Results

Survey 357528

Number of records in this query:	1000
Total records in survey:	1000
Percentage of total:	100.00%

Field summary for QA1

I agree to these terms and want to participate in the survey. I confirm that I am 16 years of age or over.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Yes (A1)	1000	100.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QA1

Field summary for QB1a(SQ001)

How often do you go online and for which of the following activities (for private purposes)? [a. Check my email]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Several times a day (A1)	893	89.30%
Daily (A2)	92	9.20%
Weekly (A3)	10	1.00%
Monthly (A4)	2	0.20%
Less than monthly (A5)	0	0.00%
Never (A6)	3	0.30%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB1a(SQ002)

How often do you go online and for which of the following activities (for private purposes)? [b. Use instant messaging (e.g. WhatsApp, Facebook Messenger)]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Several times a day (A1)	577	57.70%
Daily (A2)	165	16.50%
Weekly (A3)	87	8.70%
Monthly (A4)	28	2.80%
Less than monthly (A5)	33	3.30%
Never (A6)	110	11.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB1a(SQ003)

How often do you go online and for which of the following activities (for private purposes)? [c.   Make or receive phone and video calls over the Internet (e.g. Apple's FaceTime, Microsoft's Skype)]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Several times a day (A1)	84	8.40%
Daily (A2)	110	11.00%
Weekly (A3)	320	32.00%
Monthly (A4)	174	17.40%
Less than monthly (A5)	217	21.70%
Never (A6)	95	9.50%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB1a(SQ004)

How often do you go online and for which of the following activities (for private purposes)? [d. Read or write a blog]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Several times a day (A1)	75	7.50%
Daily (A2)	197	19.70%
Weekly (A3)	258	25.80%
Monthly (A4)	159	15.90%
Less than monthly (A5)	166	16.60%
Never (A6)	145	14.50%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB1a(SQ005)

How often do you go online and for which of the following activities (for private purposes)? [e. Participate in social networks such as Facebook, Instagram, Twitter or LinkedIn (e.g. posting messages or other contributions)]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Several times a day (A1)	358	35.80%
Daily (A2)	181	18.10%
Weekly (A3)	177	17.70%
Monthly (A4)	76	7.60%
Less than monthly (A5)	78	7.80%
Never (A6)	130	13.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB1a(SQ007)

How often do you go online and for which of the following activities (for private purposes)? [f. Watch or upload video on YouTube or another video platform]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Several times a day (A1)	185	18.50%
Daily (A2)	235	23.50%
Weekly (A3)	310	31.00%
Monthly (A4)	97	9.70%
Less than monthly (A5)	98	9.80%
Never (A6)	75	7.50%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB1a(SQ009)

How often do you go online and for which of the following activities (for private purposes)? [g. Watch movies or TV programs online through a streaming service such as Netflix, Amazon Prime, etc.]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Several times a day (A1)	107	10.70%
Daily (A2)	185	18.50%
Weekly (A3)	279	27.90%
Monthly (A4)	85	8.50%
Less than monthly (A5)	114	11.40%
Never (A6)	230	23.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB1a(SQ010)

How often do you go online and for which of the following activities (for private purposes)? [h. Listen to music online (e.g. through a streaming service, a radio station or otherwise)]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Several times a day (A1)	214	21.40%
Daily (A2)	216	21.60%
Weekly (A3)	190	19.00%
Monthly (A4)	101	10.10%
Less than monthly (A5)	135	13.50%
Never (A6)	144	14.40%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB1a(SQ011)

How often do you go online and for which of the following activities (for private purposes)? [i. Play online games]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Several times a day (A1)	58	5.80%
Daily (A2)	61	6.10%
Weekly (A3)	77	7.70%
Monthly (A4)	62	6.20%
Less than monthly (A5)	179	17.90%
Never (A6)	563	56.30%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB1a(SQ012)

How often do you go online and for which of the following activities (for private purposes)? [j. Buy or sell goods or services online (e.g. Expedia, Airbnb, Amazon, eBay, Uber)]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Several times a day (A1)	27	2.70%
Daily (A2)	50	5.00%
Weekly (A3)	273	27.30%
Monthly (A4)	307	30.70%
Less than monthly (A5)	278	27.80%
Never (A6)	65	6.50%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB1a(SQ013)

How often do you go online and for which of the following activities (for private purposes)? [k. Use storage space on the Internet to save documents, pictures, music, video or other files (e.g. Google Drive, Dropbox, Windows OneDrive, iCloud, Amazon)]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Several times a day (A1)	302	30.20%
Daily (A2)	196	19.60%
Weekly (A3)	171	17.10%
Monthly (A4)	101	10.10%
Less than monthly (A5)	128	12.80%
Never (A6)	102	10.20%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB2

Who provides Internet access at your home?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Fixed line telephone company (SQ001)	551	55.10%
Cable television provider (SQ002)	271	27.10%
Satellite television provider (SQ003)	37	3.70%
Mobile phone company (SQ004)	292	29.20%
Other (e.g. community network, municipal network, Wi-Fi) (SQ005)	133	13.30%

Field summary for QB2

Field summary for QB2b

Please specify "Other" (e.g. community network, municipal network, Wi-Fi)

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	133	100.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

ID	Response
78	Optical Fiber company
89	Wi-Fi
90	fibre connection owned by municipal power services, rented to independent small ISP
118	Fibre-to-home ISP
137	Fiberoptic cable is being installed. Not sure who the provider is. Television will still be going on the cable provider.
141	We are a privately owned high tower building which is connected to the MAN-network of the university. The building is a former dorm and the connection is being shifted into a paid rented one. I am the network administrator and also administrate the server and the firewall.
150	wireless via roof antenna
178	wi-fi
195	Commercial ISP
204	WiFi CenturyLink
207	the german community network "Freifunk" (see freifunk.net)
211	university
212	Freifunk community network
218	Freifunk, of course
229	fiber offered by municipality
268	fibreoptic service provider
270	dongles from different companies for different country use
289	Community network
305	BT the fixed line; someone bought Virgin the service and WIFI box; some services accessed by phone
308	Wi-Fi
313	No internet at home
316	ISP
319	wholesale-network-access-based service provider / reseller
326	Wi-Fi
328	Local Area Wifi Provider
334	TalkTalk
338	municipal network/Google Fiber
354	don't have internet at home
387	Fixed line internet provider
394	Relish
396	wi fi
398	Wi-FI
443	wifi
445	Re-seller of wholesale services who owns no fixed infrastructure but provides services via tarifed rates set by the national regulator
471	Wi-Fi
478	Wi-Fi
494	The Phone Coop
495	connection is provided by the landlord to the whole building
496	University through a contract with a fixed line provider.
534	It is a community network in a student residence
546	Wifi
550	University Wi-Fi
568	Wi-Fi
583	wiFi
587	university
602	Wi-Fi
617	community network

668	Specialized Internet provider
688	fixed wireless acccess
692	Nomadic/Wifi
710	Public WiFi (e.g. Cafe, Hotel, & Restauran) & University WiFi
727	Fibre.
746	Wi-fi
761	Wi-Fi
768	Municipal network
769	block community network
770	Via my host
782	Internet over long-range Wi-Fi
784	Work; tethering
797	community fibre network
807	wi-fi
829	My own AS, my own fiber.
836	Fiber 1GB/s
858	FTTB
868	WI-FI
878	local isp, not municipal
887	Municipality
891	Wi-Fi
898	Wi-Fi
899	community network
901	guifi.net community network
910	Freifunk
911	Freifunk
912	Freifunk - see freifunk.net
916	municipal network
926	community network
940	Residence network.
963	wi-fi
970	wi fi
982	Fibre optic by a local company for most of the houses in the recent new development.
985	Wifi
1028	WI-Fi
1059	Wi-Fi
1073	Wi-Fi
1084	community, university wifi networks
1095	French Data Network (FDN) : a self-managed ISP, participant of the Free movement
1113	Wifi
1116	comunity network
1119	university WLAN
1144	University
1155	Wi fi
1162	Wi-Fi
1180	community network and Wi-Fi
1230	fuck
1239	W-LAN
1244	Housing community organizes network
1251	WI-FI
1304	wi-fi
1317	studio wifi, fixed line from flatmate
1322	unregistered mobile dongle - Pay as You Go data top up
1325	Cable local company
1353	wifi
1356	Wi-fi
1365	Shared house broadband internet
1419	wifi
1454	Local ISP, via wifi
1473	local commercial operator
1520	community network
1585	Community network
1587	Wi fi
1590	digital cable TV service provider
1591	WiFi provided by student accommodation

1597	Wi-Fi
1602	Community network / Online service
1607	eudoram and also Studentcom (both Wi-Fi)
1614	Wi-Fi
1629	Wi-Fi
1631	virgin
1639	Wifi
1643	WiFi
1651	community wireless network Ninux.org
1692	wifi
1921	Community network (I guess)
2090	Wi-Fi
2103	Wi-Fi
2142	Wi-Fi, Community Network, Municipal Network
2164	Virgin Wi-Fi
2175	Relish
2208	Wifi
2217	Don't know
2223	wi-fi
2235	student accommodation
2267	Wi-Fi

Field summary for QB3

Have you ever changed Internet service providers?

Answer	Count	Percentage
No, I have no other options; I can only access the Internet through my current provider. (A1)	68	6.80%
No, I never considered it; I am fully satisfied with my current ISP. (A2)	110	11.00%
No, I considered it and have other options but it is too complicated, inconvenient and/or time consuming. (A3)	194	19.40%
Yes, I have changed Internet service providers. (A4)	591	59.10%
No answer	37	3.70%

Field summary for QB3c

What was the main reason you wanted to change:

Answer	Count	Percentage
Cost (SQ001)	249	42.13%
It was too slow (SQ002)	210	35.53%
Better offer (SQ003)	254	42.98%
Too many interruptions or breakdowns of the connection (SQ004)	148	25.04%
Privacy concerns (SQ005)	31	5.25%
Other (please specify, e.g. moved house) (SQ006)	182	30.80%

Field summary for QB3d

Please specify "Other" (e.g. moved house)

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	182	100.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

ID	Response
38	Moved to a new house covered by only another service provider
84	At my current address there is no other possible, so sadly I had to change.
86	moved
87	moved house
88	The (last) provider stopped providing copper-line phone.
89	moved house
111	moved house
115	moved house several times
124	moved house
132	moved house
170	moving around
171	Moved. Wanted to spread services across mutliple providers to reduce the power of any single supplier.
175	Provider wasn't available where I moved
180	moved countries
195	Poor service, technical support
199	moved house from one city to another
202	I had to, while moving between apartments and countries.
206	Moved House
211	moved
214	Moved house.
217	Moved house
218	Moved, and then the only available Provider (by this time) had a data limit in place.
222	moved house
223	moved house
228	moved
233	moved
237	Moved house
238	following bad advice
241	moved house
245	Moved house
266	Lots of reasons - price, compatability of their email, slow speed of service, concerns about how their operating system wrapped itself around the compurter and also, it just went out of date (it was AOL)
270	we changed when away due to sabbatical or periods abroad
275	Moved house, which affected availability of suppliers
279	Moved house
283	moved house
288	Moved house
289	moved house
305	Acquired the orginial ISP; would change but terms impenetrable
306	moved houses
307	moving house
318	moved house
319	moved to house with existing contract
321	moving, wanting one that matched my values
337	moved house
364	moved house
379	Moved house
382	Moved to another flat, better offer - better offer for lower price.
387	Quality of service and technical expertise
401	Moved

