advantages and disadvantages?
	What do you think about the role of democracy at the European Union level?	Should the European Union increase cooperation or be more of a Europe of homelands? What relationships should there be between democracies in different countries?
	What do you think about the role of experts in democracy?	Who can or should the experts be?
	What do you think about the role of people of public trust in democracy?	Who are the persons of public trust? What qualities should they have? How can one become such a person?
	To what extent are Polish people conscious participants in civil society?	How can this awareness be increased?
	From what sources do you learn about changes in the law?	How do you assess the availability and reliability of these sources?
	How do you express your opinion on proposals for changes in the law, both those put forward by politicians and citizens?	
	How would you like to be able to get involved in changing laws on a	

	national level?	
	What is the role of social media in civil society?	
	What do you think about citizen legislative initiatives?	Do you know of an example of such an initiative?
	What would encourage you to put forward your own citizen legislative initiative?	How would you work to prepare such an initiative?
Portal	Introducing our idea	As a foundation, we would like to create a web portal that would promote the development of civil society. We would like to create a space for substantive discussion of changes in the law in Poland.
	To what extent is such a portal needed?	Why? What is missing from other portals? What would it need to stand out?
	What functionality would you most like to see on such a portal?	Please tell us how you think such a portal could work.
	We would like to focus on a nationwide law. What are your thoughts on this?	Why? What difficulties might we face?
	What similar efforts to involve citizens in the discussion of changes to nationwide laws are you aware of?	Do you know of such activities on the Internet?
	Who should this portal be for?	Who would primarily want to use this portal?
	Who else should participate in the operation of this portal?	What groups of participants do you see? Who would guarantee integrity, impartiality and efficiency on this portal? We propose the participation of citizens, experts, ethicists and people of public trust. What do you think about this?
	How to respond to unserious proposals on the portal?	How should users promote good proposals? What solutions in the operation of this portal would prevent the promotion of unserious proposals?

	How to deal with potential hate speech?	What proposals should absolutely be removed or blocked?
	How should moderation function on such a portal?	Who is a moderator to you? How do you recruit people for moderation? Should they be volunteers?
	How to encourage people to participate in the life of the portal?	When would people have a sense of empowerment using this portal? How to create this sense of empowerment? What motivates people to actively participate in such a community?
	What do you think about the possibility of voting on the portal and how would it work?	On what issues and how often should voting take place? What should be the role of voting on this portal? How to create questions and possible answers in votes?
	How to identify users on the portal?	What user data should be required for registration, and what should be displayed? How to verify portal participants to avoid the creation of multiple accounts by one person?
	What should be the role of fact-checking (checking the factuality of claims made as facts) on such a portal?	How to introduce it on the portal?
	What activities of the foundation, beyond the Internet, do you think would be needed and possible?	What should be the relationship between the portal and the foundation's offline activities?
Summary	How could such a portal function in twenty years?	What changes in the world or in technology could affect the evolution of the portal?
	Do you have any thoughts related to our conversation or would you like to expand on a topic or add your own?	
	If we would like to inquire about something, can we contact you again?	
	Thank you for your time	We sincerely thank you for your time and valuable information provided to us

Part I: Democracy

The meaning of democracy

What does democracy mean to you?	
----------------------------------	--

For most of the interviewees, democracy means freedom of expression, such as freedom of speech. For three interviewees, democracy means freedom in general: freedom of speech, freedom of choice, and that the state does not interfere in their lives. One person told us that democracy for them also means being able to be heard by the authorities. Three people also pointed to equality and respect for everyone regardless of the mindset one holds.

We were also told that democracy is a system in which, in theory at least, there should be "rule of the people" or majority rule. One respondent pointed out that democracy understood in this way is a dummy, the actual rule of representatives is very far from the rule of the people directly. A very distant notion. In contrast, another respondent indicated that democracy "is such a nice system in the rule of law, one of the possible ones that makes the majority of citizens have the right to decide."

One person pointed out that, on the whole, it depends on external circumstances whether democracy is a good system or not. Sometimes there are circumstances that require quick, unpopular decisions, and in a democracy, making such decisions is insanely cumbersome. Moreover, such decisions that will not garner support at the polls and in elections are postponed from month to month.

One person said that it is important in a democracy that people even with very controversial opinions on a topic should be heard.

Statement	Number of respondents
Democracy is freedom of expression (e.g., speech)	4
Democracy is liberty	3
Democracy is respect for another person	3
Democracy is respecting and listening to the other side	2

Single opinions:

- Democracy is the opportunity to be heard by the authorities
- It is important that those with controversial views also be heard
- Democracy is not always a good system, it depends on the circumstances
- Democracy is a dummy because it is a distant concept.

- In a democracy, the majority of citizens have the right to decide.
- In a democracy, it is difficult to make unpopular decisions when there is a need to make them quickly.

Quotes:

"There is no such thing as a perfect democracy. It's not feasible in the world, people are different, people's mentality is different, it's hard to have a real democracy, it's idyllic."

Participation in civic life

How do you participate in civil society?	Do you participate in elections? Do you sign petitions or participate in initiatives (local or national)? (How did you find out about them?) Are you active in or supportive of any NGOs? (How did you learn about these organizations or needs?)
--	---

Most of the respondents, if they have the opportunity, sign petitions, among others on the Internet (e.g., Avaaz). All of the respondents expressed interest in what is happening in the world and said they keep up to date with information from various sources, primarily the Internet. Two people indicated that they actively express themselves online on social media, such as commenting on posts or entering into discussions with politicians.

All respondents are taking part in the elections, one person will be taking part for the first time, while another was "very bad" for a while and did not participate, but is now taking part.

Two people mentioned that they participate regularly or have participated in demonstrations. One person told us that they use social media to organize themselves and protest on an issue, for example. The theme of social media as a good place to organize often runs through the respondents' statements.

Half of the people told us that they are not actively involved in activities such as foundations. One respondent mentioned that the reason he is not active in NGOs is lack of time and other priorities. There were two people who were active in some way (a foundation for children in the hospital and an association for animals).

For two, it's local activities that are particularly important, such as involvement in participatory budgeting.

Two people indicated that they sign petitions electronically. One person considers signing petitions online to be particularly important to them because of the convenience of such a solution. Another indicated that it is difficult to sort through them and find those that are of interest. They also said that the mechanism for public consultation is currently weak in Poland because it lasts too short.

For one interviewee, participating in the election commission was also a way to engage in civic life.

For one of our respondents, it is important to interact within the neighborhood using a Facebook group, both in matters of neighborhood assistance and announcements of sales or exchanges, as well as in the field of municipal decisions.

One respondent indicated that it is difficult for entities seeking their interest and signatures to break into the mainstream.

Statement	Number of respondents
Respondents are not actively involved in civic activities, e.g., through activities in foundations	4
Local actions are important	3
Respondents sign electronic petitions	2

Quotes:

"If you don't know the political or historical situation then you have to experience it a second time, and I kind of feel that's what's happening currently."

"When it comes to global democracy, I certainly like to speak out on social networks like Twitter, to engage in conversations, to engage in jokes, but also some conversations with people who have a different opinion, who very often disagree."

"I also like to take part in signing all kinds of such documents in an online way, it's mostly about convenience."

Development of democracy in Poland

How should democracy develop and function in Poland?	How can democracy be supported? How do we develop it? What can we do to make it develop?
--	--

Democracy should, first and foremost, take care of the independence of the courts and respect the tri-partition of power and have instruments to guard this. It should be based on majority choice. We were also told that it should direct its "offer" toward young people, "because they are the ones who will one day rule this country"; democratic states should listen more to people, especially the young, building understanding of the situation.

We also heard that in order to develop democracy we should get involved in social/public life and react to what the authorities are doing. There should be a wider promotion of involvement in, for example, foundations or other ventures. It would be necessary to change

people and their thinking and talk about it. Citizens should also go to elections and elect representatives, instead of, for example, just sitting on the Internet and complaining.

One person noted that most people say that as an individual they mean nothing at elections. They believe that individual people's thinking about the insignificant value of their vote in elections has an effect of scale because more people say so, which translates into a significant number of voters.

It is also important to teach about democracy at school and develop a good core curriculum for teaching civic awareness. One respondent said that it is important to teach informed debate by holding various types of workshops in schools, where students would be divided into groups with different views, and the discussion would be moderated. It is important to teach that people have a voice and influence, as well as respect for others.

It was also pointed out to us that it is important to be tolerant of differing attitudes - if you ban something it doesn't mean it will go away. In addition, it is accepted that one does not talk about politics, while during the interview we heard the opinion that talking about politics should be something normal, which does not lead to arguments and is present, for example, at the dinner table. Another topic is the subsidization of pro-democracy activities - it is important to subsidize such actions, for example, through fundraising.

Statement	Number of respondents
People should be encouraged to engage and talk about democracy	4
Developing democracy is about education and making sure you are aware of your rights	3
Developing democracy means taking care of independence of the courts	2

Single opinions:

- Democracy cannot be developed because it is too old a system. Something new needs to be proposed.
- According to one person, there should be instruments to guard the tri-partition of power.
- One should move with the times and observe the changes taking place in the world, not so much copying solutions, but leading to innovation.
- One interviewee noted that although in our country there are no fist-fightings in the Sejm (the lower house), the level of discourse is very poor, which has an impact on citizens and legislation.
- According to one person, the political scandals of the past, which were of lesser importance at the time, had a big impact on those in power at the time, and now larger scandals pass without a louder echo.

- According to the interviewee, the problem is also the so-called "throw-ins," i.e., parts of the introduced laws that do not deal with the substance of a given law, which, in his opinion, shows the low level of our democracy.
- It was noted that both pro-government media, as well as those that do not support those currently in power, are not objective.

Quotes:

"People are afraid of this topic [politics] and it is said that, for example, at the table you don't talk about politics, and that's what the opposite should be, you should talk, promote the desire to talk, but not to argue, because arguing doesn't lead to anything, by force we won't do anything, so it should be substantive, that everyone has their own worldview, everyone supports someone there, let's say, but you can live with that. The color red can live next to the color black, that's how democracy should live, that's how we should support it."

"If everyone has the right to speak out, it doesn't provoke worse reactions. It's like prohibition, if something is forbidden it will be [there] anyway."

Development of democracy in the world

And what should this development and functioning look like on a global scale?	
---	--

According to most interviewees, democracy should be present in as many countries of the world as possible, because everyone would be equal and no one would be persecuted for their views; it is the best system. Some pointed out the aspect related to the cultural and technological context, which would affect the operation of the system locally - not all countries could easily adopt the system for this reason.

It was also pointed out to us that countries in Europe and the United States should support each other and bet on cooperation.

Statement	Number of respondents
Democracy should be the system in as many countries as possible	4
The mentality of the people and the level of technology affects the possibility of democracy in a country	2
European countries should unite	2

Single opinions:

- Democracies are no longer developing because they are highly developed in some countries, so it's more about "sorting out" everything.
- In most European countries, conservatives and right-wing parties are being pushed out of power.
- Since the outbreak of the conflict in Ukraine, Europe has become more unified, and this unification is a good thing.
- Democracy is one, and only the mentality may be different. Democracy should develop at international and continental levels.

Quotes:

"Democracy developed well in the world (...) But in the 60s, 70s it developed well, now it is not likely to develop. In some countries it is developed enough. A lot of negative things are done there covering it with the word democracy."

Disadvantages of the democratic system

What flaws in the democratic system do you see?	How can these disadvantages be counteracted?
---	--

Among the disadvantages of the democratic system, respondents mentioned that the wrong people, i.e. those who play dirty, can come to power. In addition, it was pointed out that democracy can be a system of government that is too distant from the ordinary citizen, which ordinary citizens do not listen to and causes people to be lazy. Unwillingness to talk about democracy and active living are problems of this system.

We heard that in democracies the wrong people can take office and win elections, although this is also at the heart of democracy, while in authoritarian systems the wrong people in power are the order of the day.

We were also told that at the level of the European Union it is a disadvantage to make decisions unanimously, which delays painful but necessary decisions. In turn, people who use power for their own purposes and go unpunished are getting into Polish politics.

We also heard that democracy can be a terror of the majority, where the majority will impose its will on minorities and literally everything will be voted on. Another point was that important laws are being mishandled in Poland, that there is a "prolonged process of arriving at a systematized legal basis."

We asked respondents how to counteract these drawbacks. They told us that people should be taught to talk freely about politics and democracy. Politics, in the perception of the respondents, is a taboo subject, while it should be alive, present here and now in the life of the citizen. They also mentioned that one should try to submit citizen initiatives, educate from an early age, and make people aware that it is normal to be wrong sometimes. Voting should also be encouraged.

We also heard that people shouldn't be afraid to promote their views and shouldn't think that democracy is only on paper; they should know that it actually works, it exists, it functions, so they should talk about it without fear so that it is not considered a taboo subject.

We were also told that politicians themselves should be required to be more self-reflective, to realize that democracy is not a board game, but an actual quest for change for the better.