405	Moved house
414	moved house
415	Moved house
417	move to a new appartment
429	Moved house
449	Previous 'independent' provider sold out to big operator
466	Customer Service (or lack thereof)
473	moved house and low service
482	Moved house
483	moved house
487	moved house
494	Ethical provider
501	moved house
511	Moved house
524	Moved house
525	Moved house
548	moved house
556	Moved house
562	Dreadful customer service; disregard for customers' personal data
566	Moved house
571	I used IN-Berlin for a while: non-commercial service, used because of: outstandingly good service for the money spent, no privacy concerns; had to leave them only because of switching phone company
587	different places of life and work
596	partner get's employee deal
603	Moved house
606	moved house
649	Moved house
653	Moved house
664	Moved house a couple of times; one provider also was terminated.
668	Moved house
670	Changed mobile operator
678	Poor support services, unresponsive, horrible hotline
688	friendship with ISP
703	travelling
707	moved house
708	moving
723	moved house
771	Moved house
792	Moved house
803	Too few giga bytes per month
808	moved house
837	Moved
858	Terrible customer service
878	moved
891	Moved house
901	guifi.net has better peering conditions with some ISPs
912	a) when moving, and b) when i had no choice than to use a provider with data cap.
918	Better customer service
920	Bad support, bandwidth limitation
934	I moved to another country
937	Got a divorce. Changed provider because ex-husband wanted the current ISP account name. I didn't care.
944	I wanted a more ethical supplier so I moved from Sky
951	moved house
981	Moved house
984	Poor customer support.
998	moved house; old company could not provide connection
1004	Annoyed by previous company treating me badly & making money out of me
1005	moved house
1010	moved house
1017	Wanted short term broadbad
1021	moving to another country
1056	Hotline: did not accept to help because I connected with mac osx (provider: Numericable)
1057	moved

1058	moving
1060	moved house
1066	Moved house
1089	moved house
1095	I had an interest in self-managing the structure, being given a voice, be aware of the political-technical orientations of the association.
1109	moved house
1112	Career moves.
1113	moved
1128	Moved house
1129	moved house
1132	Cable-modems were invented
1133	Moved out of state (there seems to be only 1 feasible--speed, accessibility, and cost wise--option for Internet in the recent cities I've lived, which is ridiculous)
1135	logistical pressure
1136	existing ISP was unavailable in an area I moved to
1147	moved house and country
1156	moved house
1158	much better service
1163	moved house
1173	moved house
1180	moved house
1186	moved
1199	Ethical concerns about monopoly provider in Australia (Telstra)
1202	Corrupt duopolies ensure that you have to switch providers if moving house in Hong Kong.
1206	Moved house.
1218	moved house multipletimes
1219	we have changed operators due to moving but also because promised speeds haven't been met or the bandwidth hasn't been enough for simultaneous streaming watching and mobile phone use
1220	moved house, it was cheaper
1225	Moved house
1245	Moved house. Other times: Pricing
1248	Moved house, internet usage changed
1255	Moving house
1264	moved house
1275	moved house
1289	poor service (helpdesk, consumer service etc.)
1291	Moved house; moved country
1302	ipv6, fixed ipv4 address
1316	moved house
1317	not necessary as sharing option availabe
1318	Moved house
1322	I entered into a contract with my previous provider (BT) verbally (phone conversation). I was never send a copy of my contract. Contrary to the initial agreement I was charged extra each month (in excees of £50), my connection was regularly interrupted leaving me without access to the internet and the company kept referring me to 'small print' on the contract I have never seen. I terminated the contract. I considered other broadband providers, but after some online research decided that they are not trustworthy (contract issues/privacy issues/etc.) and now do not have broadband at home. The alternative is relatively expensive and unreliable, but not as stressful.
1326	moved house :)
1328	moved house
1332	moved
1355	moved to an other city
1362	moved house
1373	moved house
1377	Moved house
1383	moved house, limitations on ADSL access
1385	Moved house and hacked
1389	moved house
1394	moved from Budapest - Paris - Budapest - Berlin
1395	Appalling service response, charging policy, bad speeds &
1401	moved house
1418	Moved to a different city for Higher Studies.

1421	Incompetent customer support, difficult to reach a human on the phone and when you did it was expensive.
1425	Moved house
1515	Moved house; used that opportunity to take a better offer.
1539	Moved. Got rid of landline phone and there was no other Internet-only package option.
1559	moved
1575	Bad service
1583	our ISP was bought out from under us they took over our account without asking us
1591	Moved house
1651	mvoed house
1714	Previous service not available in new location
1967	Moved house
2044	moved location
2139	Moved house
2149	moved house
2163	Moved house; the previous server did not operate in my new area
2204	change of adress
2261	moved house

Field summary for QB5

How satisfied are you with the quality of your Internet connection at home in terms of its speed and the continuity of the connection?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Totally satisfied (A1)	198	19.80%
Moderately satisfied (A2)	547	54.70%
Not so satisfied (A3)	191	19.10%
Totally unsatisfied (A4)	44	4.40%
Do not know (A5)	2	0.20%
No answer	18	1.80%

Field summary for QB6

Imagine you travel on the train in the country where you currently live. You are using a laptop and you want to connect to the Internet. On average, how good do you think the Internet access on such a journey is?

Answer	Count	Percentage
In many cases, no Wi-Fi-Internet access is available. I will not be able to connect to the Internet. (SQ001)	271	27.10%
In many cases, no Wi-Fi-Internet access is available. I will try to connect to the Internet via my phone or another device. (SQ002)	469	46.90%
Wi-Fi-Internet access is available, but very expensive. (SQ003)	152	15.20%
Wi-Fi-Internet access is available for a fee that I do not consider expensive and am willing to pay. (SQ004)	52	5.20%
Wi-Fi-Internet access is available without payment, but I have to register and sign-up to some form of promotion or advertising. (SQ006)	218	21.80%
Wi-Fi-Internet access is available without payment and without the need for special registration. (SQ005)	144	14.40%

Field summary for QB8A(SQ001)

Which of the following do you feel confident you can do when using a computer? [I know how to download, open and save a downloaded file]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very true (A1)	943	94.30%
Mostly true (A2)	54	5.40%
Not very true (A3)	1	0.10%
Not true at all (A4)	1	0.10%
Not applicable/I do not understand (A5)	1	0.10%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB8A(SQ002)

Which of the following do you feel confident you can do when using a computer? [I know how to upload files]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very true (A1)	899	89.90%
Mostly true (A2)	85	8.50%
Not very true (A3)	10	1.00%
Not true at all (A4)	3	0.30%
Not applicable/I do not understand (A5)	3	0.30%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB8A(SQ003)

Which of the following do you feel confident you can do when using a computer? [I know how to install an app on my mobile]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very true (A1)	858	85.80%
Mostly true (A2)	59	5.90%
Not very true (A3)	23	2.30%
Not true at all (A4)	29	2.90%
Not applicable/I do not understand (A5)	31	3.10%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB8A(SQ005)

Which of the following do you feel confident you can do when using a computer? [I know how to connect to a Wi-Fi network]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very true (A1)	912	91.20%
Mostly true (A2)	69	6.90%
Not very true (A3)	12	1.20%
Not true at all (A4)	5	0.50%
Not applicable/I do not understand (A5)	2	0.20%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB8A(SQ006)

Which of the following do you feel confident you can do when using a computer? [I know how to backup my data]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very true (A1)	753	75.30%
Mostly true (A2)	183	18.30%
Not very true (A3)	56	5.60%
Not true at all (A4)	4	0.40%
Not applicable/I do not understand (A5)	4	0.40%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB8A(SQ004)

Which of the following do you feel confident you can do when using a computer? [I know how to adjust my privacy settings]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very true (A1)	619	61.90%
Mostly true (A2)	262	26.20%
Not very true (A3)	90	9.00%
Not true at all (A4)	21	2.10%
Not applicable/I do not understand (A5)	8	0.80%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB8A(SQ007)

Which of the following do you feel confident you can do when using a computer? [I know how to use cloud services]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very true (A1)	592	59.20%
Mostly true (A2)	239	23.90%
Not very true (A3)	105	10.50%
Not true at all (A4)	49	4.90%
Not applicable/I do not understand (A5)	15	1.50%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB8A(SQ008)

Which of the following do you feel confident you can do when using a computer? [I know how to browse the Internet anonymously, e.g. using an instrument like Tor]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very true (A1)	362	36.20%
Mostly true (A2)	216	21.60%
Not very true (A3)	196	19.60%
Not true at all (A4)	190	19.00%
Not applicable/I do not understand (A5)	36	3.60%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB8A(SQ010)

Which of the following do you feel confident you can do when using a computer? [I know which information I should and shouldn't share online]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very true (A1)	571	57.10%
Mostly true (A2)	337	33.70%
Not very true (A3)	72	7.20%
Not true at all (A4)	17	1.70%
Not applicable/I do not understand (A5)	3	0.30%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB8A(SQ012)

Which of the following do you feel confident you can do when using a computer? [I know how to design my own website]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very true (A1)	341	34.10%
Mostly true (A2)	220	22.00%
Not very true (A3)	194	19.40%
Not true at all (A4)	213	21.30%
Not applicable/I do not understand (A5)	32	3.20%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QB8A(SQ012)

Field summary for QB8A(SQ013)

Which of the following do you feel confident you can do when using a computer? [I know how to create something new from existing images, music or video]

Answer	Count	Percentage
Very true (A1)	371	37.10%
Mostly true (A2)	246	24.60%
Not very true (A3)	189	18.90%
Not true at all (A4)	159	15.90%
Not applicable/I do not understand (A5)	35	3.50%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC1A

Have you experienced privacy violations in respect to any of the following Internet services?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Email account (e.g. spam or hacking) (SQ002)	674	67.40%
Social media platforms (SQ003)	343	34.30%
Online shopping (SQ004)	239	23.90%
Online banking (SQ005)	85	8.50%
Search engine (SQ006)	247	24.70%
Mobile phone use (SQ007)	244	24.40%
I have not experienced any of the above (SQ008)	224	22.40%

Field summary for QC1B

Please provide an example/ more details of the privacy violation you experienced.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	637	82.09%
No answer	139	17.91%

ID	Response
36	DIrect advertising
38	- Spam in the email - unsolicited messages in social media - too much customized suggestions from search engine (after online orders on Amazon)
44	Call center calls for proposing services and goods.
45	Spams all the time
48	Advertisements on web pages reflect your last searches. Ads mail from websites you have never visited.
49	many times received commercial advertising from source senders never contacted by me. many temptative received to get personal details, in particular personal and/or business emails and bank account details
52	gave information to third party althought not mentioned in TOS
54	I use a script blocker, but cross-service information sharing is still notable in ads across my devices
61	Spam, phone calls from vendors.
62	Using my email address for spamming
65	phishing
66	Theft credit card, theft by china hacker my twitter account (still using by these)
68	For the email, I received spam daily. While browsing (search engines, social media, shopping) the advertisements are often tailored to my profile, even if I do not remember to have authorized this.
69	Tags following cookies; Spam; Phishing,
70	spam in my email
72	My phone number/email address was given to other companies which contacted me.
78	email: gotten emails that almost tricked me into clicking links to mock services to grab my passwords, gotten mails seemingly from relatives via their hacked email accounts asking me for money social media: I have friends that showed me messages they received from fake profiles impersonating other friends of ours, asking if I had gotten those, too online shopping: scammers set up shops, cash in the money and don't deliver, claiming the packages were sent. Had to cancel the payments via the used money service / bank search engine: After Snowdens revelation it was clear that all US search engines need to be regarded as fully wire tapped mobile phones: GSM and UMTS encryption are broken since years, need to switch to up to date phones with TLS 1.2 support and use such secured protocols (IMAPS, HTTPS) instead.
82	After searching for a particular flight, I have been receiving ads for this destination, even though I am trying to minimize tracking and ads. There are probably many privacy violations which are not obvious.
86	Amazon ads from wishlist on ebay mobile page
87	* EMail: Spam, Phishing * Social Media: Spam, Phishin, Chainmails * Search Engine: Complete history of every search * Mobile Phone: Complete History of everything
89	- Spam e-mail. - Personal data being abused for purpose not agreed on. E.g. advertising.
90	email: i get spam to addresses i never published (probably bruteforced, as it is a common account name). / Online banking: Bank sells ("anonymized") data about my spending habits to third parties and through some mechanism knows which transactions are rent payments, job income, utilities' payments etc, which is shown to me in some overview diagram. I switched to a new bank a few months ago. / Search engine: I get localized results dependent on my IP address geolocation even though I set my language preferences to english, for

	example I get wikipedia links in my country's language instead of the english wikipedia. I would prefer english wikipedia because the articles there are more detailed.
92	Amazon proposes stuff that i actually like, facebook and google too, lots of spam to mail personal email
93	Immediately after I look for a flight to some destination, offers for hotels in that destination appear in other windows
97	spam, spam and other unwanted advertments (=spam!); to not be excluded from (virtual) social life and other communities/services/whatever I regularly need to agree to terms of services which I don't like at all and are violating my privacy in various ways
98	Spam sent with my e-mail address in the from field, so that I received the pertinent "undelivable mail" messages.
99	Phishing. I received the same web page of my credit card provider (not exacly with the same periodicity as usual) and from there I gave my credentials and some money was stolen from my account. Thanks to the credit card service the payment were stopped (but only after a regular legal action/denunciation with the police station)
104	Spam is a constant occurance. Nobody has (to my knowledge) ever hacked any of my accounts but I frequently receive emails from former students' accounts that are spam and must have been hacked. The use of search engines often leads to adds and proposals that are based on past searches.
106	Spam, spoofing, phishing, dangerous attachments
108	Predatory journals and publishers, predatory companies : clicking on the unsubscribe link install cookies (and may be worse) but does not satisfies the unsubscribe request.
110	I was charged a weekly amount from a company providing services I never knew about, notified by sms, I was told it happened by surfing the internet on the mobile and had to deactivate the push-notification service from my mobile phone (failing to receive messages from my own service provider, back, etc) to avoid repeating in the future. Same happen to friends/relatives with unwanted "services". I have a spam filter in my email addresses (private & work) which capture a dozen spam/fishing a day
111	constant spam and attempted hacks (none successful so far)
115	just regular spam emails and apparently social media "reading my emails" and also getting ads that correspond to terms I searched on Google although I switch off this in privacy settings
119	I don't use a mobile phone - I do get spam emails, regularly - junk filter is not very effective.
122	Not authorised access from South Asia Countries (Thailand, Malaysia) and India. Credit card duplicated and used in orfider to buy on-line flights.
124	Scam online. A pop-up advertising that resembles the train website. I though I was buying my ticket, it ends up I was setting a Direct Debit for 23 euros with an obscure company that offers discounts on your trips. Somehow I managed to get my ticket. It was only after one year that I realized the Direct Debit. The bank provided refunds but they also let me know that the company I had the DD with was actually 'legal'.
125	Privacy in this context means of personal data protection. So by definition, the receipt of spam and junk mail would be a violation of privacy.
126	A Kurdish activist once hijacked my personal www website, before I learned to regularly update WordPress software. I get lots of spam every day, in spite of the filtering done by my university server provider.
131	Yahoo
132	I received several times an email from my email address to my email address.
138	Someone broke my password and Google and Facebook alerted me so I had to promptly change it.
141	My email account was hacked and used for spreading spam. Then I changed to gmail where privacy violation is implemented but I am save by using a 2 way authentication.
143	My email account receives a lot of spam although my university has established a fire wall. But the account has not been hacked so far. Once I received an email including a dangerous virus but which I did not open luckily because I had the impression that it was not serious.
144	Online purchase on one website --> email spam
149	Email and social media accounts hacked and rendered inaccessible to me (psswords and security details changed by hackers)
151	Google notified me once that someone from Russia had tried to access my account. Another time I spammed all my contacts in Skype with a link, which I had not sent.
154	spam everyday; orther people upload my personal data (photos); once I saw the bank account of someone else for a few seconds after logging into my online banking service;

155		Offering me services I don't want
156		I was charged of payments I haven't done on my Paypal account
159		Once on Flashchat 123 licensed to the owner of the website called xopom.com the administrator of the chat turned out to be reading what I was talking about with my correspondent and rudely invaded my chat room and aggressively harassed me. Websites and servers located in a country where human rights, freedom, dignity and privacy are not respected cannot be trusted in no way!
162		email hacking
163		Someone tried to hack into my Twitter Profile. I also got notifications from my Gmail account that someone else tried to log in.
164		False emails sent demanding payment for fake invoices.
170		hacked mail. abuse of credit card by the shop after shopping
171		Spam on email and SMS. Tracking on searches. Constant tracking about shopping and social media.
178		Intrusion in my email
181		Advertisements, porn site links etc all popping up while browsing or checking email.
182		A Instagram account was open in my name.
183		I frequently receive SPAM and a few times have received messages that were clearly phishing.
184		I have once experienced some virus sending out spam e-mails from my Yahoo account.
186		Several years ago someone sent spam from my email account to everyone in my contact list.
187		email password credentials, social media such as facebook when I received on personal/private message the attachment is infected with Malware. I was able to know that when i realised that some wrong behaviour on my laptop then consulted with security speciality who helped me on this.
188		my account number was used for withdrawal by a company that I wasn't a customer (their customer had the same that I have)
189		I have had my Facebook account hacked twice and so I had to reset account and it is now more private (i.e. only friends can see it). I have also had my Amazon account hacked once although nothing was purchased from it. And my online banking account had one fraud alert on it.
191		Profile on twitter
192		piracy of my e-mail address, used to send spam to all my contacts
194		Receipt of spam, mostly I presume my email address was sold from a site where you have to supply an email address
196		profiling
201		It is difficult for me to answer this question as I believe to be wrong all use of my data without formal reimbursement of some kind in which I have equal rights to the provider and am free of coercion. Nevertheless, I submit. As a result, I am unclear as to what exactly is meant by the term "privacy violation." Should I provide a personal ethical code when answering, or a standard legal definistion as I understand it?
202		It depends on how you define privacy violation. But I percieve advertisement as a privacy violation, it diverts and distorts my attention and leads me into trails of thought that I would not otherwise have. My thoughts become hijacked.
204		I get a lot of spam. I put it in delete file and delete. The spam is advertising for various products.
206		Spam Credit card details stolen
207		My mail address was used in combination with my real name to better address me with spam. Since I used this mail address only for online shopping, it's clear that an online shop got hacked and my personal data was stolen.
208		Phishing (via mail), malware as attachment
209		Spam on my university email.
211		spam, intrusive data gathering and analytics in search engines
213		I've been spammed a million times on my schools emailing system and on yahoo and gmail. I've had some occult groups sent me friends request and among others
214		My bank account was hacked about 6 months ago.
215		lots of spam
216		phishing e-mail
217		Bank account hacked, emails spammed.
218		Due to an unsafe script on the server, there was a short time in which a spammer could (and has) use my server for their spam. Just a few hours, but nonetheless.
220		Spam, fake emails and predatory publishers.
223		name, address, personal information provided given to third parties
226		- You get SPAM from known companies who claim you allowed somewhere to use the mail

		address but you did not for sure. - Shopping companies memorize everything you ever did on their platform forever - Banks share customer information with private companies outside local law enforcement - There are aboute no secure operating systems available and apps claim too much rights without user controll
228		Phonebook uploading from chat/phone app, net of friends/relations uncovered by social net, photo uploading/tagging without consent
229		spam
232		Receive a lot of spam. Increasingly from individuals attempting to represent well known and established brands e.g. Apple iTunes, Amazon etc. Phishing scams.
233		The only real privacy issues I've had is spam and emails that claim to be from legit companies, but are actually phishing emails.
236		I'm registered with a free Wi-Fi service provided from railway station. When I'm near the station, an automatic sms remember me (every time) that Wi-Fi Station service is available an how connect to it.
238		spam emails sent using my account, attempts to hack my twitter account when I had one, credit card hacking for small sums of money, so called "relevant" advertising i.e. continuous harassment through search engines...
239		Targeted marketing, even without explicit-well informed consent
240		Some years ago I was getting email addressed to someone with the same forename and family name but different email address.
241		I received the classical spam from my electricity company asking form my credit card info so they could refund me some unjustified bill. I was not focusing, I gave the info... the security company from my bank allowed me to realise some people were using my bank account before a large sum was spent.
242		Unwanted emails
244		I decide to quit facebook when they asked me to send a copy of my id which i didn't, then they asked a very personal question (and the answer was not on facebook). While i'm profiled because of my navigation, I feel that my privacy is violated because it shouldn't be anyone beetween my screen and I. When buying in a non https website.
245		I've received a phishing email purporting to be from my bank. I also receive a large amount of spam emails.
247		Yahoo email account hacked - twice
255		A e-mail account was hacked and taken over; an online retailer's security was breached and my payment information compromised
259		Lots of spam. However I consider spam the price of doing business. If I want free services, then I have to expect spam/ paid for messages/ use of my data to sell to me, especially on social media.
264		Receive frequent spam emails. Amazon account was once hacked.
266		My gmail email account was hacked. I changed the password, hasn't happened since.
267		My account was hacked
268		I loaded a virus when I had inadequate protection.
272		I am bothered by personalised adverts and feel ambivalent about targeted suggestions using my browser history, f. ex. Amazon, but also in my email account. I am regularly cold called by agents who know my name and phone number even if I have had no dealings with the companies they say they represent.
275		Mostly spam
279		-I often receive spam emails. I once received a spam email account from my own account and promptly changed my password. -I often see ads for products or topics that I search using Google. -An app I downloaded once would often send me spam notifications on my phone. I then found out which app it was and uninstalled it.
281		spams, cookies, and online bullying to pay money
289		Lots of spam from sites I visited once or twice. My Steam and Twitter accounts were almost hacked.
292		My work account (university) is spammed/phished weekly despite filters; I have (once) accidentally installed malware from an email on my email account; I have had Yahoo and other commercial accounts hacked at the source.
296		email account was pawned - yahoo
297		Spam, unauthorized localization.
299		Somebody from Colombia was paying his/her Netflix from my Visa.
303		cookie
304		About fifteen years ago, someone changed my email password. I got it back after a while,

	though.
305	Worse violations come through the post and junk phone calls; employer misuse of my attn.
308	Someone attempted to hack into my bank account
313	Skype hacking
315	PAypal hack
317	Spam bot sending out messages from my account name
318	Account hacked
319	I've had Skype compromised, and have noticed some pretty ridiculous and conspicuous associative advertising.
321	Data breaches on platforms I have accts with. Search engine targeting, shadow profiles etc....
323	Notified of person(s) trying to use my account; upon viewing an item online, it will appear as a push ad on my social media interface
325	Email spam from unknown or spoofed senders, social media messages from unknown or spoofed accounts, invasive/too-knowledgable advertising on social media, phishing attacks from senders impersonating banking websites, general quasi-legal spying on my activity by search, social media, and email providers.
326	spam Email saying that someone needs my bank account to do money laundry lost my password for a e-commerce website someone told me that my personal informaton had been stolen for crimial usage on a fake call
328	User data collection leading to specific advertising on social media and in mail spams
329	Some hacker (s) enter to my account (facebook), intend to learn my political activities, and than inform me to the officials.
332	Email addresses tailored to only be used specifically for one business (for instance, netflix@mydomain.com) receiving spam emails. The companies either share/sell the email address or otherwise lose control of me email information (through a hack or the like).
334	I received the emails from some brands that I never provided my email to them.
336	I have had my credit card number stolen from an online retailer; been stalked by an ex thru social media; and have had an old email address hacked.
337	Spam; seller calls
343	My twitter account and hotmail account were hacked.
344	SPAM and phishing attacks in my email. Fake accounts requesting access to my social media profile.
345	Constant spam in gmail service. The most annoying privacy violation, however, is that a federal government tax agency undisclosed personal data to online data services, or the later had access to it: name, address, phone, national number identification.
348	Spam. Account passwords being posted online (I know through pwned)
353	4 days before each traveling in a foreign country, I receve a message from my mobile operator announcing the costes of their services out of the boundaries
354	Mainly spam, also people including you into social media groups or mailing lists without consent.
356	I receive a lot of phishing and some information that my account user data was hacked
360	I used to receive spam in my mail box and from time to time, i find spywares in my computer. I assume that some of my provate informations are captured by the websites I visit without my consent.
366	various phising attemps via email, attempts to invest money in fraud schemes etc,
375	I experienced a large amount of spam. I consider google's linking of search results with the in-Gmail advertising as privacy violation.
377	targeted advertisement sent to my mailboxes.
378	I received email on behalf of the bank to enter private information. I received product announcement on hacked purchase site. I received facebook friendship requests from fake profile.
379	There are many examples. For example: In 2007, I had a gmail account I used for a nonprofit on whose board I sit. Google accidentally made my account public to the whole internet, exposing several confidential conversations. On Facebook, it was clear that private messages were being used to supply information to advertisers in order to present me with targeted ads, as I repeatedly saw ads related to terms which had appeared only in private messages. In 2009, a credit card processor who was processing my payments for online music went bad and sold all of their customer information to criminals.
380	Mostly spam. I do not like my searches recorded on both my mobile and desktop.
381	Facebook is egregious in its presentation of ads relevant to my other online activity, e.g., eBay browsing. There was one instance in which Facebook continued to advertise a particular eBay sale to me for a unique product I had already purchased.
382	Spam emails :)
383	My yahoo email was hacked as well as my health insurance provider.