We were also pointed out to us the weakness of the functioning of the citizens' legislative initiative, because despite the collection of a hundred thousand signatures, there is no legal obligation to consider such an initiative once it has been filed.

The prolonged process of arriving at a systematized legal basis, i.e., overly long discussions on some topics, was considered a drawback.

As for counteraction: the constitution should be basic reading in schools, properly explained, and rights should be shown and how one can exert influence first in one's small environment.

Statement	Number of respondents
To counter disadvantages, people should be taught to talk freely about politics and democracy	2

Single opinions:

- The distance between the representatives and the people is so great that it makes the voter intellectually lazy.
- Democracy sometimes allows people to elect the wrong representatives.
- At the European level: the disadvantage is the need for unanimous approval of decisions.
- Perhaps too much tolerance for what can be considered wrong is a flaw in democracy.
- A charismatic leader (e.g., an activist, citizen journalist) should assist in smooth decision-making. A good leader is important, it is someone who will be a

representative of the people - a person, a politician, an activist, a citizen journalist, such a person in whose name or behind whom the masses follow.

- Ethics is only one, while the problem of democracy can be too much tolerance in sensitive, worldview issues, such as discussing access to euthanasia.
- The main ways to counter an authority with which one is dissatisfied are to protest and take part in elections.

Quotes:

"The mess is terrible [...], the calling from the Sejm to the Senate, from the Senate to the Sejm, throwing back laws that are acceptable to part of the population. It hurts a lot that you can't fix something, you just have to drone on, such a tug-of-war, and I would like us to be a more cohesive nation, despite our differences, but in basic values."

Advantages of the democratic system

And what advantages do you see in this system?	How can they be strengthened, cared for and developed?
--	--

For our respondents, the main advantage of democracy is the absence of coercion: the ability to have one's own views, the absence of pressure that one should think in a certain way that pleases the authorities, and the ability to voice one's own opinion (mentioned by four people). We were further told that the advantage of democracy is equality, in the sense that everyone has the same right to believe what they want and to vote for whom they want. Another point was the possibility of living the way one imagines.

What respondents see as strengthening democracy can be fostered by teaching a culture of debate at school, respect for others and their views that differ from our own, and learning how to create communities, build relationships and simulations at school.

We also heard that the virtues of democracy could be strengthened by creating groups of people, first on the Internet and then in real life, sharing common values, and teaching in schools to be proud that we have democracy and that we can decide for ourselves. One could also try to inform people objectively about various issues, from many points of view - to make them think, to draw conclusions.

There were also suggestions to take strictly political action to bring about a change in the ruling political camp - petitions, publicizing various issues.

We were also told that in supporting democracy it is important to create regional groups: you can support local government initiatives, create your regional interest circles, such as the Kashubians, Mazurians, Highlanders or Silesians, who feel regional distinctiveness. With democracy they have the opportunity to celebrate it.

Statement	Number of respondents
The main advantage of a democratic system is the absence of coercion	4
In a democracy, you can speak your mind	4
Democracy allows you to look at things from different perspectives	2

Single opinions:

- An important feature of democracy is equality among citizens.
- Creating a sense of unity within a group is important in strengthening the virtues of democracy.
- Encouraging regional and local activity also plays an important role.

Quotes:

"In order to develop democracy, it is necessary to inform people, to show different sides of the coin fairly objectively, to make them think, to draw conclusions."

"[The advantage of democracy is that] there is no way that people who have extremely low support can easily rule, that is, by definition, the majority vote always rules."

"It seems to me that we have forgotten to enjoy this democracy and the fact that we can decide. Politics and politicians have become so disgusting to us as of today that we try not to think about it, or if we do think about it it is only in a negative sense, in a negative context."

Functioning of democracy in Poland

How do you assess the functioning of democracy in Poland?	
---	--

Six respondents believe that democracy in Poland is in a bad state. This is due to the shape of the laws under way regarding the judiciary and the increasing division in society. It was also brought to our attention that those in power are abusing their power and failing to obey the laws in force, and that Poles are becoming less and less able to talk to each other about the topics that divide them.

One person pointed out that it should not be the case that she feels that "all rights" are being taken away from her (in the context of the women's strike).

Two people think everything is fine with democracy in Poland. One believes that gone are the days when elections were rigged, although they stress that overall it is not theirs to judge. In contrast, another respondent said they feel that democracy exists in Poland at the

moment. They don't personally feel any limitations and don't think that any comparison can be made between the current level of democracy and the past. As the person said, they understand that we are talking about democracy, not politics.

Statement	Number of respondents
Democracy in Poland is at risk	6
Democracy in Poland is in good shape	2

Single opinions:

- It is unclear how the current democracy will leave a mark on the future, what harm it will do to the young people who will live in Poland.

Quotes:

"I feel that - democracy exists at the moment. Not to be compared with the past, personally I don't feel any limitations. Because I understand that we are talking about democracy, not politics."

"It's not for me to judge; it's working just fine; there's no better way for Poland now; we've moved away from the days where votes are rigged."

Threats to democracy in the world

What threats do you see to democracy in the world?	
--	--

Respondents listed a number of phenomena that, in their view, have a negative impact on democracy and threaten it as a result. Among other things, we heard that a threat to democracy is making politics into a business (political corruption) and an ideological tilt to one side. Another issue is also the danger that people will not get involved and react to bad tendencies, should they happen. As a result, they will stop believing in democracy and their agency.

The democratic world is threatened by Russia and the seizure of power by people who would like to "collaborate" with it. We also heard that the threat is the manipulation of public opinion in a way known from the cases of, for example, Cambridge Analytica, Russia's interference in the US elections or the Brexit referendum. According to one respondent, it is not only Russia that threatens democracy, but also Syria or Israel, as they want to exercise totalitarian rule.

For one person, too, the loss of faith in democracy is a threat. If people stop hoping and think that what's going to happen is going to happen, things can only get worse.

Statement	Number of respondents
Russia and its collaborators are a threat	2

Single opinions:

- Democracy in the world is threatened by data manipulation (e.g. Cambridge Analytica).
- Social divisions are a threat.

Quotes:

"Russia threatens not only Ukraine, but also Poland, Europe and the whole world."

"As the past history of the Cambridge Analytics operation shows, the famous Brexit case, the US elections, people can be reduced to so-called zeros and ones for today, that is, it is very easy to program people, to predict their actions, to possibly influence their actions."

Inspiration from democracies in other countries

What do you see inspiring about democracies in other countries?	What citizen engagement activities are you aware of?
---	--

Among these inspiring elements of democracy from countries around the world, three of our respondents pointed to the possibility of manifesting one's views or manifesting dissent without risking one's well-being, for example; the possibility that this voice will be heard.

We were told that in other countries they understand that one can be in the Union, subject to EU regulations, but also not limit one's national identity. According to the interviewee, in our country the thinking is zero-one, i.e. either the Union or national identity.

Statement	Number of respondents
What inspires in a democracy is the ability to express one's views safely	3

Single opinions:

- The rapid organizing in Canada during protests, for example, is inspiring; more slogans, less "hard walking on the ground."
- The Scandinavian ability to "get along" and get a lot of people involved in referendums is inspiring.
- According to one of our respondents, it is inspiring that in the West there is no opposition of patriotism to membership in the European Union.
- The outlawing of radical parties such as right-wing parties in some countries is inspiring.
- What we could also be inspired by is the ability to build political compromise.

Quotes:

"I like the fact that they are more attached to slogans there. Poles walk more firmly on the ground, they [in the West] are more used to slogans, freedom on pennants. They act so much with slogans, for example, in America, but that causes more mobilization, there, all you have to do is throw a slogan, the transport workers started rioting in Canada, the government fought them, it wasn't democracy."

"The biggest impression on me is in the Scandinavian countries - the referendums, despite the huge costs, but they take place and people actually take part in them and it's a very large percentage of the population [...] when I think about it and I follow it in the media it gives me goosebumps, wow, that it can be done and it's such an amazing thing."

Representative democracy

What do you think about representative democracy?	What are the advantages and disadvantages?
---	--

Half of the people have a positive view of representative democracy, that is, when the representative is well elected and properly represents the constituents and their views. This is a good solution because it removes the need for the citizen to decide on various issues each time and is convenient for those who do not feel the need for more involvement. The advantage of this system is that if one chooses a candidate well, he or she can be someone who will impress and show the way.

Among the disadvantages of this solution, it was pointed out that voters in general do not know anything about the representative in question, or how the person behaves in their private life, or what kind of person they are. According to two people, sometimes the wrong people are elected, moreover, we trust strangers.

We were told that people elected in a representative democracy must be well-known, work for their environment and their party, contribute on the Internet, in the press, on television, and speak their mind and what group they will represent.

Another drawback of this system is that people lose touch with democracy and forget that freedoms and rights should be taken care of.

One respondent cited the election of unsuitable people, who later change, as disadvantages of this form of democracy, because a lot of people go into politics for money

One interviewee said that he always familiarizes himself with the party's program before the elections, but that what is important in representative democracy is not only the elections, but also the opportunity to observe politicians during their term of office. He considered it a disadvantage that many politicians are "voting machines," and the number of interpellations they bring is zero.

Statement	Number of respondents
Representative democracy is ultimately a good and convenient system of government	4
In a representative democracy, we entrust power to people we do not de facto know	2

Single opinions:

- Representative democracy removes the need for total involvement from less active people.
- Representative democracy makes people distance themselves from caring about their rights.

Quotes:

"Poles, unfortunately, are not interested in running to the polls. That wow effect after 89 is gone somewhere. We've reached two generations who don't remember that time, or when they were alive it was a stage when there was, I don't know, Teleranek, anything like that, so they can't really associate it. People my age, like I said, for me, voting, deciding is a privilege."

"Someone said that democracy is the most expensive system of governance, changes of government and elections cost money, but it is the best system of democratic governance. Being able to choose a candidate and someone to represent your interests is the best it can be."

"We trust strangers, we don't know these representatives on a daily basis, we don't necessarily have to pass them on the street, we won't meet them in a store, we only know about them what the newspapers will write to us, tell us at prepared conferences or post on social media themselves. We don't know how they behave on a daily basis in a friendly relationship, trusting a stranger."

Direct democracy

What do you think about direct democracy?	What are the advantages and disadvantages?
---	--

Direct democracy is hard to introduce in our country because of the number of citizens, it is easier in countries with smaller populations. In Poland it would be difficult to organize and more costly. We could also get stuck with referendums if they were held on every issue, even trivial ones.

We were also told that not everyone can govern because they don't know everything, so having representatives is better. It was also pointed out that direct democracy can lead to chaos. We don't encounter it every day because we live in countries with indirect power, so ignorance of it is quite a disadvantage.

The interviewees also commented on the advantages, such as the opportunity for everyone to have their say or, in one person's opinion, the lower likelihood of rigged referendums.

We also heard that direct democracy with referendums is very good, and the ones that have taken place are a good way to show respect for the people. You can have your say in them anonymously. If these are important issues it is a good system.

Statement	Number of respondents
Direct democracy has definite drawbacks	3
Direct democracy has definite advantages	2

Quotes:

"Direct democracy is hard to implement in our country because of the number of citizens. Smaller countries with smaller populations - in them it would go more smoothly. In our country it would be more difficult to organize it and it would be more expensive."

"Precisely the direct one at referendums is a very good one, precisely at such referendums. There have been several referendums, and I think this is a good way to show respect to the people. To reach out to the whole population, to motivate them."

Democracy in the European Union

What do you think about the role of democracy at the European Union level?	Should the European Union increase cooperation or be more of a Europe of homelands? What relationships should there be between democracies in different countries?
--	---

Perceived advantages and disadvantages

Our respondents pointed out to us a number of features of the European Union, which are, in their opinion, disadvantages or advantages, while generally speaking positively about its very existence.

One interviewee told us about the way separatist rebellions in Spain or discontent in France were suppressed, which was incorrect from his point of view.

Disagreements between different member states and their meddling in the policies of others were also noted, as well as drawing attention to things that should be treated as a state problem. This was considered by the respondent to be a disadvantage, but also an advantage, as it allows there to be an overarching authority to turn to.

They also pointed out the need to consider whether the most important decisions made by the Union should be taken unanimously, as some countries have strayed from the European path.

Also economic policy was mentioned by one respondent, who said that the law should be equal for everyone. If a German wants to drive in Poland then there is no obligation to earn in zlotys, so also a Pole driving in Germany or France does not have to earn in euros. The interviewee summed it up by saying that politics and economics should go two different ways in parallel, which has not been the case for a long time.

Another person said that Poland in the EU is seen as an undemocratic country, while the EU does a lot to take care of the rule of law.

It has also been said that material support from the European Union for many of the countries' own endeavors gives hope to many people, as the Union both watches and controls and also helps.

The direction of change in the Union

One respondent said that on one level cooperation in the Union should be strengthened, while on another level national separateness should be strengthened. Another person opined that we should not become states of the European Union. It is possible, according to the interviewee, to cooperate economically, to have a broad policy on goods and services, without coming into conflict with identity.

Another said that cooperation should be strengthened, through law, a common currency, the economy or agriculture. Another interviewee said that the reason why cooperation should be strengthened is the current economic and military situation.