387	Email account: spam
	Online banking: misuse of creditcard online
	Gaming: compromise of accounts associated with online gaming
388	I've received spam, though honestly I never thought of that as a privacy violation before
393	I often get new kind of spam based on my online activity
394	I have been an early pre yahoo Internet adapter. Over time, I had several Internet Credit Card fraud experiences, My mobile phone got hacked in to too.
395	Spam, hammering with same adds, use of my browser history...
398	receiving spam e-mails
401	Lots spam and scam emails.
402	Someone hacked into my email account and sent a spam email to all of my contacts. I changed my password and it hasn't happened again.
407	Spam emails whick regularly arrive in my mailbox
411	my email and social media platforms were hacked by one of my neighbours for 9 months and i could not fix it easily till i got the help of a hacker !
414	Twitter account and email account used to send spam messages to contacts
415	Facebook account was suspended apparently for "review".
416	Buy an exercise program for XBOX and suddenly bombarded with diet control ad I've never seen before, across all my email addresses.
	Constant change changes in Facebook T&C's resulting in private posts becoming public
	Exposure to Google Remarketing advertising
	Tracking by Marks & Spencer via my mobile phone ID upon entering their stores
417	Getting advertising on private an public e-mail all the time. I do not like "personificated advertising" .
419	fortunately I experienced only attempt of the privacy violation.
421	Lots of unwanted marketing messages that I never opted in to.
	Phishing messages telling me that a particular kind of account I have has been locked or terminated and asking me to sign in.
	These have become some sophisticated that I have on a few occasion, ignored perfectly legitimate messages because I have become so suspicious.
429	Card cloning after use on eBay many years ago. Using PayPal now negates this possibility.
431	Someone used my credit card details to purchase goods without my permission.
434	Spam, phishing attempts, had to change credit card
435	mailings to which I didn't sign up, following online shopping with a different provider; spam messages through contact address on a website I manage
436	Someone hacked my Amazon account and my paypal account and attempted to make a number of purchases. He/she successfully bought a pizza from Domino's, I felt bad for him/her.
	Once or twice in the past 7 or 8 years, I've gotten a message saying someone from a distant location attempted logging into my email or social media accounts, but the security settings prevented it from happening.
440	While I was reading news - i.e. gossip - on mobile Facebook, it was activated a paid app that I did not want
443	A website I used turned out to be a front for a Chinese website. I bought a pair of boots which arrived and were nothing like what I bought. A month later, HSBC called to say that there were attempts to use my card fraudulently. Transaction attempts were made in China and my card had to be cancelled.
449	Email account briefly compromised, sending spam.
	Facebook (not used but have account) was somehow compromised and used for spam.
	Re: Online banking- mine is fine, but I have been identity frauded as in my details used to open online accounts.
457	CC entered online; subsequent fraud attempt
460	Spam, hacked account
464	I have received various indecent offers by e-mail. My e-mail account was once hacked and spam sent from my name.
466	stolen personal data
472	E-mail: I receive a lot of spam.
	Social media: Companies where I am obliged to enter my data, use that information to show me ads.
	Shopping: When I give my e-mail address to a company, and they sell it to other businesses. When I buy something, and then there are ads to other related products all over the pages I browse.
	Bank: My bank checks my account and then tries to offer products that they think I need.
	Search engines: When I search for a flight in a search engine, and then all the pages that I

	assess have ads about that destination.
	Phone: My phone company uses my number to call me to offer other services.
473	I got tracked by cookies so i got advertisement that was selected by my shopping interests.
474	someone from other countries hack my e-mail and I finally close the account.
	Also, someone sent e-mail to me, which are not relevant to my job. It seem like the person he/she dealing with has similar name to my name.
475	I've got calls where a foreign caller (from the UK) has tried to phish my personal information
478	False E-mail messages from addresses I know the owner well
483	I recently made a separate personal account in Facebook, planning on adding people I intimately know. Except many people now know because Facebook keeps showing my new account as 'Friend Suggestion'.
486	Constant spam, from good-looking addresses
487	normal spam
492	Getting email spam about items that i had searched online (Google).
494	Targeted advertising based on my past activity Intrusive ad pop ups on the phone Spam email with ads and no way to unsubscribe
496	Spam, although the filters these days catch most of the "financial offers" and "virility supplements" before they get to me.....
498	E-mail spam messages.
500	A spam Facebook account
506	Spam emails
507	I was asked to send money to recover my files. Since I have just saved all my files prior to the incident I did not pay
508	When an app requires access to your private data before you install it is a privacy violation.
511	Spam email; unexpected charges to my bank account
512	mails not sent to addressee
513	I have received various emails that are supposedly from my bank.
515	I think it was to do with yahoo and it was hacked and it affected all users.
517	I thought my web email was hacked because of using the wifi on UK trains (free access mostly) I know there's a risk, but the real risk was professional hackers who went large scale into the web email companies. Eventually they told us to change our passwords, one web email company told their users 2 years AFTER the hacking!!!
523	Daily spam and phishing
525	I get advertising based on Internet searches I have made. I think I have received advertising from verbal mentions of topics.
530	my email account was hacked into and, subsequently invaded my bank account.
531	organisations continuing to send materials when I have asked them to stop/unsubscribe. organisations sending sales messages when I have expressly forbidden them to do so having given them contact details for a specific purpose and expressly forbidden them to use it to send sales material
533	Very occasionally a virus has appeared on one of my email accounts - but not recently.
534	Each time I receive tailored ads I feel uncomfortable. But when I really felt all the boundaries broken was once I booked a taxi to pick up me from the airport and two different companies started to send me instructions to meet me with the driver. One of them, the one which I hadn't hired, included the fee, that was the pirate company because I had already pay the fee when I booked the service.
536	I keep getting emails inviting me to adult dating sites.
542	Skype has been hacked and I often get other people's hacked emails. And too much spam.
543	My bank account, email account and online shopping (Boots) account have been hacked. I have been bombarded with not pertinent promotions/ advertisements/messages by companies and political parties.
544	unauthorised payments using my card and spam/hacking on my emails sending mass emails to all my contacts containing a weblink.
545	My Yahoo Messenger account has been hacked more than twice in the past five years - once it was completely taken over and I was unable to get it back for some time.
548	Accounts from various websites that were (possibly) hacked as they were present in datadumps.
549	spam
557	Just general spam emails and some phishing emails - more on my computer at work than in my personal email account.
559	getting sometimes inundated with SPAM messages, specially at work email accounts

561	Sharing of my details to pradatory Journal publishers
562	Third parties who leak an e-mail address given uniquely to them, to third parties. An example would be Santander who leaked two separate email addresses which were associated with specific bank accounts, and which were subsequently used by spammers. Santander apparently reported it was a third party marketing company that they had used, who had leaked the data. Another example would be United Airlines who leaked my address (twice).
568	On Facebook, i have had people I do not know ask me to send them a private message using my email most likely because they do not know my email. Phone companies in my country also send unsolicited messages or make machine calls several times a day thereby disturbing my activities and distracting my thoughts. My email has never been hacked as far as i know.
566	My privacy is violated every day by my ISP. Other violations are available.
567	As a media researcher studying the role of the media during the Afghanistan and Iraqi wars (the early 21st c.) and later when I was censored as a journalist writing on Asia issues, esp. China and India - via e-mails; I had to change my e-mail, PC, the provider.
571	Spammers "owned" E-Mail server; search engines regularly use personal data for advertising…
577	Facebook hack
578	(1) My yahoo email account has been hacked on more than one occasion leading to the hacker posing as me and begging for money supposedly from airports around the world. On one occasion I lost all of my contacts and couldn't get that info back. (2) I have received phishing emails at least half a dozen times.
583	Phishing, advertising virus
587	spam, starting websitess on my screen which I didn't visit, follow up advertisement after searching for flights or hotels
588	Use of credit card data.
589	Spam
592	Social media snoops on everything I do. I search for somthing in a browser, and next thing I am being spammed with adverts for it on facebook. Wagamama sends me emails based on my location, despite my not having used my phone in their restaurant, let alone connected to their wifi. Recently is asked how my visit was to their Camden restaurant (by email, the next day) and I had not logged into their wifi, told anyone on any messaging service I was going there. I consider this to be an invasion of my privacy. I emailed them about it and received no response.
596	I believe my mobile number has been shared to 3rd parties without my consent. Often receive spam to one of my email accounts.
597	Email and Twitter was h4x0r3d to send out spam (separately).
598	I receive lots of unsolicited text messages
600	hotmail account hacked credit card bank hacked online and purchases made - bank were very quick to spot this.
604	I receive spam emails weekly and my phone was hacked and had to be reset.
605	Spam emails but I just delete them
611	Hacking of my e-mail accounts; listening my mobile telephone; monitoring my Skype connection
612	Profile copying on Social Media. Online banking fraud.
613	Pop Ups, targeted ads and spam emails
614	push information and online adverts
617	Spam, ID-Cookies hard to delete, on line profiles that get generated without my knowledge
620	I have received many spam / phishing emails all of which are spotted and deleted. I did experience a breach of a webmail account, due to data theft from the account provider.
629	A friend from my contact list told me
634	When participating in a protest group, I found that my e-mail had access problems, as if someone else was using it.
636	adwares, hoax, fishing
638	Xkeyscore odes that all the time, it's like the privacy violation flat-rate. At least, that's what it feels like.. Why not online banking? I guess, it's mostly out of hope.
639	Spam
640	Get lots of spam and my emails have been hacked previously
645	Spam email; phishing email; search results serving targeted advertising and "sponsored" search results.
649	I was informed my social media account might have been accessed by an unauthorised party and advised to change my password, which I did immediately via a known, authenticated link.
650	spam emails
651	Just spam mail to google and work account.

653	Spam Email was hacked and weird messages sent out to everyone. Somehow a company took money from my bank account. Someone had hacked something somewhere.
654	tracking between websites
659	Facebook congratulated me on teacher's day, even though I only said that to my friends through Messenger. I ofen receive ads about things I say near my mobile phone. And I often receive ads related to things I search on Google.
664	Tracking and targeted advertising (in all but online banking); mandatory use of closed-source, intrusive low-level software (in case of online banking); SMS and alert ("pop-up") message spamming by my mobile carrier.
665	Google encroachment is the ultimate privacy invasion!!
666	Email account hacked and messages wiped.
668	I'd been receiving spam via e-mail. Also, my current phone number had been owned by another person, so banks sent me not relevant messages.
670	searching for something and then receiving related advertisements in other platforms
678	Plenty of spam; spam detection program that is far from perfect (AOL), still receiving spam from emailers flagged as spam, and, on the other hand, having to check up my spam inbox several times a day to retrieve non spam from addresses that are in my address-book. Getting ads referring to product classes I looked for before on completely different sites is bothersome (Big Brothersome). Offerring me promotions on hotels in places where I just return from is boht bothersome and funny.
688	someone guessed the answer to a recovery question on an ecommerce platform; email spam is obvioous; fake profile account pretending it's me on a SN.
692	Data sharing of my email address without my consent
699	Of course loads of spam messages, and a couple of times opened a dodgy attachment that caused problems. Occasionally a site identified in a search tries to download e.g. ransomware. My bank account was also compromised - I don't do online banking but I think it might have occurred through accessing details sent in an attachment.
710	* Email: Spam and scam * Mobile phone use: Spam and scam
711	Sometimes ago, my facebook account was used to post obscene pictures. So i had to change the password. Similarly, my gmail account was hacked and used to send email soliciting for funds on my behalf.
712	Oriented Advertisement, via e-mail, search results, social networks. They use chat content information.
715	My email account has been hacked into from Eastern Europe. My organizations website was victim of DDOS
717	Intent of login into mail from china
718	Sending of spam/unsolicited emails, and sending of unsolicited adverts based on search results I conducted using search engines
720	I've had spam e-mail, advertisement in social media platforms, advertisement in online shopping and mobile phone use.
723	Regularly receiving spam emails, occasionally phishing scams. Also web analytics data, although it is probably my fault for not using private mode regularly. Most website cannot be accessed without consenting to cookies.
725	Spam using my email address to send out crap
726	Spam from US sites I've never subscribed to CVS and a bill from Sprint semiregularly Facebook account was hacked and another profile set up asking friends to connect. I followed FB insurrections and also advised friends who were subsequently hacked to do the sand steps
727	Spamming Hacking of my twitter account Online shopping leading to various other related e-mails
728	Spam mailing too often
736	My gmail account was hacked about two years ago. I have since then used more extensive privacy settings.
740	Received messages from third party that possibly would have acquired my data from internet providers, mobile phone carriers and online shopping sites
746	Spamming, hacking, search engine finding all my details Browsing activity used for targeted advertising
749	PRISM/FIVEEYES illegally captures meta-data and other specific data on my Internet use in real time.
750	- Search engines data collections pushes adverts.

	- Facebook account hacked.
759	targeted advertising
764	Ad tracking across all websites and services
	(I use ad blockers mostly, but on occasions I have to switch them off it becomes very apparent how far tracking reaches)
766	aAaA
768	Advertising
769	receiving regular spam messages via email
	receiving personalized un-required adds from Google services, based on content of my gmail emails
	finding my email address visible in clear on pages where I did not put it
	getting un-required personalized slides from Facebook with personal pictures uploaded on Facebook
	getting phone calls from advertisers who found my contacts on web
772	The installation of new features on my search window. Over-riding / altering existing settings is very frustrating.
773	I put something in a shopping cart at a shopping site and a reminder popped up to buy those things on my social media platform.
779	- Location tracking - 'like' appeared on my Facebook account in relation to a cafe I visited. I never clicked the 'like' or even visited the cafe's Facebook page but the location device in my phone must have done it automatically.
	- Also related to location - when using the Google maps app on the mobile, Google makes it seem like it is necessary to enable GPS location in the phone. From my experience, it seems if I don't enable it, they open the maps to somewhere on the opposite side of the world kind of like a punishment (instead of opening it to the last area I was looking at, which would seem more reasonable to me).
	- My Facebook account data was saved onetime on a friend's computer and he entered a joke status update. I feel like Facebook tries to trick users into making their accounts stay on, by sometimes having the box checked and sometimes not. So one thinks the box (which says I want to remain logged in or something of the sort) isn't checked unless one clicks it as most of the time that is the case, but then sometimes it is just randomly already checked.
784	- Twitter: followers with clearly sex-selling agenda
	- spam from the "Nigeria connection" or similar things
789	spam emails, advertisements corresponding to search keywords or visited sites
790	Regularly receive spam, phishing etc. I'm more concerned with the data that is lost by the providers who have it - eg Yahoo.
792	Malware /warm(?) installed when I was trying to connect my PC to a work drive; Physing programme through email
796	- Mail spam, e.g: advertisement on medicine
	- SMS spam, e.g voice bots or Nigerian scam
	- Targeted ads, e.g a product I looked up in amazon is shown on discount on ads (happens rarely, I always have means to remove ads from a website)
797	Just bogus emails and spam.
803	They stole my mail account password
801	I've been fished and had my online credentials taken. I was also a victim of fraud in the early days of paypal, and was part of a class-action suit against the pay service (circa 2000).
811	I receive many spams on my private mailbox, publicities are also sometimes annoying : either on my laptop or mobile phone...
810	Spam sms and e-mails
815	Email account sending emails to my contacts - no message just a link.
	Amount for items purchased on line which i had not bought or used my card. Bank confirmed my card details had been stolen and supplied new card.
819	Signed up to e-mail newsletter and received obviously notifications for sales etc. from an affiliate to that company. Some I was not sure how they got my name. It doesn't seem to happen that often, but occasionally it does.
828	Spam emails/texts/phone calls
829	PII collected, monetized, used, and disclosed in excess of stated policies, and in some cases extralegally.
832	Targeted advertising and nuisance calls for advertising purposes.
836	lots of spam
837	Spam and phishing attacks via email
	robocall telemarketing via mobile phone, occasional text message spam/phish

841	Was informed that my private data on an Internet retail site was accessed illegally. The retail outlet offered me a free year of credit monitoring
842	spam mails
843	Receive a lot of spam email, most recently often claiming to be from HMRC and trying to get you to claim a tax refund. I get unsolicited calls on my mobile from companies telling me I've been in a car accident (which I haven't).
845	spam emails
852	spam
854	Email from Poste Italiane asking for access codes
857	daily spams amount to 10 at the very least. what I consider as spam phone calls, either on my mobile or my "téléphone fixe" does not happen very often, but still too much...
858	You put down "spam" as an option. I therefore (along with everyone) gets spam. Mobile phone - PPI / accident clams, etc.
860	spam
863	Amazon, Google, U tube, (I don't use Facebook),Twitter use your data to offer links-ads to specific items/topics /content, based on your preferences. It should not happen...without your own permission or at least fully and legally clarified.
869	An online shop was hacked and information used for targeted spam.
873	My email account had been compromised. The hacker changed my password too, locking me out of my account.
876	Theft of credit card information, stalking on social platforms, viruses by clicking on banner ads.
878	several forums where i was a user were hacked and their databases were fully dumped, including email accounts and passwords.
880	The use of my mobile phone number by businesses I had never been in contact with
883	I check if my privacy settings are the way I want them maybe once a month (considering the updates) and I have configured privacy settings on google + gmail but not on my phone thinking they will synch. But one day I noticed that all searches on my phone were forwarding me adverts - which does not happen on my computer. AS i was looking for how to change this, I noticed the google app installed on my phone (Huawei) had tracked the last path I took that day (I had not used GPS) - founded by mistake or luck. So I changed the settings and now it does not do so but I am checking once in a while if my selections have changed; especially after looking up directions on the google app (not even on maps).
885	Most obvious are the FB "celebration" postings using earlier postings of users without their consent.
886	Service providers tracking behaviour
888	Receive SPAM emails and SPAM telephone calls
891	Shows advertising from my earlier purchases, perhaps I have given my consent to it which I don't remember. Another thing is my location is extracted for the services which normally don't require a location value to provide me a service.
893	spam emails, targeted advertising
894	spam usually send to me taking my address without my permission information used by social network
898	Bank was hacked
899	Being called by bank companies over 6 years period that I have never given my number to nor agreed to receive such calls.
901	I searched for a trip to a place. After that appeared a lot of ads about this trip, and other possibilities. That's why in my internet surfing experience I feel watched
902	My email added to campaigns with no possibility of unsubscribing, intensive adds about a product, phone number added to a database, local upsells that I didn't request
910	Several sites I used were either hacked or my data was sold to spammers.
911	Sending cleartext passwords via unencrypted e-mail. Phishing attempts via one Email account with fully Qualifying Personal Data (including typos) I used for one seller on eBay
913	Identity theft
914	Spam Emails to Adresses not publicly available, email spam after purchasing items,...
915	Continual spam, not just on email but to Skype, my phone and direct to my voice mail box. Spam invitations to connect on all forms of social media but especially on Facebook, Skype and LinkedIn. Targeted ads that are off-target but are clearly the result of a term I used in a search query. Stolen credit card numbers. I buy on-line for myself but also for my company. My personal credit card gets compromised about once every 18 months. My corporate credit card has to be changed at least 2-3 times per year.

916	Credit Card Fraud due to hack of online shop, Phishing Attempts via email and SMS
918	Adverts and messages based on my previous search. Spam activities from unknown email senders etc.
924	UBER account violation. Someone used it for himself. Had to cancel my credit card
925	Spam
926	spam and commercials
930	Site I did not want appeared.
932	They know. I don't
935	I'm amused to get hotel ads (booking.com, expedia) at the news website (e.g. BBC) after having had a tentative look for hotels in that city.
937	Account #s hacked so had to change numbers, account settings, etc. after hacking found and I was notified.
	E-mail account too easily subject to phishing attacks (simple and common name) so had my account names changed to include #s and/or symbols.
938	Lots of spam always targeted at my University account. Other accounts: no problem.
939	Email: tons of spam
	Social media: targeted ads which I have not opted into
	Mobile phone: spam text messages
940	Getting emails from services I never agreed to, or spam asking for money from "strangers".
941	my email address was hijacked and used to send out messages, supposedly from me
946	Paypal hacked and €14 euro withdrawn. Spam email
949	Calls from services providers, for which I never signed up with.
951	spam email and phone calls
954	I have received several e-mails which tried to "warn" me of my bank account being hacked and which asked for my details, so "the bank" could get fix the problem.
955	My yahoo email account has been hacked at least twice in the last 8 years resulting in some of my contacts getting spurious begging emails from me as if I had lost my wallet in a foreign airport.
957	Resale of my identity to advertisers and spammers in violation of acceptedd T&C.
958	Credit card hacks; spam
960	I am not sure where I got the virus but was probably email on my work laptop - flashing sign told me to call a number or all my data would be wiped. A voice over accompanied this. I ran to IT dept and they told me to simply switch off the computer and reboot, did so and all was fine.
966	Someone use my information on social media to harass me and troll my family
	Identity theft. Copied my information and posed as me to say obscene things online
967	Spam
969	A fake Twitter account was created which was using my old photo that you can find through google search. I complained to Twitter about this and they closed the dodgy account.
	I also feel violated when plane tickets go up in price the more I search. This is totally unfair.
971	HAd to change my yahoo account after it was hacked and mail sent to all contacts
976	Anticipation of serch interest, spam, ads related to mails content, etc
981	I've certainly received spam--yesterday, even--though my filters are strong and up-to-date. I have also received texts and robot-calls on my mobile line, even though I am on multiple do-not-call lists.
984	There are SO many it's hard to choose just one... OK, so one of the privacy disruptions I regularly encounter is service providers asking me for my mobile phone number so they can scoop me up in their marketing nets. Just yesterday the government agency that provides water to my home demanded my mobile number when they already know my address. I gave it to them and then I asked why they wanted it - if I hadn't asked, they wouldn't have disclosed their purpose. The person said, "In case we want to send you promotions or news." So I said, "OK, I'm opting out of that right now. Do not want. Please make a note in your system." As the country in which I live has national privacy legislation I hope my preference will be respected. If not, I will complain. A second example is that I use cash transactions in preference to credit card as I don't want to enable my financial institution to construct a profile of my spending habits they can sell to third parties - although really I trust my financial institution which is a "by the people, for the people" type of credit union; I don't trust the providers of the credit card technical infrastructure though. I wish there were a more readily accessible internet version of cash transactions but I'm unaware of such a thing at this time - to the best of my knowledge all online financial transactions leave an identity trail. Sorry, that's two examples. Please don't discount my response though.
986	Search engines pull together information that I do not necessarily want to be still available as it seems irrelevant/awkward.
	Email spam filters at times slip through messages which clearly are scam/phising attempts.