One respondent felt that we should raise our voice and talk about whether we want the Union to be a Europe of homelands or whether the direction should be the other way around. At the same time, she would like to see some autonomy for each country, while at the same time establishing the same rights in defense and economic issues.

Statement	Number of respondents
Cooperation within the Union should be strengthened	4
Democracy in the European Union should be better	3

Single opinions:

- We should not become states of the European Union.
- We should consider whether the Union should be a Europe of homelands or whether the direction should be the other way around.

Quotes:

"There is nothing wrong if a country has its own national identity, I am in favor of that. I would not be in favor of us becoming states of the European Union. [...] You can cooperate economically, have broad policies, in terms of goods, services, nothing stands in the way. This does not go in any way in conflict with identity."

"Unfortunately, Poland in the EU is seen as an undemocratic country. The Union is doing a lot to make sure there is rule of law in Poland, for example, withholding EU subsidies is also a way."

"Everything should be tightened more, whether it's the law, whether it's the common currency, whether it's the economy or agriculture, it should be tightened more."

"Frequent attention to something that may be considered a state problem, but is blown all over Europe, all over the world sometimes, because this European Union is a sizable institution. This has its own such disadvantages, but it also has its advantages, because there is higher supervision of everything."

"It would be very serious to consider in the current situation whether we want these most important decisions taken by the European Union to be taken unanimously, because we can clearly see that certain countries have deviated from their European path and at this point rather care about something else."

"Personally, I think that the cooperation should be further strengthened."

Experts in democracy

What do you think about the role of experts in democracy?	Who can or should the experts be?
---	-----------------------------------

The general vision of experts in democracy was quite similar in most of our respondents. It should be a person who is knowledgeable about the piece of knowledge they are advising on. We were told that, unfortunately, this is often not the case, because whoever wins the elections chooses their people for particular positions to promote their way of thinking.

An expert should deal with a topic on a daily basis, it should be a professional with unparalleled knowledge and experience. His role is very large and should be to advise individual people and politicians. An important element is the knowledge not only of Polish realities, but also of the law around the world, from the areas of the economy on which he knows. One should have not only knowledge, but also experience.

It was also pointed out that there is a situation in which different experts disagree with each other, due to different views on the same aspect, and still continue to be experts.

We were also told that experts should receive appropriate training and take an active part in democracy, and organize themselves into appropriate groups. One could become an expert through years of experience.

Statement	Number of respondents
The expert should have education and/or experience	5
The expertise should be in a specific area	4
People in power choose experts who promote their own point of view	2

Single opinions:

- Experts should take an active part in democracy.

Quotes:

"Politicians are for waffling and they can talk things without deeper meaning, but an expert should know by themselves and know that they have an impact on what we do. It should be professional."

"An expert should not be some home-grown or self-proclaimed one, but one who has unparalleled knowledge and experience."

"Everyone has an internal perspective on an aspect, each expert may differ from one another, and we call them experts anyway."

Osoby zaufania publicznego

What do you think about the role of people of public trust in a democracy?	Who are the persons of public trust? What qualities should they have? How can one become such a person?
--	---

Desired qualities

Respondents listed many qualities that a person of public trust should have. He or she should be apolitical, although it was pointed out that he or she should not support the government if the government lies, and that some people previously involved in politics may continue to have a good reputation.

Such a person should be transparent, so that facts such as improper arrangements or interests do not suddenly come to light.

It was pointed out that it should be a person who is primarily impartial, active in local government or aid or other organizations. Such a person must show their help and represent something for a long time, as well as have subject matter expertise. According to one respondent, a person of public trust should also be open-minded, have something to say, be motivating and inspiring, as well as display impeccable personal culture and be able to speak to people.

General thoughts

It also noted that they are treading on thin ice, as trust is hard to build and easy to lose.

We were told that as of today it is hard to identify public trust persons in our country, because people on the left have their trust persons and people on the right have theirs. We are very conflicted as a society.

How to become?

Also given as an example was the way to become a village leader, that is, if one has a good reputation, runs the farm well, and has a life of good repute, then people come to such a person with their issues, knowing that one will be heard.

For respondents, it is important in order to become a person of public trust to engage in activities that defend the interests of other people. It's also worth having a somewhat idealistic attitude and earning trust through attitude. One should not be someone off the street, but should represent something longer. One should actively participate in ventures, contribute to forums and speak with sense, because people don't like lies, waffling and big speeches, they just want the truth and sensible communication of information.

Statement	Number of respondents
To become a person of public trust, one must be active for a long time	5
One must have a certain track record to be a person of public trust	3
Such a person must be impartial	2

Single opinions:

- Trust is hard to build and easy to lose
- It's hard to identify people of public trust in Poland these days

Quotes:

"A person of public trust should be apolitical, not belong to any political bloc."

"On this principle, if in the village Stachu has a good reputation, he runs the farm well, his life is in good repute, one or another will come to him, they know that with any matter or problem they can turn to him. These must be people verified by society, not imposed."

"Trust is hard to build, and even easier to lose. These are people who are treading on very thin ice, I think they are also such little legends walking the earth."

"[To become a person of public trust, you have to] actively participate in such activities, contribute to forums and speak with sense, don't spout nonsense, just say what makes sense, because people don't like lies, waffling, big speeches, they just want the truth and meaningful communication of information, from point to point."

"As of today in Poland, it would be insanely difficult to identify persons of public trust as far as our country is concerned."

Awareness among Poles

To what extent are Polish people conscious participants in civil society?	How can this awareness be increased?
---	--------------------------------------

Awareness of Poles today

We received a variety of opinions, ranging from those that it is bad with the awareness of Poles as citizens, to mixed and positive ones.

We were told that people like to talk on forums, but when it comes to concrete actions (such as supporting a candidate or forming a movement) many people don't want to. Poles are more interested in themselves and getting money, and they don't have time for action.

It was also noted that unawareness has its roots in the communist era, and many people continue to feel that their vote, not just in elections, does not count. One respondent indicated that they have high hopes for their generation of young people (by which they mean people in their twenties or early twenties), who are unafraid and not only through words, but also through dress, lifestyle and actions express themselves, and participate in political life.

Another interviewee said that Poles are conscious participants to a small extent. He pointed out that, in their opinion, as of today we are fighting an "us versus them" political battle, and it looks identical from both sides. In his opinion, it is often not about democracy itself, but about voting well for one or the other. They put it this way, that we are over the precipice and running towards it all the time.

We were also told that although the awareness of Poles is low, age opens our eyes, because one perceived some things differently ten years ago and one perceives them differently now. It was also noted that it is difficult to be aware of for someone who does not pursue the subject.

Two people pointed out that things have gotten much better since the 1989 breakthrough. We have begun to model on the West how one can demonstrate, look at local issues, notice bad and good things, be aware of one's rights and fight for them. There is now an awareness of democracy, although there is also more and more indifference.

Raising awareness

In order to increase this awareness and activate people, they need to be made aware that their vote means something and if more people get together then something can be changed. People need to be given a real purpose for action, not relying on the fact that if you vote for one person or another it will be good. We were pointed to local initiatives as what gets people more involved in participating in civil society.

It was also proposed that an online portal be created where citizens could report their pains or problems and suggest their solutions, and then the portal would rank this hierarchically, according to what is most important, and give the authorities the appropriate message.

In order to raise awareness, it is necessary to speak, write and show. According to the respondent, the Internet is a better source than television. In it you can find the most reliable picture of what you are looking for, so the survey participant likes to look into what is ideologically close to him. Also, another interviewee indicated that raising awareness should be done through more actions in electronic media.

The portals were also pointed out by one respondent, believing that the existing ones, which seek the truth and oppose fake news, play a big role. She also noted the significant influence

of passionate journalists who are at the center of events and convey the truth, thus building their brand.

Raising awareness is also possible by introducing an appropriate course of study in school from elementary school onward. One should go more in the Western direction, especially in terms of familiarizing people with defense issues earlier, as in Switzerland.

Another important factor is to celebrate democracy more and show what a tremendous opportunity it is for us and the vast possibilities it gives us. This should not be limited to just informing people about the tripartite system of government and the fall of communism. One respondent also said that people should be taught to obtain information.

Statement	Number of respondents
Very few people are aware	4
There is an awareness of democracy in Poland	2

Single opinions:

- The ignorance of Poles has its roots in the communist era
- We are currently fighting an "us vs. them" political battle, where it looks the same on both sides
- A web portal has been proposed
- Democracy in Poland should be celebrated more

Quotes:

"It could go either way, for example, there is an online portal where, for example, citizens can report their pains or problems to the authorities and suggest such a solution, but people can also get together on their own, someone runs a forum, everyone reports problems."

"Many are unaware, the feeling remains from the communist era that their vote, not only political in elections but in general, that their vote doesn't count, that's why I put very high hopes in my generation, those young people, those 20, 20-something year olds now, who are not afraid."

"As of today we are fighting a war that is really political, us versus them. It looks identical from both sides, each faction has its own, let's call it, arguments."

"It seems to me that we've been over such a precipice for several years now, and we've been running toward it all the time."

"There's more and more indifference because there's so much of it, events or fakes because people stop believing, it makes society indifferent because we don't know if it's true."

Sources of knowledge about the law

From what sources do you learn about changes in the law?	How do you assess the availability and reliability of these sources?
--	--

We were pointed to a wide variety of sources from which respondents learn about changes in the law, such as news portals, television, newspapers, mobile apps, family and friends. We were also given specific examples, such as the Journal of Laws, the Lex legal information system, Łukasz Bok's KiKŚ app, or the newsletter of a law firm, not mentioned by name.

Accessibility and reliability can vary, as sometimes a flashy title can be very shallow. One respondent said that, for example, information about vaccinations was conveyed in a contradictory manner by different media sources. It was also pointed out that one sentence taken out of context can mean something completely different than it does in context.

Some people said that they judge the sources they use as reliable, while others said that the news is not objective. It was pointed out to us that it is necessary to be able to sort information and it is necessary to fight against fake news.

Statement	Number of respondents
I use the Internet to learn about changes in the law	8
The availability and reliability of these sources is limited	4

Quotes:

"It's very often the case, I won't say always, while there are times when it's through this type of electronic information that politicians start digging into given regulations, possibly given works, and somewhere this topic develops."

Expressing one's own opinion about changes in the law

How do you express your opinion on proposals for changes in the law, both those put forward by politicians and citizens?	
--	--

Six people indicated that they talk to loved ones (five people) or co-workers (one person) about political issues, including half that this is the only form of expressing their opinion.

The person reluctant to speak on the forums said they are not a lawyer, so they don't like to make excuses on topics they don't know about and don't like to impose their reasoning on someone.

Some people comment or share political content on social media, such as Facebook and Twitter. One respondent said that the ability to enter into discussions with politicians is easier now, precisely because of the presence of Twitter, than when the only way to contact them was through MPs' offices.

One person also told us that he contributes online by signing petitions.

Statement	Number of respondents
Discusses law changes with loved ones	5
Comments or shares political content on social media	4
Talking to loved ones is the only way to express an opinion on legal changes	3

Single opinions:

- Twitter provides an easy way to communicate with politicians
- A form of expression is signing petitions online

Quotes:

"I limit myself to conversations, on forums I don't express myself, because I'm not a lawyer, I don't like to make smart remarks on topics I don't know about."

"I discuss them a lot, especially with friends, I also talk about it a lot at home."

"As of today, when it comes to any kind of changes in the law, I use social media like Facebook, Twitter, just to comment somewhere."

Engaging in changes in Polish law

How would you like to be able to get involved in changing laws on a national level?	
---	--

Three people proposed the creation of a portal. There were different opinions about its operation, but they boiled down to the possibility of proposing one's ideas and contacting

people more educated in a given direction, as well as informing about changes introduced or proposed in Polish law. It was said that it should be a place for substantive expression.

One interviewee said that our judiciary should return to the European norm, and that they would like to be able to speak out for or against changes in the law. Another person announced that they want to take an active part in politics, go to elections, follow what is happening in the state and react to it.

We were also alerted to the desire to influence legislation in the European Parliament.

One person said that nowadays influence can be obtained through signature gathering, or participatory budgeting, thanks to which a lot has changed with the participation of citizens.

Statement	Number of respondents
There could be a portal to help engage in changes to the law	3

Single opinions:

- It is important to be able to influence decisions in the European Parliament

Quotes:

"I would like there to be, not even a forum, but maybe a portal, where I could, for example, present some idea of mine, and someone already smarter than me or more educated in the direction could pull it and give it shape. A portal to propose changes and express your opinion."

"As of today, it would be nice if we had any kind of portal, a place where proposals for changes in the law would be published, where you could comment in a substantive way, possibly make your comments, and that anyone would see it."

Social media

What is the role of social media in civil society?	
--	--

Half of the respondents explicitly told us that the role of social media is great or very great. Two people spoke unequivocally negatively about the role of these media, indicating that they cause confusion. They pointed out to us the receipt of money by some participants for promoting selected content, as well as the negative role of fake accounts and news.