	I suspect that scam and phishing is ongoing as I at times get offers to befriend certain ladies via Viber/Facebook without me asking/knowing.
989	I have received phishing e-mails (several time). But I do recognize them as such.
993	Being signed up for promotions unknown when signing up for another service on another platform. e.g. getting calls/texts on mobile having signed up for something online. Spam and attempted hacking also on multiple accounts.
994	In 2014, my email account kept spamming my contacts. I had to change my password a number of times and also implement other security features (such as two-factor authentication). I'm still not sure what caused it. Also, I am annoyed when I see ads for things relevant to what I've spoken about online or searched for. An instance of privacy violations during mobile phone use came when I downloaded a game app for Android, only to find out it records us and sends it to a server (when disabling the microphone and video permissions, it no longer worked).
998	Hacking; spam unwanted calls, sms - despite number not given out same with emails .. receiving many advertising emails without even knowing how they got to know my address hacked email accounts of others - so I guess I got on the list to receive mindless spam
1003	fake fb friends actions
1004	Subjects of my searches in a browser magically appearing thereafter as Facebook ads etc.
1005	Gmail has systematically entered my mail for advertising purposes; additionally, I receive daily spam quantities, at least the filters are useful. Additionally, in Venezuela, my telephone number is sold in massive databases affiliated with my name and profession for advertising purposes. The government has big data management that is not governed by any standards of transparency or security. Also, I have suffered attacks that tried to take control and / or access to my email accounts or social networks, I suppose that for being an activist or for reasons that were unknown as they were unsuccessful. One of those attacks I was able to trace back to China, it was to turn my twitter account into an advertising robot.
1006	Spam and fraud regarding e-commerce
1009	Spam and phishing emails
1010	e-mail: spam, hacking social media: hacking
1012	Many but most obviously through messaging apps like Viber and What's App, then Facebook seems to like inviting people to me my friends even if I do not request it, on all these you have to turn off all notifications and then when they change their privacy terms and conditions go back in and change your settings again. So mostly I would say it is apps and social media on my mobile are the problem.
1013	Spam
1017	Strange emails requesting I send money to help someone in a pickle in Uganda. Also, had fraudulent PayPal emails sent to my accout that look like the real deal
1018	Work account constantly spammed/hacked.
1024	Spam messages from game providers such as "Snack Games" which either pretends or really signs people up to mobile games and it costs money to unsubscribe. Mobile phone providers, unfortunately, are not helpful in solving this issue by protecting their customers' accounts (in the process of cancelling such attempts I have googled the games and several customers from different mobile providers faced the same problems) -There is also the typical "you had an accident"-call one gets and which always seems to happen in waves when entering data on some service websites.
1029	i HAVE BEEN HACKED AS I USED MY MOBILE PHONE AS ANOTHER NUMBER TOOK OVER MY FACETIME. I HAD TO TURN IT OFF QUIT FIND OUT HOW I COULD GET RID OF THE OTHER NUMBER... I DO NOT KNOW WHAT DAMAGES I HAVE GOT FROM THAT.
1031	I have encountered a number of online shops that after registration forwarded my information to other vendors.
1032	Spam in email, payment made to a fake company in China (?)
1041	Facebook informed me that my account was being attempted by someone else to get and it was hacked.
1043	Facebook account violation. Mobile violation.
1049	Regular and large amounts of spam to one email address. Phishing emails to an academic email address.
1050	My email address was hacked and spam mail sent from my address to approx 20,000 email

	addresses. Not only was this inconvenient for the recipient but the number of bounce backs I received rendered my email account unusable
1051	people calling me who I have not invited to do so (often)
1056	1. Spams received on my email address at free.fr. This address was known only by "free.fr" and by Gmail because it was used as a recovery address for my Gmail account. I never emitted from my address at free.fr, except many years ago with free.fr itself. 2. Unwanted spams on my cell phone. Some commercial spammers had private information about me. I assume that it was communicated (directly or via partners) by some companies from which it was unavoidable to buy products or services without communicating private data.
1057	hacked email
1058	Mainly in terms of spam, account hacking, locking out of account, but also none response to subject access requests.
1059	Receiving spam email, spam text messages, bank hoaxes.
1060	Spamming, fake accounts trying to get my access credentials.
1061	I receive spam regularly. On social media, some of my private messages were at a later point published on my wall.
1066	I get endless amounts of spam on my email, as well as commercial SMS on my phone. Unless I'm using ad blocking software (which I do in every device that supports it) I also get targeted ads that are clearly based on information obtained from data brokers and by tracking my usage patterns, in addition to anything I may have voluntarily entered in my profile.
1070	I was showed targeted ads without having accepted cross-platform cookies.
1072	School system for which I worked experienced a data breach (UT System - employee data)
1073	I have doubts about privacy violations from some unknown sources
1074	I regularly receive spam mails.
1078	Received mails asking for my details
1079	Spam emails.
1083	My gmail account was hacked every 12 hours for 2 days. They were after my bitcoin and got it.
1084	The most prevelent example is when I search for something that can be remotely considered for consumption, I will get emails from Amazon telling me about their product in the same line.
1089	google adverts and facebook invitation in an email address i never connected to any services
1093	Pop up window, where i knew that if i fill in any information it will be stolen
1095	Email or sms spams, unexpected or frustratingly accurate targeted ads on diverse websites.
1102	Suplantación de identidad en blogs, acceso a mi cuenta de correo para modificar reglas y desaparecer archivos, depósitos y retiros sin mi conocimiento o consentimiento en mi cuenta de paypal, descarga de aplicaciones en teléfono móvil sin mi autorización explícita.
1103	My bank account was used for onoine purchases.
1105	Was sent an email allegedly from my University where I was asked to change password, which included stating my existing password, which I did. I noticed the error I made and changed my password immideately after, so believe no one managed to log om to my account
1107	surfed website for a purchase, and the purchase later appeared on social media advertisement.
1108	I receive several spam My credit card was cloned
1109	soon after searching the advertisements I am exposed to change, reflecting my searching.
1110	Pulled off LinkedIn and fb for being intrusive
1111	Spam. malware
1112	I've had my GMail account hacked. I've had my older Yahoo.com hacked. I've had my credit hacked. (As for email, I've moved over to Protonmail).
1113	unsolicited text messages, spam, phishing attempts
1119	My facebook account was once hacked through an anonymous mobile number despite the fact that I have never submitted my mobile number to Facebook, claiming to be mine. To reclaim my account, I've got to submit my ID (I reside outside of US and Europe) and it took more than 2 weeks before they (Facebook) gave me back the access.
1121	Dedicated announces. Much too precise fir my taste w.r T. My previous browsing avtivity.
1123	The main concern is collection of data. No one checks long consent agreements because of lack of time and 'giving up'. This is a sort of privacy violation, since such sites as Facebook have total access to our phones if it is on the phone and can see all our activity. They can also see what we do online in general, this is violation. On a more personal privacy level, I get constant spams and once my Twitter account was hacked.

1124	Use of my email address to spam others (my contacts included)
1126	some old accounts were hacked and because the standar email is not encrypted/trusted my primary email gets a lot of spam.
1127	tracking, spam, sale of email address and other data to spammers
1131	My Facebook account was hacked successfully once, to little effect. There was an attempt to hack that I prevented through two-factor authorization after that initial hack. My email was briefly hacked before I used good passwords.
1133	I've experienced unidentified transactions in my bank acct via online banking. Not sure what the root cause was, but luckily my bank reversed the charges. I've experienced email hacking, either my old and junky emails were hacked at some point, or I've received spam from hacked contacts (via email and social media).
1135	typical spam
1136	data leaks by service providers
1138	I have had attacks on my computers. I have had product purchase information used by other parties. I have personal treats on social media and blogs. I have had numerous phishing attacks.
1143	Someone take my credit card number, by internet, during a shop and used to pay a lot of bills. The bank, 10 dias after approximately, send me the money back.
1144	I receive spam on the basis of cookies collected about my browsing activity.
1145	Dozens of spam emails daily. News web sites flooded with advertisement for items that I browsed at Amazon or other sites
1147	Personalized advertisement following the content of private emails
1148	account hacked
1149	Yahoo! Breaches, Twitter breach
1150	Writing about something in Gmail and then getting matching ads on Facebook or Twitter. Being bombarded with ads on Facebook/Twitter that have nothing to do with me.
1153	Ad targeting (web sites), spam, search engine "personalization," social media ad targeting
1156	Unsolicited e-mail and calls after online shopping in clear violation of the terms of service. Phisishing attacks via mail.
1157	Yahoo mail hack - required new passwords and security
1159	e-mail spam.
1160	Yahoo account was hacked and was informed of this by Yahoo and told to change my password.
1161	Advertising related to my searchs on Internet.
1162	mostly get ads in facebook, google searches specific to internet browsing history, which means a continuous tracking of internet searches. Also, account hacking attempted.
1163	Spam was sent in my name to people from my address book
1165	Spam messages and phone calls, credit card misuse/theft, targeted advertisements based on personal identity characteristics I did not provide
1169	spam, phishing attempts. Gmail was hacked once before two step authentication available.
1170	Someone posted a message to a group of people on Facebook as me that I did not post.
1174	My gmail account was hacked into after I clicked on a link sent by a friend who was not aware that her email address had been hacked into. It was a phishing type of violation.
1176	getting emails which address my name with all kind of invitations, suggestion
1185	Mainly in the cases of publicity that appears later a buy o see something in an online store. Also, I have used "Have I been pwned?" to see if my e-mail has been hacked, and effectively yes it has.
1186	Forgot to logout of email while using computers not mine
1191	A lot of spam in the email. Shopping one store kept my money but didnt received the product nor a refund.
1194	Spam, advert pop-ups, etc
1197	Google tracks users and uses the information to target us for advertising.
1198	I receive spam and other email or message in the webpage I open about my shopping
1199	With regards to my email, there is a person (or some people) who keep providing my email address to service providers (perhaps mistakingly), so I keep receiving another person's messages. Sometimes service providers do not use email authentication processes, so it's impossible to sign-in to adjust settings so that I can invalidate that account. This happened when the person(s) used my email account to sign up to Tidal. This means that all of these companies and organisations around the world have my personal email address in their database, even though I don't have a relationship with them. Also so many companies make it impossible for you to delete accounts, only 'unsubscribe' from updates, and this makes me irate. I am also becoming much more concerned about the volume of personal data /profile information that Google have about me. I have signed up to many Google services for

convenience (Google Play Music, Google Drive, Gmail, Google Fit etc), but I wish I could see all of my data in aggregate and opt-in or out for retention of all of those data sets. I'm concerned about how much they know about me, but I'm sucked into the vortex now! Wonder if it's too late.