We were told that it is a powerful medium because you can use it to convey your ideas and change the attitudes of people in our country by activating them to various activities. We also

heard that the role of social media is greater than that of television and the press, and it is achieving significant reach very quickly.

One respondent pointed out that it is primarily a medium for information, both positive and negative. In their opinion, it is the last bastion on which politicians do not have as much influence, although of course they also create content themselves.

Statement	Number of respondents
The role of social media is large or very large	4
The role of social media is negative	2
The role of social media is greater than television and radio	2

Quotes:

"Through social media, the world has shrunk terribly, you can send more information, that's certainly what it fosters. Discussions can be established, people can cross over to do something, contact is better, there is a better flow of information."

"Social media is the last bastion that politicians, those in power at least, don't have that much influence on. They try to create content, they succeed, while it's not like we can shut down this internet in Poland as of today."

"Chaos, tremendous chaos, how to throw everything into a bag, you still have to choose for yourself, you have to look at the source and don't care so much."

Citizens' initiatives

What do you think about citizen legislative initiatives?	Do you know an example of such an initiative?
--	---

Six out of eight respondents had heard of citizen legislative initiatives. Three of them pointed to Ms. Godek's initiative as an example, although two people spoke negatively about this particular initiative, and a third person did not express an opinion.

The very existence of the citizens' legislative initiative is assessed as desirable, although two people pointed out a problem with its mechanism. It was pointed out to us that while it can be submitted, it often has no resonance. One person also told us that those currently in power only consider projects submitted by citizens that are convenient for them. In her opinion, there should be a provision that mandates that every project that is submitted be addressed.

The ability to express our opinions and judgments and to promote what we think is right was pointed out to us as advantages. We don't always have to agree with the actions of the elected authorities, who may take actions that are inconsistent with their electoral agenda. The possibility of an initiative also gives ordinary citizens a chance to have their say. We have been told that it is amazing that people have the willingness to put forward such initiatives.

One respondent also pointed to the nationwide referendum as another opportunity to engage in dialogue with the national government, and spoke positively about such an opportunity.

Statement	Number of respondents
The existence of the possibility of submitting initiatives is right	7
I had heard about citizen legislative initiatives before the survey	6

Single opinions:

- There should be a legal provision to deal with any initiative

Quotes:

"The mechanism itself, this possibility that citizens can submit a project - this is generally good, because it allows us to do such a thing, we have the opportunity to express our opinions, judgments, we can promote what we think is right."

"When electing an authority for four years, you can't always agree with that authority, I choose on the basis of some program, but somewhere something after two years introduces something that doesn't coincide too much with the program. Then why shouldn't the public express itself?"

"It's something amazing that people have the desire to do something like this at all, it's time-consuming, nerve-racking, so it's something amazing."

"The problem is that those currently in power consider those projects submitted by citizens that are convenient for them. If there was a provision that ordered every project to be dealt with, perhaps things would look different."

Presenting your own initiative

What would encourage you to put forward your own citizen legislative initiative?	How would you work to prepare such an initiative?
--	---

What would encourage?

In order to propose their own law, respondents would have to have a very good idea to propose it. A mechanism that would help a group of people organize themselves would be encouraged, that is, people with similar views would find each other.

Something would have to frustrate respondents a lot for them to want to create their own initiative. One respondent indicated that they would talk to their neighbors, look on the Internet. The main factor for one respondent would be the fact that someone else stands by their side and supports a particular demand.

It was also pointed out to us that with the current political situation, proposing one's own initiatives may not make sense, as they would have to be in line with the thinking of those currently in power. Therefore, for one respondent, even presenting a great idea would not make sense until the law is changed so that there is a need to address such an initiative.

Also, knowledge of the law would be helpful in presenting your own initiative.

How to work on the initiative?

To begin with, a topic would have to be proposed so that people could think about the idea itself and have some sort of forum for this, where everyone could have their say. With the idea crystallized, a representative could be sought to represent the group, as well as experts to help frame the idea legally and procedurally, and work on a more concrete outline of the initiative.

It would be important to look for arguments that show the view of the person creating the initiative, expand their own knowledge, show information and statements of experts.

The hardest part could be finding a group of people who would also be willing to get involved. Finding representation is also important for some of those surveyed, as they themselves might not be willing to take on such a role.

It is important to prepare well on the legal side, so as not to cause some oversight. Thus, it would be necessary to do solid research, as well as to gather a large number of people who would like to make a difference and have the motivation to do so, so as not to be left alone with the idea.

One would also need to make sure that the proposed regulatory changes would not be easy to circumvent or would not create an unclear situation. This could be achieved by getting the opinions of as many people as possible.

Consultation with like-minded people can begin by preparing a handout. One would also reach out to people through social media, as well as seeking influential people to promote the topic.

Statement	Number of respondents
One should expand one's own knowledge to propose a good initiative	5
Some mechanism to help a group of people get organized would encourage them	4
At the beginning, it is necessary to propose an outline of the idea and get feedback	4
A very good idea would be needed	3
It would be necessary to find a representative	3
The help of experts or lawyers would be needed	3

Single opinions:

- Proposing initiatives in the current political situation may not make sense
- An analysis would be needed so that the proposal for a revised law would not be easy to circumvent or create ambiguity
- People could be reached through social media or famous people

Quotes:

"In the beginning, you need to throw a topic so that people can think about the idea, have some kind of forum so that everyone can express themselves, everyone can give their opinion and you can discuss the topic on the portal."

"The main thing would be that I know I'm not alone in this, that someone else is standing next to me, who would also support a certain thing, who would also want to change this thing, which would make me think first that someone is next to me."

"In the first place, I would certainly try to confront other people, to present this idea, this bill to them, so that they would comment on whether they see it similarly or maybe I missed something, maybe it would be worth adding something, it would be worth pointing out that a particular provision may be easy to circumvent or may cause some unclear situations."

Part II: The Portal

Need for a portal

To what extent is such a portal needed?	Why? What is missing from other portals? What would it need to stand out?
---	---

Seven out of eight respondents indicated that the portal was needed, including five who said it was very much needed. It would allow people to voice their views and opinions from every corner of Poland. The portal should be open, meaning that everyone should be able to put forward their opinion, and it should not work in such a way that someone throws in a bad idea and it will cause a "vilification" of that person. The discussion should be substantive (without attacks on other people), not emotional, like on Facebook. Such a portal should send a message to the user that he or she should focus on the topic if he or she is guided too much by emotions rather than common sense.

Potential users might not look for such a portal, but if they found out about it they would look at it eagerly out of curiosity. It would be good to gather in one place all the legal advice or news, so that one does not have to search on different portals or groups, included in a simple way, grouped and organized. It is necessary to have good advertising so that everyone can get to it.

There was a suggestion to create first a mobile application for young people and then a web application for older people. The app would have to be accessible to all, innovative and easily accessible. An important element of the mobile app is notifications

Other portals often lack intuitiveness. The layout also plays an important role. Simplicity has been suggested, such as subdued colors and a delicate font.

The main topic would be citizen initiatives, so the application should focus on this, present different aspects of the topic, constantly develop it, show, give examples, explain why something happened. The current hot topic should be developed. The public consultation process should be presented, discussed, perhaps with interactive recordings, multimedia or voting.

The application should especially stand out for its ease of access and navigation, since many government websites are unintuitive, hard to get to something. Headlines describing topics should not only be inviting, but most importantly simple to understand and direct.

One respondent pointed out that with a potential change in power, it would be great to be prepared for the opposition's entry by having the foundation prepare proposals for laws to fix what has been broken, and consulted with the toughest heads.

On other portals, there is a lack of involvement, and everything is shown in a soulless way. The problem of the ruling party ignoring the opinions, especially the negative ones, of the Sejm or Senate office was pointed out.

It would be worthwhile to create appropriate sections, for example, tax law, the Polish Order (Polski Ład), describing the problems, pros and cons of a particular solution, as well as what provisions are mutually exclusive, which are unnecessary or illogical.

The problem may be to break through, since such a site may already exist and no one knows about it. The differentiator should be easily stated information that is understandable to everyone, not just lawyers or people familiar with the industry.

You can see people, those who don't know where the money comes from and those who blindly believe what is reported on TV. What is missing is a place that explains in an easy-to-understand way what it is all about, what the regulations will mean, how they will come into effect, what can happen, what the dangers are, and possibly how a particular law can be improved.

A hallmark of the portal could be the catching of fake accounts and haters, as well as the support of a psychologist for people who experience hate. Such a psychologist could explain that a person is entitled to his or her opinions and support him or her. Such a person could approach him or her, as well as the psychologist could initiate interactions. It is possible to act analogously to that in portals where sales chatbots operate, asking if the customer (or in our case, the user) needs support.

Texts that are not aligned with the foundation's point of view should not be allowed to be removed so that everyone has the right to speak out. The portal should dispel doubts, and be free and unbiased, aiming for pure facts.

It would be another platform for exchanging views, like Twitter, for example. The portal would have to distinguish itself by inviting credible guests, the possibility to ask questions, debates, and be the initiator of live meetings. It would be important to be able to submit topics and laws or seeds of change to laws.

The problem could be access to the portal by people who have poor Internet connection. Older people could be assisted by their families in publishing content on the portal. It could be made available from the age of sixteen or eighteen. For young people, there should be functionality to make them aware of how to get there and submit an initiative, and that it is a complex process.

Statement	Number of respondents
Portal is needed	7
The discussion should be substantive	5
Intuitiveness is important	3

It is worthwhile to explain the laws	3
The relevant sections should be created	2
You can't discriminate against people because of their views	2

Single opinions:

- Everyone should be able to voice their views
- The portal must be unbiased
- A graphic design with subdued colors and a delicate font is proposed
- Different aspects of the topic should be presented, developed, shown, examples given, explaining why something happened.
- Headlines/titles should be simple to understand
- It is necessary to catch fake accounts and haters
- Possible access from sixteen or eighteen years of age
- There should be a mobile and web version
- Psychological support for those experiencing hate is needed
- The ability to submit your own topics is important

Quotes:

"There is a need for such a portal, because thanks to it, people could voice their opinions and views, people from every corner of Poland could do it, there should be this portal open so that everyone could present their opinion."

"It's certainly needed, maybe all just such or legal advice or news would be gathered in one place and you wouldn't have to search on different portals or groups, something like that would probably be useful."

"Very much needed, much does not need to be added, people are not fully aware, and this could [help] especially in the form of an application that would be available to all, would be innovative and easily accessible. Web-based and mobile."

"It is needed very much, only one question arises as of today, because the fact that there are changes needed in the law is known to both you and me very well, we are aware of this."

"It is needed badly, it just needs to earn its credibility."

Eagerly awaited functionalities

What functionality would you most like to see on such a portal?	Please tell us how you think such a portal could work.
---	--

The portal should indicate which issues are more important and deal with the issue chosen by users (for example, based on how many percentages want to deal with the issue). There must be a hierarchy, and the most important topic highlighted.

It is important to be able to ask a specialist in the field how the issue currently works, whether any laws already describe it, in order to know this at the very beginning of the journey.

Functionality may include: the ability to vote, opinion, statement, submission of initiatives. Examples of category breakdown are: strictly political, national, regional, culture, religion.

Selection of topics can be done by moderators, but also through polls among people.

It is worth noting the usefulness of notifications in the mobile app, they can engage participants and remind them of the app.

Another suggestion is to make the portal more informative or alarming. The point is to educate people about current laws. Proposals should be created by specialists in a given topic, also taking into account what solutions work in other countries, pointing out their pros and cons. According to the respondent, entering into discussions at the current level would not do any good.

It would be useful to be able to set alerts, subscribe to newsletters about what project the government is working on, and be able to select the branches that interest us. Possible categories are: life, impact on taxes, payout, etc.

Desired functionalities include: the ability to speak out, create groups of people with shared values, sign petitions together, respond to posts, comments, the ability to share, integration with Messenger, the ability to log in, a separate discussion box, the ability to create closed groups, polls, voting (for determining statistics based on group characteristics such as age ranges).

Statement	Number of respondents
Users should be given the opportunity to speak out	7
It is important to properly divide the categories	5
It is useful to be able to vote	4
The ability to respond to posts and comments is important	3
It is important to be able to contact a specialist	2
Self-reporting of initiatives should be available	2
It is useful to determine voting statistics based on group characteristics	2

Single opinions:

- Ability to create groups of people with shared values
- Creation of notifications in the mobile app
- Issues should be prioritized
- The portal should be more informative than a field of discussion
- Attention should be paid to similar legal solutions in other countries
- It is useful to be able to set alerts and subscriptions
- It is worth enabling the signing of petitions
- It is worth giving the possibility to share content on social media
- Integration with Messenger should be considered
- Functionality for creating closed groups can be added

Quotes:

"It should be that the portal would allow us to contact an expert, in a topic that interests us - we have an idea, but we would like to ask a specialist how it works now, whether any regulations now capture it, so that at the beginning of our path we can see if it makes sense."

"In terms of functionality, it would be more of an information issue, even an alarm issue at times."