1200	Hacking of an online retailer that caused some personal details exposed.
1204	I was a victim of credit card hacking last year. My bank experienced a rash of debit card phishing within the community it covered. While the money was returned, there was no clear explanation from the bank why that happened and what safeguards were taken afterwards.
1205	spam
	edu addresses are very vulnerable
1209	Spam, unwanted emails
1210	Spam on email and cell texts; phishing scams; email malware
1211	mostly spam and targeted advertising
1214	My twitter account has been hacked through persuading it to accept an external source as authenticated, not via having my password but through some other technical hack (not phishing either).
	My email almost became unusable due to spam before bayesian filters got going. I've had accounts spoofed as the source of spam and have had to change the email address due to overwhelming number of automated (you are sending spam) responses.
	I had to set my smartphone email to whitelist only despite never giving the email address out beyond trusted friends/family, due to the volume of spam it was receiving.
1216	Spam of all kinds, automatic and non-obvious setting of the default search provider.
1217	Crossreferencing info from personal messages from Facebook and also Google search with advertising.
1219	spam, attempts to login to my email account from locations across the sea
1225	The site claimed that my email address will not be given to third parties but obviously it was given as the number of spam emails increased.
1226	Signup to spam newsletters, spam SMSs on mobile.
1232	I have just received a lot of spam and emails that, if I did what they asked, could have landed me in trouble (i.e. emails of fake banks asking for my banking details or other private details)
1233	- ads or suggestions in social network platforms that follow my online search or website previously visited
	- ads or suggestions in social network platforms strictly related to my previously online purchases
	- Free WiFi service that send on my mobile number a message every time I'm in covered range
	- mail message with suggestions based on my Web activity and navigation
	- mail message with personal data request (or personal credential)
1234	Bombarded with advertisements on new products and discounts through email, phone and browser.
1236	phishing mails, ad spam
	microtargeting, personalized ads, facebook suggestions of pages I might like
	random fb messages from people (or bots) I don't know (saying: I saw your profile and I just want to say "Hi"...)
1237	Spam
1238	I know that the commercial social media sites profile my contents contributing on these sites and sell them to advertising companies.

1238 (continued)

Intelligence community like GCHQ via Tempora as mentuoned in the Snowden's revelations can monitor my data by looking into these companies' data collection.

Data stored in crowd servers have backdoor which can be snooped by law enforcement.

Everytime I visit any sites, they collect cookies and track my IP. Communicating without Tor, Man in the Middle of Attack can analyse the nodes and traffic in order to map out before deciding the hack. But I barely trust this VPN since it was developed by the US Navy, a nation state which has long spied on their people and other countries for economic advancement.

Moreover using VPN is not necessarily safe as to how much the VPN company is trustable. VPN can surrender users info to the law enforcement depending on the local laws and the dominant ideologies which the VPN company believe in.

On censorship, all financialised sites develop algorithms to sort prioritise and present selective ads-target to users. Another word these commercial sites do not represent online

	data to the publics and the reality of our society. They in fact undermine the Net neutrality, the public sphere, libre internet, and democracy altogether. Google and Facebook are the two main monopolies which are not social media companies, they are the Establishment and the advertising companies.
1239	Using my WhatsApp contact list to suggest friends on Facebook.
1242	- Newsletter without double-opt-in - searching for a good and then seeing ads everywhere - Mails with dangerous links and attachments
1243	Weight-loss spam was sent from my private e-mail account. Family members were very offended.
1244	1) After I was given a cancer diagnosis I got a very marked increase in buying proposals for pharmaceuticals related to my type of disease. 2) A typical example among daily such examples - which I do not see as severe privacy violation but "irritating" - is that Facebook for many years have said that I am living in Buenos Aires (probably since I have many FB friends there) while I am in fact living in the Stockholm area in Sweden
1245	My email address has been sold or given out to 3rd party companies.
1248	My eBay account is regularly attacked, as is my PayPal. Both services inform me of these attempts.
1249	spam product advertising which I never subscribed, but they just knew my personal email box...
1250	My email has been hacked a few times. I find the way that I'm marketed to because of places that I've been (or walk passed) or visited online really annoying.
1251	EX. 1. Once I purchase a product through website, now, I continuously experiencing getting advertisement every now and then from that site. It is irritating. Ex. 2. I tend to follow certain policy related decisions made by the government and share the information in my social networking site (not making any adversial remarks on the government or ruling party - occassionaly express the concerns of a policy its implication to the common), but i happen to see certain sites of print media (which i use to read news) tend to provide news stating which i may like (a news which critiquing the ruling party). Analysis of my web search, i see a potential privacy issue - next labeling an individual to a particular orientation is unethical.
1252	Spam, unwanted advertising, phishing mails
1253	sale of my personal data from online shopping to other companies that subsequently contacted me, ads that follow you around the internet, location tracking on social media, spam emails
1255	Card cloning when using online shopping (some years ago), frequent spam attacks into my primary personal email, attempts to hijack my twitter account.
1258	Constant spam on work email address; Online banking account hacked. The banking intervened and called me multiple times on my mobile phone to make sure I was the one accessing the account and making payments, etc.
1260	I have had spam sent to my address book from my email account and have had phishing texts and emails send to my email and my mobile phone. I have also had a virus that used my laptop as the host through which to send penis enlargement emails (!).
1265	I CONSIDER ALL ADVERTS AND MOST COOKIES TO BE PRIVACY VIOLATIONS
1266	Advertising from sister companies, spam for viagra and adult dating
1268	Spam emails sent using my address.
1273	Unwanted spam emails and cold calls
1275	Only spam mails
1280	My yahoo email accounts have been hacked on more than one occasion, leading to me losing my contact list and leading to my contacts receiving phishing emails from the hackers claiming to be from me stranded in a foreign airport and asking for considerable sums of money.. I am moving more and more of my email correspondence away from yahoo and towards gmail.
1281	spam
1284	It happened once that my credit number was stolen, after shopping online. It happened about 10 years ago.
1286	usual phishing attempts and spam violation with old email inboxes on hotmail etc database hack with some retailers I've bought goods or services from
1288	repeated attempts to impersonate officials at work to obtain personal data e.g claim that the computer system at work is being up dated and I need to provide my personal details and password
1289	phishing emails (int the name of Apple and Google) and phone calls, email spam ("nigerian

	letters")
1291	Like everyone, I receive unsolicited commercial email (UCE). However, I have pretty good filtering from both my main email providers. I also see spam postings on Twitter and in Facebook groups.

It's annoying, but it's not the worst thing ever. |
1292	Losing a personal photos
1297	Data sent to advertisers without my informed and optional consent.
1298	Adds, on Google or Facebook, about previous searchs or purchases.
1301	Fake website which looked very similar to the official website of the bank; I decided to cancel my online services for a year.
1302	Spam (or UCE if you prefer), and endemic phishing/malware delivery attempts.
1304	I bought something from ebay , I bought one item and ended paying twice for two same items to different people, but afterwards nobody was responsible.
1305	So much related spams about my normal activities search in my mail.
1307	Spam by people/companies I've never had contact with.
1309	Fishing emails, spam – due to business reasons one of my email address is in the wild for years and that flood my mailbox, not al of it could be controlled.
1310	I can not use an app without giving access to my camera, contacto or photos. When I buy something they ask for all my data like my address en phone.
1311	Receiving spam emails, that's pretty much it.
1313	1) Spam through both my email accounts, and attempted phishing on my gmail account. I had to reset the password, and made sure of two-factor authentication.

2) Someone (it turns out later, someone I knew) logged in to my FaceBook account and posted a 'humorous' but very embarrassing homophobic message that my friends responded to. Not long afterwards (2014), I decided to delete my FB account because of other privacy concerns - the use of personal data and experimentation with feeds without user consent. |
1315	For example: My browsing and date use records are being shared with compensation to the providers without my permission and with no compensation to me. My records are used for commercial and financial gain for the development of companies, of products and of services - the goals and objectives of whom may violate my values - without permission or compensation . My records are saved without my permission. My records are used to profile me without my permission. My records are used to promote goods and services to me without my permission.
1316	Lots of spam. Large amounts of data collected and used to "customize" online ads. Although this is permitted by online entities such as Facebook, I regard it as a privacy violation.
1318	Spam, sockpuppets, trolls
1319	Phishing, unauthorising spam emails, cold calling, fraudulent pitches, repeated email marketing after unsubscribing.
1322	SPAM in my mailbox, money stolen from my bank account (apparently through Yahoo which I have never used), regular cold calls on my mobile, my details (name and postcode) visible online without my permission, my photos and name appearing on social media sites, etc.
1325	Fake website and actual larceny
1326	email address which is generated each time it's registered with a website or company was sold on to other companies or otherwise leaked to other companies. By using a unique email address with each company I register with, I know exactly which company was lax with it's care of my data. When confronted, they denied it could be possible, and told me I must have not checked the 'opt out' box for their marketing. Since I'm very conscious of the use of my data I knew this to not be the case. To this date I still receive spam marketing contacts from companies to this one email address.
1327	Identified against my will in photos by other users. Face tagged in facebook photos, tagged generally in Instagram photos.
1328	unrequested advertising, spam mails, years ago some kind of credit card fraud or online banking intrusion (wasn't clear)
1330	Fraudulent payment was taken from my bank account
My email connections where used for spamming
1333	I called from a public phone ina international airport in Europe. I used my credit card and it was colonised
1335	my email address was hacked and my data pawned. now I get lots of phishing emails, phone calls and text messages
1337	unwanted ads, auto-complete suggestions, content on auto-play following detected patterns even though I'm interested in something else, ads for shopping based on my browsing for weeks (even though I'm not interested in that product anymore), dodgy websites asking for personal information, phishing scams. no trolling, but I'm certain that my profiles are

	monitored by third parties that I would rather not have access to.
1338	Accessing some shady websites and/or installing a "free" software (video converter or other utility tool) resulted in unwanted browser extensions and malware being installed, even though the software seemed legit and trusted. I also checked the advanced options of the installer and didn't agree to installing anything else. The malware kept changing my browser settings and generating pop-ups and pop-unders. This happened in early 2000s, I reinstalled my operating system to solve the problem.
1340	spam emails, spam messages (whatsapp, facebook), email account data, pc virus
1344	Spam traps (unwittingly confirming active email address which then gets spammed).

Links in instagram profiles that lead to email or facebook spam?

Mysterious redirects through suspect sites, presumably to generate paid traffic. |
| 1345 | Some not allowed data were taken from my device |
| 1346 | Stolen credit card information.
SPAM via email.
Social media spoof accounts sending friend requests |
1359	Ads for undertakers after searching for a phone number of an undertaker
1353	Spam email
1355	spam email sent through my email, that is, it came from my account but didn't show up on my sent-box.
1356	Hacking the e-mails; even watching the home
1357	Spam has been a fact of online life for a very long time, surely?
1362	Being spammed with personalised mails containing information such as my name.
1363	Got some calls from education agencies asking me about whether I want to take a course for TOEFL. I realized that was because I registered in some test information sharing forums.
1365	I have experienced hacking on my e-mail account. A (not-so-obvious) spam e-mail with an inappropriate and probably harmful attachment has been sent to all my contacts. I wasn't able to reverse the action.
1368	Spam is sent to my email account (e.g. from Facebook, on which I have no account).
1371	Tracking software on search engines capture extensive personal data on search engines and also on email so that private content and search history are exposed through advertising or cached in ways that can later reveal information to third parties
1373	mass surveillance, unauthorized access
1374	When I sign up for a service, say alerts for accommodation search from an accommodation website, I get spammed to death because they "sold" my email to so many media companies who send me all sorts of crap at that email address. No amount of "unsubscribing seem to stop them because they just keep coming from different magazines newspapers and media services. In despair, I may have to abandon that email. that's the second email that has been thus spammed.
1375	Credit card info stolen and used from online e-commerce platform, Spam through email
1377	My password was found in a list of leaked passwords, it was the fault of the platform that the passwords leaked.
1378	Lots of email spam, like an unsubscribed email list from an enterprise that keeps sending me promotional emails and newsletters. Also, apps tha recorded my conversations and used the results to show me ads inte apps on my phone.
1379	had a virus after opening an e-mail years ago
1382	Drawn into unnecessary payments. Only stopped through service provider.
1383	several tries to hack my accounts on Gmail, Facebook, Instagram, however, none of them were succeeded.
1385	I accessed a site to download academic books in a language which is not English and it turned out to be a snare. My computer was hacked
1388	Being bombarded with SMS mostly from Fast food outlets about new offers.
1389	Spam, fairly consistently, and in the past I have had email accounts hacked.
1395	Spam from sources I have no connection to. Non malicious. Just trying to promote services or product.
Not a big problem but increased in last 6 months.
1398	costunized advertising, spam Mails, tracking the places where I travel.
1400	My credit card was hacked during a trip overseas. A purchase was made using my credit card. I had to contact my bank. They opened an investigation and made a refund.
1401	Messages sent spoofed from contacts
1406	My Twitter account was once stolen by another user, who made use of it for several months. However, in general, my main concerns are not about privacy. I trust that I make enough efforts to protect my data. My concerns are in regards to the creation of big multi-business conglomerates and the impossibility of refraining from using services that have become