"It would certainly be nice if you could set alerts, newsletters, on the principle that the government is working on a particular project, possibly legislative work is going on [the project]."

Nationwide law

We would like to focus on a nationwide law. What are your thoughts on this?	Why? What difficulties might lie ahead?
--	--

Seven out of eight respondents were unequivocal that focusing on nationwide law was a good idea. It was pointed out to us that topics need to be divided into categories so that there is no chaos. We would also need to ensure the presence of experts, explaining to people what the laws are about and their practical implications.

Respondents also indicated that it could be difficult to publicize the portal, but that it could eventually become very popular. It was pointed out to us that users should be able to give their suggestions, including proposals for laws.

It was also noted that there will be questions as to why we focus on national laws when you can read about them in the news, haters will be present. It's also worth taking care of in-app notifications to remind people about the portal, as people can become saturated with the topic.

An important comment made by one respondent was that since we are members of the European Union, we should also point out the context of EU laws, i.e., that the rule in question results from the implementation of an EU rule.

Two people indicated that the portal should be open to English speakers, e.g., because there are more than just Poles living in Poland, as well as it would be a broadening of horizons.

One respondent also indicated that real-time online meetings, such as in the form of a moderated panel, and the presence of polls would be a good direction.

Statement	Number of respondents
Focusing on nationwide law is a good idea	7
Promoting the portal can be difficult at first	3
The presence of experts is important	2
Portal should be open to English speakers	2

Single opinions:

- It is necessary to divide the topics into categories
- The portal could eventually become very popular
- It is worth taking care of notifications in the application
- The context of European Union regulations should be included
- Online meetings and polls would be valuable

Quotes:

"A portal like this, a state-wide law that affects us all, would be a good idea."

"[Focus] only on the national law is not quite right, because we are members of the European Union and very many directives are implemented in our country, it is not always GDPR, they are not always some pieces of several hundred pages, while sometimes some things are important, and we may simply skip them."

Similar activities

What similar efforts to involve citizens in the discussion of changes to nationwide laws are you aware of?	Do you know of such activities on the Internet?
--	---

None of the interviewees was able to identify a portal analogous to the one we propose. Some interviewees pointed to partially convergent activities of some individuals or groups, but they were not exactly what we are proposing due to the focus only on providing facts or individual initiatives. Interviewees pointed to such activities on Facebook, for example.

It was also noted that a large proportion of posts on convergent topics are at such a low level that they do not engage a larger group of interlocutors. Mobile apps were mentioned, however, integrating citizens locally or focusing on informing.

There is a lack of a place where everything is easily accessible, where people can enter, consider proposals and make their comments. It was pointed out that comments proposed by citizens are often not listened to.

Television debates were also mentioned, especially in the context of the campaign. According to one interviewee, they don't have a particularly good formula in our country, like in the U.S., where there is more culture of speech and respect. We were also told about Twitter activities or conversations with people on portals such as Wirtualna Polska and web TV, as well as debates at universities and on YouTube.

Statement	Number of respondents
There are partially convergent activities on other portals	8
Respondent is unable to identify a portal analogous to our proposal	6
Existing discussions are at a low level	2

Single opinions:

- You can find mobile apps that engage citizens locally or focus on informing
- There is a lack of a place where everything would be gathered in one place

Quotes:

"I don't know of any that engage, because now it's just giving information."

"I don't think I know of any similar activities as physical actions, in fact, this type of information usually appears in the online press, possibly on Twitter, on Facebook or in relevant groups."

Target group of the portal

Who should this portal be for?	Who would primarily want to use this portal?
--------------------------------	--

The portal can be for everyone, but it should not involve people who simply want to argue and challenge. It should attract people who are interested in the law and want to participate in its activities in an informed way. It would have to be substantive and professional, and help people understand the law. It should explain intricate laws.

The target group is seen differently by the interviewees, according to one person it is young people, according to another it is middle-aged people. One interviewee indicated that it should be for people in their twenties and above.

If the work is done thoughtfully, the portal could also be of interest to people who are just beginning to explore the topic. According to one respondent, it could be like Wikipedia, but for law and politics, to be able to learn more about the law.

Specific social groups, such as entrepreneurs, were also pointed out as a target group. Also mentioned were people who are fickle when it comes to their views, want to assert themselves, or don't have their views yet.

Statement	Number of respondents
The portal should be for all adults interested in substantive discussion	7
It should explain the intricate provisions of the law	2
It may also be of interest to those who are just beginning to explore the subject	2

Quotes:

"The portal should attract people who are interested in the law, who consciously want to participate in it, who want to get more involved in it, not just to be."

"The portal should help you understand the law."

Other participants

Who else should participate in the functioning of this portal?	<p>What groups of participants do you see?</p> <p>Who would guarantee integrity, impartiality and efficiency on this portal?</p> <p>We propose the participation of citizens, experts, ethicists and people of public trust. What do you think about this?</p>
--	--

Media, experts, moderators, judges, famous people, students, students, adults, legal advisors and politicians were mentioned.

Moderators should make sure that the portal is arranged and there are appropriate categories. According to one respondent, the more important question is not who should participate, but how to guard the culture of expression.

Reliability could be guaranteed by a state institution in which we have confidence, or a non-governmental organization dealing with the law and confirming expert status, maybe a bar council, giving a kind of certification as to people's competence.

Three of the respondents said that it is the creator of the portal, first of all, who should guarantee reliability, impartiality and efficiency. Also mentioned was a team of good people, made up of people with education and experience, such as sociologists, people with degrees in law, politics and geopolitics. Also mentioned was a group called researchers or "diggers," who would dig so long on a given topic to get to the truth and make sure whether the information given is true or not.

It was also noted that there are no such statesmen in our country who are authorities for both right- and left-leaning people. One respondent pointed out that they used to be judges

of the Constitutional Court or the Supreme Court. We were also told that not imposing a political option through the portal is a good idea.

They also referred to our proposal and six people said it was good. Also mentioned were people of public trust, the ombudsman, people from the third sector, experts, well-known people (who have done something, even locally), mayors or people recommended by users.

Some responded to our proposal to involve ethicists, saying it was a good idea. One respondent said that we need to know what kind of society we want to be, and that values are key, hence the presence of ethicists, based on basic life values shared by religious and non-religious people, would be desirable.

It was also mentioned that the experts must be trusted individuals who will have to prove themselves. It was noted that we can create something like Twitter, where we will have a very serious war under every form of expression, and we will go from substantive arguments to ad personam arguments.

Statement	Number of respondents
Experts should participate in the portal's activities	2

Single opinions:

- There should be appropriate categories
- It is necessary to have a close-knit team of people
- We lack statesmen, who are authorities for everyone
- Our proposal for the participation of the mentioned groups (citizens, experts, ethicists and people of public trust) is good
- Involvement of ethicists is a good idea
- Experts must be people of trust

Quotes:

"It would have to be a good team, because one person can't handle it, a team made up of different people, but different I mean people with education and experience."

"I think also researchers, I don't know if there is such a profession or occupation, but such people who sit in it and will dig so long until they get to the truth and make sure whether this news is true or not."

"Politicians, from time to time, could [get involved]. That they would be invited guests and show [issues] from the legal or legislative side, each of us is at a different level of knowledge. A politician, whether we like them or not, it would be good for them to speak on the top issues of the week, or the topic of the week."

Non-serious proposals

How to respond to non-serious proposals on the portal?	How should users promote good proposals? What solutions in the operation of this portal would prevent the promotion of non-serious proposals?
--	--

The problem may be non-serious proposals appearing on the portal. Most people said such behavior should be blocked.

According to two people, this should happen gradually, that is, first a warning and then banning the account. In their opinion, this is supposed to be a serious portal, not for gossip and chatter. One person pointed out that experts should be the ones to catch such topics. There was also the opinion that it should be the moderation that deals with particularly absurd proposals.

Two of the respondents suggested that it should be up to the community to decide whether a topic is serious or not, on a poll basis whether we allow the topic to be discussed further.

One person pointed out that non-serious proposals should be responded to with serious answers, on the assumption that there are no stupid questions, but there are stupid answers. However, this should not be used to excess, because some questions cannot be answered wisely. This person also pointed out to us the example of Reddit, where some stupid questions are answered by people so wisely that it is a pleasure to read and makes sense. Young people may also be interested in such discussions.

Preventing the appearance of non-serious proposals is important. A huge problem for both Twitter and Facebook is troll farms, i.e. the creation of accounts that grow at a rapid pace and contribute nothing to the discussion except brawling and name-calling. Appropriate algorithms could also be used in the operation of the portal, which would catch the creation of a large number of accounts from the same IP address.

We also talked with respondents about how to promote good proposals. Portal administrators could generate topics themselves that are important to a large number of people. There should be indicators showing that this is a key problem to be solved, based on overall traffic and people's interest in the topic.

We were also told that examples should be shown of how to express oneself on a given topic in order to promote good proposals. There was also the idea that selected initiatives could be branded with their names by well-known people respected in society.

It was also suggested that we allow topics to be shared further, that is, sent via Instagram, on Facebook, in a message or link. This was justified on the grounds that since the dawn of time, passing information to each other has been crucial.

It was also pointed out to us that it should be possible to tag content using reactions, such as hearts or "likes." As for sorting, it was suggested that it should be up to users to decide whether to sort by the most pluses or from oldest to newest or newest to oldest.

Good proposals would need to be publicized so that users have the opportunity to vote. To this end, it has been suggested that we go beyond the service, for example, through short, thirty-second ads on YouTube. There should also be actions, summarizing the effects of our activities, as this already builds a sense of causality, for example, through videos or testimonials. Such promotion of good activities later causes a snowball effect.

Statement	Number of respondents
Non-serious proposals should be blocked	5
The portal should propose topics that are important to a large group of people	3
Blocking frivolous proposals should happen gradually	2
The community should decide whether a proposal is non-serious, by voting	2

Single opinions:

- Non-serious proposals should be answered seriously
- You should be shown how to express yourself properly
- It should be possible to share topics on external sites
- It is important to allow the use of reactions, such as "like" for example
- Good proposals should be publicized
- Topics should also be promoted outside the portal itself

Quotes:

"This is not a portal for gossip and chatter, we should draw some kind of line."

"Respond with serious answers - I say this with conviction. I'm coming from the assumption that there are no stupid questions, but there are stupid answers, and by answering competently it's that okay, they take us seriously, and even to stupid questions they will answer."

"If someone can't behave in such a place, can't understand the rules there then I don't see how they can use such a place."

"A huge problem for both Twitter and Facebook is troll farms, i.e. the creation of accounts that grow like mushrooms in the rain, contributing nothing to the discussion."

"Maybe according to the principle of upbringing, that first you need to say, don't do this, we don't want this, admonish that if the second time there will be a consequence, the third time a ban, but not right away, just a warning that we don't want this behavior."

Hate speech

How to deal with potential hate speech?	What proposals should absolutely be removed or blocked?
---	---

Participants generally state that hate speech should be strongly curbed, usually by blocking such users. It is absolutely necessary to block posts that are racist, incite hatred, urge evil acts against other people, sexual propositions.

One user said that it is necessary to block those proposals that promote evil, are demoralizing or carry bad resonance.

One person said that the determinant should be whether a statement offends someone else. For her, it is unacceptable to persecute a group, singling out the characteristics of a particular group, mocking someone, imposing divisions, proposing privileges for only one group.

It was also brought to our attention that vulgarities should not be accepted on our portal.

According to some people, law enforcement agencies should also be notified in extreme cases (e.g., criminal threats, life-threatening threats).

We were also told that discussions sometimes follow certain patterns. One can discuss and have arguments up to a certain point, but at some point it becomes a "tug-of-war."

It was also suggested that in less extreme situations, one should respond competently and explain why the behavior is not appropriate.

It was also pointed out that posts that have nothing to do with the topic should also be deleted.

Statement	Number of respondents
Hate speech must be eliminated	8
Posts containing hate speech should be removed	7
Users who commit hate speech must be blocked	3
It is necessary to notify law enforcement authorities in some cases	2

It is worth explaining and clarifying the rules of conduct on the portal to users who commit hate speech	2
--	---

Single opinions:

- Demoralizing proposals should be blocked
- Vulgarities should not be accepted
- Posts that have nothing to do with the topic should be deleted

Quotes:

"Absolutely blocked, racist, hate speech, inciting hatred, inciting bad things against other people, the user should be immediately removed, and in extreme cases notify law enforcement if they become active."

"Fight radically, without any scruples."

Moderation

How should moderation function on such a portal?	Who is a moderator to you? How do you recruit people for moderation? Should they be volunteers?
--	---

The role of a moderator

The role of the moderator was understood very broadly by our interviewees. They pointed out to us the various functions that a moderator should perform.

The moderator should shape and show. He or she should guide the participants of the portal on a given topic, and make sure that the discussion does not go sideways, but leads to the heart of the matter.

The role of the moderator would be to select ideas that come from users. For example, someone could suggest a good topic, experts would confirm that it was interesting, and we would show that there was a solution, that we might modify something else.

A moderator would have to keep track of the discussion all the time, as it cannot be let loose. However, you cannot allow only content that is in line with the views of the owner or administrator of the portal.

The moderator should be a person who is primarily unbiased and properly educated, such as in the field of law or economy.

A lot of support for moderation could be a program that would catch inappropriate content. Also, the possibility of reporting inappropriate content by users themselves would be a good solution, it is quite popular. Sometimes there would be a need to cut off the thread, because otherwise sometimes it can't be solved.

The moderator should be an intelligent person who tries to understand the discussion and set boundaries for both sides (supporters and opponents). Ad personam arguments, judging someone by their profile picture, use of curse words should not be allowed (although on Twitter they don't ban this, our portal is a more serious place).

You can accept any content before it is uploaded to the portal, both bad and good, and allow it to be reported, so as not to cut off people's right to speak, but also not to allow inappropriate content to spread. The moderator should be objective, but also a smart person in terms of personal culture and life wisdom, such as someone with a degree in psychology.

The moderator could be a lawyer without going by name. Hate speech and vulgarities should be prevented. It's best to include in the rules what types of speech are hate speech, but also without too many guidelines, so as not to discourage participants from publishing statements.

The facilitator could also put the participants in the conversation on the right track at the right time, recognizing the moment when things start to get away from the point.

The moderator is the person who points out that something is not appropriate, because it is, for example, hate speech, it should not be read by minors. He should be the person who coordinates, manages and has the authority, and above all, reacts.

Recruitment of moderators

They also addressed our question about recruitment. It should be someone who has an idea of the law (it can't be a layman), and with charisma and a sense of the moment.

Certainly, professionals should arrange the questions needed for the interview, so that the candidate can provide views, he or she should be asked what democracy is and find someone who is very likely to perform the function.

You should check for the ability of spelling correctly, because it shows competence, and also check in terms of how someone would respond to a particular issue. For example, offer a staging, give some examples and ask what they would write off or say, how they would react, where they would pass on. It can't be just a person off the street, but must be well prepared and trained. It should be a team that would consult with each other on more difficult cases.

Also, another person pointed out that there should be tests to show where the boundary is, or to show the statements, so that the person in question in his mind shows or states whether they see grounds to act as a moderator. We should have our rules and guidelines, whereas if someone seeing a post containing racist or homophobic texts does not see a problem with it, then such a person has no right to be a moderator.

People on staff or volunteers

We also received answers as to whether they should be full-time people or volunteers. Volunteering is good to a certain extent, it has its pros and cons, as does a full-time person. There wouldn't have to be an iron rule that there are only people employed in one form or the other. It would be possible to employ, for example, final-year students or young employees, it would also be an opportunity for them to learn something.

Of the arguments in favor of salaried people, one has emerged that it can be mentally tough and it is a difficult job to answer someone competently. Moreover, hiring volunteers could result in an influx of people who will opt for one of the political options, and if we pay someone then such a person can be held accountable for the results of their work, and if we are dissatisfied with them then we can simply dismiss them and they should care about the work. Also, the argument that round-the-clock work would be needed on such a portal indicates the need to hire people on a permanent basis.

Statement	Number of respondents
It should be an impartial person	4
It should be a properly educated person	4
Hiring full-time moderators is a better solution than volunteering	4
Moderator would have to follow the conversation all the time	2
The use of swear words cannot be allowed	2
It is necessary to properly prepare the interview with the moderator candidate	2
You can ask candidates how they would react to the sample statements	2
The moderators could be either volunteers or full-time employees	2

Single opinions:

- The moderator should make sure that the discussion does not go sideways
- They should select topics proposed by users
- An algorithm to catch inappropriate content would be useful
- Sometimes it would be necessary to cut off the thread
- Ad personam arguments should not be allowed
- Any content can be accepted before it is published
- Include in the rules what types of speech are hate speech
- The moderator could also speak up to steer participants of the conversation back on track, for example, when the discussion descends into side topics

- The moderator must flag content as inappropriate for minors
- The moderator should be familiar with spelling and writing

Quotes:

"Correctness of spelling, orthography - this should be strongly checked, it shows competence, they should also be checked in terms of how they would react to a thing, offer a staging, give some examples of how they would write back, what they would say, how they would react, where they would pass on; it could be an ordinary person from the street, but they must be well prepared for it and trained."

"The moderator should be an intelligent enough person who, in a given discussion, tries to understand and draw boundaries for one side and the other, that is, those who are for and those who are against."

Promoting the portal

How to encourage people to participate in the life of the portal?	When would people have a sense of empowerment using this portal? How to create this sense of empowerment? What motivates people to actively participate in such a community?
---	--

How to encourage?

The portal must have a quality and show people that something can be solved. The more professional it is, the more it will encourage participation. People need to be made aware that they can have an impact and not downplay what they say, but take an interest in some way.

One respondent advised against ads, saying that they annoy more people than they influence people. Another pointed out that it should primarily be social media ads or posts.

However, we will still need to keep the user by going with the times, not stopping, just being innovative. The layout should be updated, improvements should happen. It would be useful to get feedback from people on what they think is important to do and discuss it in your team. People should be listened to and there should be good advertising.

One person pointed out that we won't need to encourage, because it will roll on its own. The current political situation in the country has caused people to live politics, whether they like it or not.

It would also be necessary to publicize that there is freedom of speech on the portal, that one can speak out to make a difference. This could be encouraged by advertising the portal or handing out flyers.

It would be necessary to show the portal's prowess that some topics have been taken care of, although it may take some time to demonstrate something.

Sense of empowerment

A sense of empowerment could be built by realizing an idea that would crystallize, signatures would be collected and a bill would be submitted. It would also be necessary to show feedback that the bill was accepted for consideration and what happened next. Just addressing the issue would be satisfying for people, because it would mean that it was presented in a wider forum, someone addressed it and Poland heard about it.

Another interviewee put it this way, that it is necessary to show that by participating in such a portal one can do anything. According to another person, even being able to sign a petition would increase the sense of empowerment. At the very beginning, people would be happy if they could sign something and comment.

The sense of empowerment would be influenced by raising such topics that people are interested in, that they themselves ask, but also by showing solutions, what and how can be changed, giving some solutions on a platter, pointing to people who would also like similar changes, connecting people.

It would encourage that substantive comments that make sense are met with a response from the person who substantively created the document on the portal team's side. The goal would be to show people that they can actually participate in a substantive discussion.

People would be happy to have causality even without acquaintances, that anyone can submit a topic and talk. It would be advisable to promote the portal through advertisements on the Internet, as well as by organizing debates at specific times. It would be possible to show how the portal works, invite many people to the first meeting, maybe bring up some socially important topics.

What motivates?

People are motivated by the fact that if there are topics that interest them then they can find something to do, comment, help, maybe get involved themselves.

It would also motivate peace among the people, that is, so that the work of the moderators is actually visible, so that there is no hate speech, but also so that people can voice their thoughts on the subject, have discussions, so that not everything comes out of the creators, so that they can show their response.

It is worth reminding that the application works, because sometimes it is forgotten. Topics must not be written in official language, it must be understood by everyone. A glossary could be added, presenting the content in an understandable and interesting way.

Active participation would be encouraged by attracting people who are known to Twitter, they could recommend the portal and thus advertise it. According to the respondent, Twitter is the most trafficked place when it comes to political topics. In his opinion, one can find there several or tens of thousands of people who are able to make substantive comments and have their say.

Statement	Number of respondents
The portal should be advertised	4
It is necessary to show what has been achieved through the portal	4
It is necessary to cover topics that people are actually interested in	2

Single opinions:

- The portal must be professional
- It is necessary to listen to user feedback and develop the portal according to it
- It would be useful to organize debates at specific times
- It would be useful to invite people to the first meeting to introduce how the portal works
- The work of moderators should actually be visible
- It is worth reminding people about the application so that they do not forget about it
- People known to Twitter should be encouraged to participate in the portal

Quotes:

"The portal must have its own level, show the participants that it is not another portal to blah, blah, blah, but that something can be solved. If the participant feels that the portal is more professional, that alone will encourage him to learn something interesting. That alone should shoot up interest in the portal."

Voting

What do you think about the possibility of voting on the portal and how would it work?	On what issues and how often should voting take place? What should be the role of voting on this portal? How to create questions and possible answers in votes?
--	---

When to vote?

Participants saw the timing of the votes differently, but some common elements can be determined.

One idea is to vote when an idea is being considered in the forum, i.e. whether there is a point in creating a proposal to the relevant institution, rather than at the beginning.

A lot of people said that votes should be appropriately infrequent. For example, at an important moment, that is, not on every issue and idea, but when there is interest.

People could let us know themselves if something would interest them, or it could be created according to the number of comments.

We were also given the example of Radio Zet, where polls often take place. It was also pointed out that recently it has been possible to create polls on YouTube.

It would be useful to show the activity of each audience group, as well as to compare the results of the nationwide poll with the poll from the app. This would engage the community and give results.

It was also pointed out to us that if the portal is divided into national and regional issues, the respondent would not want to take part in voting on local issues that do not concern his region, at most he could express his opinion.

There has been a suggestion several times to hold votes once or twice a week, on certain days. These could sometimes be less important topics and sometimes heavy topics.

They also referred to the example of Twitter, where votes are often done as a joke. On our portal, on the other hand, it would make sense, as it would be a measure of whether people like a solution. We would also need to encourage people to interact and develop a culture of speech and action, so that they don't just vote on the basis that it is a proposal of one political party or another.

Another option is to set a certain level of interest in the topic in discussion, above which, for example, based on the number of people, a vote is created.

According to one respondent, the votes could play a central role, rather than a side role, because it would show that there is a good political base. One could describe the results along the lines of how entrepreneurs in Poland, for example, vote. It would also be useful to indicate why people oppose certain solutions. This would be a measure of trends in our society, in a given social group.

One person pointed out a doubt about whether votes are being substituted. She would prefer that everyone have an account on the site, and that groups be formed after voting.

There was also the opinion that voting should be on every issue, with a side role and could be anonymous.

The technical side of presenting the results was also mentioned, for example, showing the bars and the number of people willing to vote. The votes could appear in conversations or debates, for example with a trusted person, an expert, an ethicist.

How to create questions?

Questions that could be asked, such as whether one is in favor of mandatory vaccinations or whether unvaccinated people should be allowed on buses, were given as examples.

We were told that the question determines the answer, because the question can guide the answer. It was suggested that it was up to the participants to create such questions themselves. They should not exclude some kind of answer.

Questions should be specific, because general ones are asked, according to one person, when you want to manipulate something. One should give as many options for answers as possible and there should be room for digression.

Another person suggested that questions and answers could be created by specialists. They should be simple so that everyone understands them, as well as short and concise.

There was also the opinion that they would mainly be yes-or-no questions, and sometimes an expanded scale indicating the answer that one has no opinion. These would have to be specific questions with specific answers, with the possibility of several options, so that you don't have to add them.

It is worth going in the direction of whether or not you support the change, possibly giving, for example, three options to choose from, proposed by the people managing the portal or that arose during the course of the conversation.

It was also suggested that a case outline should appear at the top of the case, before the questions, and then the questions themselves should be open and simple.

Statement	Number of respondents
These should mainly be questions with yes or no answers	3
Voting should be frequent	2
Voting can be created when interest in a thread is high enough	2
Voting should take place once or twice a week	2

Single opinions:

- Vote should be taken on whether to create an inquiry to the relevant institution
- Voting should be rare
- People themselves could let them know if something would interest them
- It would be useful to show the activity of different groups of voters
- Voting could play a central role

- It should be shown why people are against certain solutions
- Only people with an established account should vote
- Voting results should be represented graphically
- Users themselves could create questions
- Questions and answers could be created by specialists
- Yes or no questions could be expanded to include the answer "I have no opinion"
- The possibility of several variants of answers should be given
- There should be an outline of the issue before voting

Quotes:

"It could be that whoever is in favor of an idea, at the next stage of consideration at the forum of an idea, do a vote on whether we do a proposal to the institution and whether it makes sense at all. That is, not at the beginning, but when something better crystallizes, that we support or not. Already there can be a vote. That is, votes less often, but at more important times, that is, not on every issue and every idea, but if there is interest, then we can vote."

"It could be interesting, because it's like YouTube: YouTube recently introduced this, that creators do different polls, it shows the activity of a certain audience; it would be interesting to compare the results, what the national poll looks like, and what it looks like in the app by people who actually participate; it would be cool to engage the community and give results."

Identifying users

How to identify users on the portal?	What user data should be required for registration, and what should be displayed? How to verify portal participants to avoid the creation of multiple accounts by one person?
--------------------------------------	--

How to identify?

Users should log in to the portal. Identification could be by email address. According to one interlocutor, there should be no special control over whether someone is impersonating someone, no special control or restriction, because a user can always be removed if he or she "messes around."

It was pointed out to us that the Internet guarantees a certain anonymity. Opinions differed on what data to provide when registering. One respondent was reluctant to provide a driver's license or ID number. Instead, only name and gender should be displayed.

Another respondent pointed out that the portal should display only the first name, and for registration it should be necessary to provide age, maybe place of origin, residence, education, profession, but in general as little information as possible.

The easiest way is to create an account by email, possibly using a phone number, although we were told that this is being abandoned. It was also suggested to create a username automatically, either by choosing a random name or coming up with your own nickname.

One respondent said they wouldn't allow anonymous or guest accounts. It was mentioned to us that once the portal gained relative popularity, we would have to deal with a troll farm and be attacked by hundreds or thousands of fake accounts.

It should be possible to choose whether someone gives a name or nickname, because on Twitter, for example, except for politicians, people care about their anonymity. One can face real consequences for statements on the Internet, which would be expressed in a very uninteresting way.

Yet another interviewee pointed out the need to display a first name or nickname, and also suggested a PESEL number when registering. We were also told that it is not possible to require an identity document to be scanned. Several people brought GDPR to our attention.

One more opinion was that the users should be identified by name, since it is a serious portal. Not everyone would want to share their PESEL, but information useful for statistics is worth collecting, such as locality, age, education, because post-election summaries are interesting. The form should give statistical, non-sensitive data.

Avoiding creation of multiple accounts

It was suggested that it is better to ask for a personal ID card number than a PESEL number. To avoid creating multiple accounts, it was suggested that a photo be added, although it was mentioned that this too is difficult to verify.

Another person suggested verification based on a phone number, saying that providing a PESEL number is too much for such an application. The use of an IP address for verification was also mentioned, so that there would be no duplication of accounts.

Several mechanisms can be used to avoid creating multiple accounts, such as blocking people from very exotic locations or constantly logging between locations using a VPN.

As for the troll farms, the accounts are set up in an automated way, that is, it is a random string of characters or a statement or name, and then random numbers. Therefore, it could be possible to catch this in an algorithmic way.

Actions taken from accounts, such as logging between accounts, would also need to be observed. If there are no legal contraindications, the serial number of a phone or tablet could also be read, while simply retrieving the IP address would not be sufficient.

It should be noted that the technical solutions are only proposals of our respondents, the target solution may look (and most likely will) differently.

Statement	Number of respondents
You must register and log in to the portal	7
Identification should be done by email address	2
It is necessary to pay attention to GDPR	2

Single opinions:

- You can use the phone number for identification
- Only first name and gender should be displayed
- It is useful to provide statistical data, such as age or city
- You can create nicknames automatically or give users a choice
- We will have to face a troll farm and fake accounts
- You should give users the option to choose whether they want to display their name or nickname
- PESEL number can be used when registering
- ID card number can be used when registering
- Behavior should be observed algorithmically
- You could consider reading the serial number of the phone or tablet

Quotes:

"As of today, it is very common, if only on Twitter, people who have tens, hundreds of thousands of followers each, except for politicians, are people who care about their anonymity."

"In the beginning, you will be dealing with a troll farm, which, if it sees that this is a portal that starts to count, will be attacking you by hundreds, thousands of fake accounts."

Fact-checking

What should be the role of fact-checking (checking the veracity of claims reported as facts) on such a portal?	How to introduce it on the portal?
--	------------------------------------

All respondents agreed that the role of fact checking is important or very important. It must be the case that the statements are reflected in the legal state that operates in our country.

Verification of the facts could lie with the administrator. A correction should be posted in such situations. It is necessary to check with another source and verify the facts.

It has been suggested that we have the presence of so-called "diggers," that is, people who would pursue the truth and take their time. It could also be done so that before a given piece of information enters the main page, the moderation would check the topic and do research.

It was also noted that it is difficult under political issues to verify whether the words or information are true.

It would be useful to give the option to flag this type of information if someone thinks it is fake news. Then the team or moderator could ask the author about the source, try to figure it out themselves, or simply throw out the news in question.

It is always necessary to give the source of a given piece of information and indicate from when the information is, because they change quickly.

Statement	Number of respondents
Fact-checking is important	8
Verification can be done by an administrator, moderator or a team of people	5
Moderation should do proper research	3

Single opinions:

- Political issues are hard to verify
- It's worth giving the option to mark information as fake news
- Always cite the source of the information

Quotes:

"There is a lot of fake news circulating in the Polish space, if only on Twitter, and some of it has simply grown to the level of truth. So it would be great if someone would start taking responsibility for this, maybe not so much, but would take care to actually check if the information given is true, if it rubs against the truth."

Off-line activities

What activities of the foundation, beyond the Internet, do you think would be needed and possible?	What should be the relationship between the portal and the foundation's offline activities? (For example, should there be happenings to promote the portal or non-portal related conferences)
--	--

We were pointed to various offline activities, such as legal assistance to people, having our own headquarters, meeting in different communities (cities or villages), showing up in newspapers (since people also read online newspapers), TV ads, remote or stationary discussions, connecting users with themselves, panels, discussions, meetings with statesmen, meetings on hot topics, educating in schools, live meetings, conferences, picnics, interviews, helping specific groups by raising funds for charity, happenings with interesting speakers. One person told us that the focus should be on the Internet, moving with the times and developing what you can.

Quotes:

"It should focus on the Internet. Now the Internet is such a medium that it guarantees to reach the user. You have to move with the times and develop what you can."

"Maybe some meetings, in different communities, cities or villages, where people could talk about their needs, what they expect. Maybe something like that."

Part III: Final Questions

Portal in twenty years

How could such a portal function in twenty years?	What changes in the world or in technology could affect the evolution of the portal?
---	--

Our portal would be seen as a large platform, with a track record of various laws introduced, confirming its proficiency. The portal should involve as many experts as possible and have a connection to the government. More accessibility was also mentioned, as there are places where access to the Internet is difficult.

One would see our portal as large, just as Onet or Interia is now. It was also mentioned that it could serve as a "time machine," showing how the law has changed over the years. The portal could be developed into an automated bot and used, for example, during lessons in schools.

The portal is seen as a base of specialists who would be a support arm for those in power, no matter which option, in terms of checking their proposed changes to the law and pointing out mistakes, such as attempts to privilege a certain group or sell off our assets.

One interviewee mentioned logging with facial recognition and international development. Another, meanwhile, pointed to the Metaverse.

Twenty years from now, the portal could be a flagship example of civic community and speaking out in a cultured way. Also, the ability to vote in elections or referendums through the portal when traveling abroad would be welcome. It was also mentioned that technology is moving toward the availability of everything online, and it is just a matter of getting content out into the world.

Statement	Number of respondents
The portal would be a big platform	7
It should involve multiple experts	2
Most of our activities will move to online	2

Single opinions:

- It is worth using an automatic bot
- It should have the bills introduced with its help in the account
- It is difficult to talk about the viability of the portal in such a distant perspective
- It is possible to go in the direction of the Metaverse

Quotes:

"It would already be some big platform, it would have some laws introduced with its help, on the basis of which the portal could confirm its causality, that there is a point to be on this portal. It should simply involve as many experts as possible. That is, a liaison with the authorities that such matters have been successfully dealt with."

"Twenty years from now it would be such a flagship example of civic community and speaking out in a cultured way, an example that someone is watching over it, that there is no hate speech, no trolling, it's a heavy, ambitious idea, but in twenty years it would be a place in every home, accessible from every point."

Reflections

Do you have any thoughts related to our conversation or would you like to expand on a topic or add your own?	
--	--

We asked our interviewees if there were topics they would like to expand on or add their own, and received responses from some survey participants.

Several people told us that they would be very happy to get involved in using the portal once it was established or would like to learn more about it.

It was mentioned about moderators that they should keep an eye on the discussion tracks, so as not to lose the thread, and remind us of the context in which we are talking, possibly closing the conversation if the topic has run out.

Also, we were told that the portal should not look uncritically at those in power, but allow the evaluation of power.

It was also pointed out that we did not discuss how to raise funds for our activities. Also, it is not possible for us to be biased in our choice of advertisers.

Quotes:

"If a user posts another topic, for example, the moderator reminds us that we are talking in such a context, and we can deal with this topic in another discussion. If the topic is closed then the moderator lets you know that the discussion is over and you have exhausted the topic."

"I really like this kind of initiative, there is a lack of something like this on the market, for simple students, I like it and I will be an active user, maybe not necessarily suggesting

topics, but willing to read and get into discussions, because I personally miss it, I will be thinking about it in the near future."

"I think this could be a very cool place, a very cool platform to discuss the proposed changes, a place to move this so-called tripartite commission to the network, where all of us, if we were interested in a particular topic, could participate in it, possibly learn the opinions of experts, possibly experts from one side or the other."

Analysis of the collected data

In this section of our report, we present the findings and recommendations from the research.

Part I: Democracy

The meaning of democracy	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Respondents said that democracy is important to them and primarily means freedom of expression.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>It is worth ensuring that even controversial opinions are heard in democratic debates.</p>
Participation in civic life	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Our respondents participate in civic life in a variety of ways, primarily by casting votes in elections, but also through online petitions, following the news, demonstrations, local activities and statements on social media.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>It is worthwhile to ensure that people can express themselves online by commenting on posts, discussing with politicians and signing petitions electronically. Local participatory budgets can be considered in our activities.</p>
Development of democracy in Poland	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>For our respondents, it is important to maintain the tripartite system of government as a key element in the functioning of democracy. They want democracy to take into account the voice of young people, and to be taught effectively about it in schools. Tolerance for differences in attitudes is also important.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>The development of democracy must change the way people think, and educate. Differing attitudes must also be tolerated and differences discussed.</p>
Development of democracy in the world	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>For the interviewees, democracy should be present in as many countries as possible, but taking into account the cultural and technological context. Democratic countries should support each other and bet on cooperation.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>Supporting pro-democracy activities in other countries, as well as dialogue between countries, could also be a potential direction for our efforts.</p>

Disadvantages of the democratic system	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Respondents pointed out a number of flaws in the democratic system, such as the wrong people coming to power, leading to authoritarianism, distance from the citizens, unanimous decision-making at the European Union level, the dictates of the majority, and the poor functioning of the citizens' legislative initiative in Poland.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>Free and informed conversation about politics and democracy should be encouraged, as well as citizen initiatives and education. We can also explain the Constitution.</p>
Advantages of the democratic system	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>They also noted the significant advantages of a democratic system, such as the ability to have one's own opinions.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>It is necessary to teach the culture of debate, respect for the other person and his or her different views. It is worth creating communities and simulations. It may be important to create regional groups, as well as to celebrate democracy.</p>
Functioning of democracy in Poland	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Most respondents, though not all, felt that democracy in Poland is in a bad state.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>The increasing division in society must be countered.</p>
Threats to democracy in the world	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>For those surveyed, the threats to democracy are political corruption, Russia's actions, manipulation of public opinion and loss of faith in democracy.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>It is necessary that people have a sense of empowerment and want to engage in democratic activities.</p>
Inspiration from democracies in other countries	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Respondents found various examples of inspiration in other countries' democracies, such as protests in Canada, involving people in referendums in Scandinavia, outlawing radical parties and building political compromise.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>Activities such as protests or referendums can be supported.</p>

Representative democracy	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Respondents noted the advantages and disadvantages of representative democracy. They considered the advantages to be the release of citizens from having to decide on various issues each time. The disadvantages, on the other hand, were trusting strangers about whom one knows little, and losing direct contact with democracy.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>It is possible to reduce the distance from those in power by engaging them in discussions with citizens, as well as bringing election programs closer to them.</p>
Direct democracy	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Respondents generally pointed out the difficulties of introducing direct democracy in Poland due to the cost and unfamiliarity of the subject in our country, while speaking positively about one of its tools - nationwide referendums.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>It is necessary to educate about direct democracy to bring this form of government closer.</p>
Democracy in the European Union	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>The existence of the European Union is assessed positively, although its problems are noted, such as disagreements between member states, unanimous decision-making on key decisions or the deviation of some countries from the European path. We should, on the one hand, strengthen cooperation within the EU, and on the other hand, take care of national identity.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>It is necessary to promote discussion of the direction of change in the European Union, in the context of strengthening cooperation, but also preserving national identity.</p>
Experts in democracy	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>The participation of experts in democracy is important to our respondents. In their opinion, they should have relevant education or experience, and their expertise should be in a specific field.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>We should include the participation of experts in our activities, making it easier for them to advise individual people and politicians.</p>

Persons of public trust	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Persons of public trust should be apolitical, transparent and impartial, and actively contribute. Trust is hard to build, and even easier to lose for such people.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>It is necessary to support the activities of people of public trust by making it easier for them to engage in activities that defend the interests of other people.</p>
Awareness of the Polish people	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Awareness of Poles as participants in civil society is assessed differently. Attention has been drawn to the high polarization of political life in our country. To increase this awareness, people should be activated. It was suggested that we create an Internet portal.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>Create an online portal where citizens could report their problems and suggest solutions. Democracy should also be celebrated.</p>
Sources of knowledge about the law	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Respondents learn about changes in the law from various sources, such as news portals, television, newspapers, mobile apps, family and friends. They pointed to the problem of sorting information and fighting fake news.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>It is necessary to help sort information into important and less important, and to fight fake news.</p>
Expressing one's own opinion about changes in the law	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>To express their opinions about changes in the law, respondents talk to their loved ones. Some people comment or share political content on social media.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>Being able to enter into discussions with politicians can be a valuable feature of our activities, as well as signing online petitions.</p>
Engaging in changes in Polish law	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Even before we put forward the proposal for the portal, several people said it would be helpful in getting involved in efforts to change Polish law.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>The main distinguishing feature of the portal should be the possibility of proposing one's ideas and contacting people who are more educated in a particular subject, as well as informing about changes introduced or proposed in Polish law. It is worth considering legislation in the European Parliament. It may be useful to include the possibility of collecting signatures or engaging in participatory budgeting.</p>

Social media	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Respondents recognize the large (greater than traditional) role of social media in creating socio-political reality, activation for action, although at the same time they recognize such shortcomings as their susceptibility to manipulation and fake news.</p> <p>Social media are, in their view, a buffer on which politicians do not have as much influence as traditional media.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>It should be possible to share content from the portal via social media, but in such a way that it does not add to the information chaos.</p>
Citizens' initiatives	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Respondents are aware of the existence of the institution of citizen's legislative initiative in Polish law. They consider it necessary, although ineffective, because it is not treated bindingly by politicians. They would like to see it given a higher profile, e.g. by making it mandatory for the Sejm to deal with every proposal, regardless of the political coloring of a given demand.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>Working out a solution that would ensure that the demands expressed in the initiative could not simply be "frozen" and that would give greater agility to such an initiative.</p>
Presenting your own initiative	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>It is important for our respondents to believe that their idea is important and that its implementation actually has the potential to make a difference. One method of evaluation is feedback from like-minded communities on an issue. Knowledge of existing solutions and legal restrictions on an issue is important, as is the ability to find potential supporters.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>The portal should have functionality to connect people interested in submitted initiatives and give feedback on proposed solutions. At the same time, there should be a possibility of legal consultation as to the conditions of a given project, its effectiveness of limitations, possibilities of potential circumvention, etc.</p>

Part II: Portal

The need for a portal	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>The Polish Internet lacks a portal for substantive discussion of changes in the law. Existing solutions allow too much emotion, fake news and deviation from the main topic of conversation. At the same time, they do not aggregate and organize, do not group all the updates and legal information on a given topic that has already been said. Intuitive solutions and a simple layout would be important. The portal should focus on the citizen legislative initiative and discussing it.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>A portal should be built for substantive discussion on changes in the law and submission of citizen initiatives. Functionalities should be intuitive and easily accessible. The portal should group laws by category and explain them, containing related laws and changes to them in one place. It must be free of hate speech and fake news.</p>
Eagerly awaited functionalities	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Respondents see the need to let all participants, with different political views, have their say, and to structure the discussion by dividing it into specific topics/areas. The community should be actively involved in the debate by being able to vote and respond to posts and comments. Respondents need the ability to ask a specialist in a particular field about the state of current solutions in a particular area, so that ideas for new laws, including those submitted by users themselves, can be discussed more easily.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>The portal should include the possibility of submitting one's own ideas for laws and ideas being processed by the Parliament, broken down by issue, with the possibility of voting and discussion. In some form, it should be possible to consult a lawyer specializing in a particular field to determine what regulations are currently in effect, impact assessment, risks, etc.</p>
Nationwide law	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Respondents think that focusing on nationwide laws is a good idea. They need an explanation of why certain regulations came into effect - hence the idea of explaining that, for example, the given provision is an implementation of European Union regulations. Opening up to English speakers could make it easier for them to navigate Polish regulations. Introducing a notification system will make people remember about the portal, and their attention will be directed to it.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>The portal should report by category on changes in the law, explain them and indicate why they were made.</p>

Similar activities	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>None of the respondents were able to identify a portal analogous to our proposal. We were told that there are similar activities, but they are scattered and often of low quality.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>Caring about the quality of the debate and putting proposals for changes in the law in one place can be the hallmarks of our portal.</p>
Target group of the portal	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>The portal should be for everyone, except those who simply want to argue. The portal can also be of interest to those who are just discovering the subject, and be like Wikipedia, but for law and politics to better understand them.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>It is worth explaining the intricate laws on the portal. You can think of a knowledge base that works similar to Wikipedia, but for law and politics.</p>
Other participants	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>A number of people were mentioned who could also take part in the life of the portal, such as media representatives, experts, moderators, judges, famous people, pupils, students, adults, legal advisors and politicians. Reliability and impartiality could be guaranteed by an NGO, for example. There was a positive response to our proposal for the participation of citizens, experts, ethicists and people of public trust.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>We should create appropriate categories on the portal. We can engage with a wide range of people, including NGOs. It's a good idea to involve a group of people who would dig into the topic for a long time to get to the truth and ascertain whether the news is true or not.</p>
Non-serious proposals	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Most people said that non-serious proposals should be blocked, although this should happen gradually. Other opinions were that the community should decide whether a topic is important or not, and that non-serious proposals should be responded to with serious responses.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>In the case of non-serious proposals, you can first give a warning and then ban the account. The community should decide with the help of a poll whether to allow the topic for further conversation. It is worth responding with serious answers to non-serious proposals.</p> <p>It is necessary to fight against troll farms. Good proposals can be promoted by well-known people. It should be possible to share topics further, i.e., send via social media. It is worth adding reactions, such as "likes." Good proposals should be publicized outside the portal.</p>

Hate speech	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Hate speech should definitely be fought. Posts that are racist, incite hatred, etc. should be blocked. Vulgarisms should also not be allowed on the portal.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>Posts containing hate speech should be removed, and such users must be blocked. In some cases, explanation and clarification are enough. In extreme cases, law enforcement should be notified.</p>
Moderation	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>The role of the moderator was understood broadly by our interviewees. It should be an impartial and properly educated person. Ad personam arguments or judging by profile picture should not be allowed. Hate speech is not allowed.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>The moderator should be actively involved, not only deleting posts, but also taking part in the discussion when it goes sideways. Users should be able to report inappropriate content themselves. Make sure that minors do not read content that should not be intended for them.</p> <p>In order to recruit, it is necessary to properly set up a recruitment interview, as well as train a moderator. Such individuals can be either volunteers or full-time employees.</p>
Promoting the portal	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>In order to attract people to the portal, it is necessary to make it professional, move with the times, improve the layout, get feedback from users, and show on issues solved by the portal. A sense of proficiency would be built by submitting bills on topics that interest people. It is also important that the work of the moderators be visible.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>User feedback should be listened to, and the portal itself and its layout should be updated. It is important to pursue topics that are relevant to users. It is possible to invite guests to online meetings, including people known from Twitter. It is necessary to ensure that moderation functions well. It is worth reminding the existence of the application from time to time, for example, through notifications in the application.</p>
Voting	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Interviewees indicated that votes can be held at the beginning of an idea. Many said that votes should be infrequent or depend on the number of comments. Questions should be created by specialists according to one interviewee.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>Votes can be conducted twice a week or as needed, based on overall interest in the topic (e.g., number of comments). Questions should be created thoughtfully, and an outline of the issue should be provided above the question.</p>

User identification	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>Respondents believe that it is necessary to log in to the portal. There were also different opinions on the information needed for registration and displayed. The usefulness of collecting statistical data was also pointed out to us. Avoiding the creation of multiple accounts is problematic, according to our interviewees, and according to one respondent, fewer restrictions are better, in favor of blocking or removing users who do not follow the guidelines.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>When registering, you can provide your email address, name or nickname, gender and statistical data (residence, age, education). You should actively monitor actions taken from your accounts.</p>
Fact-checking	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>The role of fact-checking is important. Statements on the portal should be fact-checked.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>There should be a correction and check with another source in case of false news. There could be a separate category of users on the portal to analyze facts in depth. It should be possible to report fake news or ask about the source. It is always worth pointing to the source and its date.</p>
Off-line activities	
<p><u>Conclusions:</u></p> <p>We were pointed to a number of different areas in which the foundation can operate, in addition to the portal, primarily consisting of meetings with people.</p>	<p><u>Recommendations:</u></p> <p>In the initial phase, the foundation should focus on the establishment, promotion and management of the portal, but in the longer term it is possible to organize discussions or happenings.</p>

Part III: Final Questions

Portal in twenty years	
<u>Conclusions:</u> Twenty years from now, our portal could be a large platform, having a track record of various laws introduced, as well as involving many experts and having a connection with the authorities.	<u>Recommendations:</u> We should involve many experts and have a connection with the authorities. It could also show how the law has changed over the years. We can also develop internationally.
Reflections	
<u>Conclusions:</u> Our interviewees said they would be happy to learn about the creation of the portal and even get involved in its activities.	<u>Recommendations:</u> It is important to have proper functioning of moderation on our portal. You can also consider going into the metaverse.

Summary

In our survey, we talked to respondents about democracy, as well as about our proposal to create a portal to support citizen participation in democracy.

Democracy

- Democracy is important to our respondents and they take an active part in it.
- It is important to them to maintain the tripartite division of power, as well as to take into account the voice of young people.
- It should also develop in other countries.
- Disadvantages of the democratic system, such as distance from the citizens, were also recognized.
- The majority of respondents gave a bad assessment of the state of democracy in Poland, and they pointed to the manipulation of public opinion as threats to democracy in the world.
- In other countries, they are inspired by referendums and building political compromise.
- For our respondents, the disadvantage of representative democracy is the loss of direct contact with democracy, but direct democracy, in their opinion, may be difficult to introduce.
- The existence of the European Union is assessed positively, although its problems are recognized, such as the deviation of some countries from the European path.
- In democracy, the participation of experts is important, while it is difficult to point to public trust persons present in Poland.
- A high polarization of political life in Poland was noted.
- Respondents learn about changes in the law from a variety of sources, and express their opinions in conversations with loved ones or through comments on the Internet.
- The role of social media is large in creating socio-political reality.
- According to interviewees, citizen legislative initiatives are important, but ineffective.
- They would also like to be able to actually influence the shape of the law through their actions.

Recommendations

- It is worthwhile to ensure that controversial issues can also be discussed, and to push for more dialogue between the public and politicians.
- The development of democracy must change the way people think, as well as educate.
- Pro-democracy activities in other countries should be supported, and dialogue between countries should be sought.
- Free and informed discussion of politics and democracy should be encouraged, as well as citizen initiatives.
- Simulations and community building can be important.

- Increasing division in society should be countered.
- One of the goals of education should be to familiarize people with the legal system in Poland, as well as to teach about direct democracy.
- It is necessary to consider in what direction the European Union should go, where to strengthen cooperation, and where to bet on preserving national identity.
- Experts should be involved in democratic activities, and the activities of people of public trust should be supported.
- It should not be forgotten that democracy should be appreciated and shown.
- It is worth helping people understand information as important or unimportant, true or false.
- It is important to engage politicians in discussions with the public.
- It is necessary to inform people about changes being made or proposed in Polish law, also taking into account legislation in the European Parliament.
- It is important to strengthen the importance of citizen legislative initiatives in Poland.

Portal

- The Polish Internet lacks a place for substantive discussion of changes in the law, working in a comprehensive manner. Existing solutions have a lot of flaws, such as lack of orderliness and low quality of statements.
- Respondents need a place where they can have a substantive discussion with specialists.
- It is important for them to translate the national law and the requirements of the European Union in terms of the legal changes being made.
- Respondents were unable to identify a web portal analogous to our proposal.
- It should be for all those interested in law and democracy who are able to participate in cultural debate.
- Many people could be involved in the portal, including politicians and well-known people.
- Unserious proposals suggested by participants should be responded to in an appropriate manner, either by blocking them or by responding to them in a serious manner.
- Hate speech must be resolutely combated, and the role of the moderator was widely understood by our respondents.
- The portal should be professional, move with the times and have an attractive layout.
- Voting elements can be used in the functioning of the portal.
- The portal should allow only logged-in users to create content, while it is difficult to prevent the creation of multiple accounts by one user, hence it is better to leave this to moderation.
- Verifying news reported as facts for their veracity is important for our interlocutors.
- The foundation can also meet with people, in addition to activities typically on the Internet.

Recommendations

- A portal should be built for substantive discussion of changes in the law and submission of citizen initiatives. It should include relevant categories, and be free of hate speech and fake news.
- It is worth making it possible to submit one's own ideas, as well as those being worked on in the Sejm, and explain them.
- It is necessary to ensure a high level of debate, and interviewees would be happy to see a section in the app where experts would explain complex legislation.
- It will be useful to find a group of users or volunteers who will review topics or news in depth.
- Troll farms need to be fought, and it should be possible to respond to content with "likes," for example.
- Posts containing hate speech should be removed, and moderation should be highly involved.
- It is important to listen to the voice of users and develop the portal based on it.
- You can also invite guests to online meetings.
- Notifications reminding users of the app can be useful in the mobile version.
- You can conduct votes on the portal, for example, twice a week.
- With different statements, it is worth adding information about the source, or even several sources.
- In the initial phase, the foundation should focus primarily on the establishment and operation of the portal.