	mainstream, since their use becomes almost mandatory. This applies primarily to social media and telecommunication industries.
1410	Just regular spam and various forms of fake offers (business proposals, affairs, etc.).
1411	I consider targeted advertising a violation of my privacy
1412	Being sent messages by strangers.
1414	phone calls by private companies while my number is not listed publicly
1415	Misuse of credit card, bot-hacking of twitter account, leak of standard passwords by various fora
1418	Whenever I browse the web for any given product I need. I am followed by its advertisements to other websites as well, irrespective whether I want to view the advertisements or not. Google offers a feedback mechanism where it assures not to send the similar advertisements again after I click I do not want to view the advertisements, but it eventually again feeds my computing screen with advertisements.
	Also, I have realised that when I subscribe an email update service on a website, few other websites also start mailing me their products manual or advertisements, eventually bulk mails stock my email inbox. There could be a data sharing mechanism between websites, but the user who subscribes to a given service should be duly informed the other emails s/he would eventually receive after subscribing a given service. It is perhaps a breach or perhaps theft of personal information.
1421	I use multiple email accounts and can track when an address that is dedicated to a particular vendor suddenly starts receiving spam. This has happened on several occasions on a diverse number of platforms, indicating that my personal is not stored with sufficient care and that the vendors use insecure systems.
1423	GMail scraping details of events I was (possibly) attending within my emails and adding them to my Google Calendar - unasked, and unwanted. Somewhat concerned on location tracking in this regard to, when accessing email from remote (non-home/work) locations.
1425	Spam
1426	They were not privacy violations but it was clear for example when going to the BBC news website that it had been noticed that I had looked at the Australian public service broadcaster's online shop because their ads came up immediately. This demonstrated to me that someone else is also reading my computer.
1431	unexpected responses from unknowns with more personal details than I considered safe. Unexplained contacts with an amazing amount of personal details
1436	Data breaches
1437	Unknowingly, my system was hacked and a virus sent to crush my files
1443	Mainly newsletters that I've never signed but I can't really unsubscribe it; always return again and again. It seems like the un/subscribe options do not exist.
	On social media platforms, always these ads linked with my "likes".
1448	My university's email system is frequently targeted by spam. Usually, I recognize that the email is questionable and don't open it. I was tricked once and immediately went to the appropriate site and changed all of my information.
1450	Accidentally opened file in spam email - account then spammed others
1451	Service providers violate my privacy constantly, including analyzing, using, sharing, and selling data about me including data i have provided them and my web surfing, clicking, ip address, phone number, address etc. In addition they do not delete data they ethically should, nor do they protect it.
1452	Spam is a regular feature of everyday life.
	After having browsed some items in an online store, they came up in an inappropriate situation (sexy lingerie ads appearing at the wrong time).
	My phone's predictive text remembers some phrases I would prefer it not to - related to searching for porn.
1454	Typically being "nagged" to buy other stuff ......
1459	nothing special, usual spam-phising messages, advertisment SMSs, etc.
1460	An attempt was made to hack into my Google email account after the LinkedIn password hack. I had used the same password for both, but luckily had two factor authentication turned on, so the hack was unsuccessful.
1467	Genral and far-reaching government surveillance and corporate data sharing/selling without my consent (very likely but I can hardly know that specifically).
1469	random emails that have come because I've used a service before and they've shared my email address with somebody. Recommendations to purchase other things / targetted ads on shopping sites like amazon that indicates they are harvesting my data. Random phone calls/text messages that suggests somebody's sharing my data.
1471	I get lot of marketing emails which I don't know how they get in y email box without my permission.
1473	Organization email address is listed on our website in plain text; gets regular spam. But

	expected.
1474	I considered my privacy being violated when I receive phone calls trying to sell me goods and services, but also when a company or organisation called revently on behalf of GreenPeace. They said, after I raised the issue of privacy and data protection, that they found my name on one of petitions I signed. However, my mobile phone number was not attached to the name when I signed the petition. Other forms include receiving spam emails and marketing messages on LinkedIn, Twitter.
1483	daily spam; hacking attacks e.g. on my yahoo account
1486	About 10% spam on one email account. Large number of pushed announcements on Facebook.
1488	My credit card used by others for their own charges several times over the past four years. Also my Facebook account was broken into by someone which caused me to change my password.
1512	Mobile phone and search engines are able to suggest me product and places even if I have gps services disconnected.
1520	Over the years, the following things have already happened to me: * identity theft related to 2 hacked email provider databases (yahoo and gmx) * identity theft "caused" by online shopping which resulted in multiple withdrawals (each 20-100 euro) from my bank account * proliferation of severe slanderous claims about me through google. claims were originally written in usenet messages pre-2000, but proliferated by google post 2005 (was #1 result when searching for my full name for several months)
1524	FB algorithms randomly claiming my account is temporarily blocked even though it isn't. I realise this is more a technological problem than security, but a friend had her account hacked recently by spyware or malware on her iPhone and it started randomly unfriending people inc family.
1538	spamming my network
1539	Google automatically added a photo I used on social media, to its maps, thus revealing my address. Had to take image down, adjust settings on phone to remove all location meta data from pictures taken. Online shopping often results in large and obvious advertising on the news websites I visit, revealing my online shopping habits to anyone who looks over my shoulder in a work/office/public environment. Social media platforms defaulted to showing my general location until I adjusted settings.
1540	Promotions from Telcos
1559	daily spam per mail, facebook gathering information even from non-users (in my case once an invitation by a person I do not know); online banking creating profiles of customers (e.g. where they buy goods etc.), daily search engine profiling of user behavior, tracking of mobile phones e.g. by apps.
1575	Lots of spam mails Goggle's usurpation of my Mobile phone
1585	Spam is literally everywhere and in many cases quite uncomfortable.
1588	Usually by a self-evident attempt to cause a virus to open by the ostensible sending of a message from someone that I know. On the phone cold-calling by organisations trying to provide services (e.g. help with car accidents).
1591	A hacker went into my email and sent messages. I fixed the problem with a stronger password.
1597	Email account hacked and sent random emails to my contacts - similar experience with Facebook.
1603	Not included above is accounts to watch films - netflix, now, amazon. My netflix account was hijacked using an italian address and additional chargeable services added to my account. It was rectified by Netflix and I changed all my passwords for everything online. Email - I am regularly spammed and occasionally get authentic looking fake emails trying to get me to send info or click on an embedded link.
1607	Emails (phishing) where it is however still clear that the message is not from a serious company because of its various aspects and the links offered; I would obtain emails where I had never seen the company before or have never signed up to it
1609	Sharing my email address so i now get a load of spam. Also advertisements of social media and websites that link to something i may have been looking at on an online shopping site.
1614	Often spam in email and someone trying to hack my email account
1617	Hacked
1623	Sent multiple emails with phishing links, bought goods online from a shop that turned out to be fake and they never arrived, on Facebook was messaged spam links and had someone

	use my photo and name to make an account of me on instagram that wasn't me.
1624	Google reads my search data which they use to serve me ads so I switched to Startpage, which is google with a proxy so they can't track my searches.
	I don't trust Facebook not to track my posts, so I dropped FB and simply deleted it. Plus I don't trust that even with privacy settings on that I can't be doxxed.
1643	My ex boy friend hacked my social media account once and ever since I stopped using it.
	He stills sends request on various social media platforms through new accounts/ various platforms.
1647	I'm constantly gettig spam mails to my account from shady medicine companies
1651	email spam received from website with explicit non-spam consent. cross-ad from searches.
	AD from wathsupp chats. Online banking phising tentatives via email and phone.
1687	I occasionally receive malware, necessitating its removal. Fortunately, I have never seen my security compromised, although it remains a concern.
1691	eBay transaction hacked and sold item re-advertised by hacker.
1714	Craigslist Google Voice scam, for instance
1921	Lots of spam and fishing on email - luckily the fileters are getting better and better. In online shopping, I have payed for goods that never turned up. One time I just didn't care, two times I got my money back from the credit card provider.
1967	Overly targeted/invasive advertising, third parties attempting to sign my email address up for mailing lists or online accounts (and some accounts not sending a verification email before subscribing me to the list).
1969	Both my facebook and email account were hacked. Google/facebook/amazon/youtube used my searches to to tailor ads (thats why i now use duckduckgo).
2004	I get spam emails on all my email accounts but mostly my Outlook accounts. A few times I've been browsing the Internet on my mobile with an at-home WiFi connection and been directed to porn websites
2016	Credit card fraud.
	Scam shopping sites that never send goods and steal credit card details for re-use despite appearing to be a secure 3rd party payment method.
2044	I was informed by the provider. I did not notice it by myself.
2050	Hacking, and spam
2057	I received spam quite frequently
2068	Spam mail to my email, mobile phone and social media accounts. Phishing attempts. Spam email of a sexual nature. Phishing attempts using my dead father's information.
2070	I get lots of unsolicited email spam.
2078	Spam emails, etc.
	Social Media (Facebook) has been hacked
2080	Get fraudulent phone calls and emails phishing for information
2083	On Facebook. So I was asked to change my password
2087	spams or commercials for the sake of profit.
2094	Posts been uploaded without my concern and mail spam
2100	Access to my social media platform and to my msgs from other.
	Plus, auto-downloading pictures of my profile on the PC I was using to log in.
2108	Spam emails
2122	Via msn when i was 10
2136	personal data used for targeted advertising.
2140	Spam emails from politicians, who probably have bought an illegal emailing list
	Spam SMS in my mobile phone
	Exposure of photos depicting me, published by other members of a social media platform
	Found my personal contact details exposed in a massive list online
	Targeted ads in the websites I visit
2142	After some major leak of millions accounts (passwords) of yahoo mail somewhere in 2011 or 2012 I never retrieved my account
2153	- Several times a week I would receive emails impersonating me or providing marketing information that I haven't requested.
	- I have received several warnings from facebook regarding trying to hack my account.
2163	Receiving spam emails and promotions for which I did not sign up for
2164	- got spam emails pretending they were from my university asking me to pay some fees
	- got spam emails pretending they were Apple and sending me an invoice for a purchase i did not make, and asking me to provide full details on my account (including bank account)
2175	Bank fraud - independent of me using my bank account.
2208	The mobile phone number was leaked.
2235	the advertisement from some companies which I did not registe before.
2237	I may write down my mobile number during online registration and get annoying calls, texts or ads from strangers afterwards.

2261	copied FB account
2264	Facebook account hacked once by somebody who wanted to see my prvate messages
	Lot's of spams for which I try to unsucribe but it never works really
2267	Email Spams, phishing
2300	Spam mail and advertisement
	Advertisement and increased mobile phone bills due to malware sms messages

Field summary for QC2A

Please consider the following statement. Users do not have control over how personal information is collected and used by online companies.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly agree (A1)	557	55.70%
Agree (A2)	352	35.20%
Disagree (A3)	57	5.70%
Strongly disagree (A4)	17	1.70%
Do not know (A5)	17	1.70%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC2B

Please consider the following statement. Most online businesses handle the personal information they collect about users in a proper and confidential way.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly agree (A1)	25	2.50%
Agree (A2)	196	19.60%
Disagree (A3)	371	37.10%
Strongly disagree (A4)	285	28.50%
Do not know (A5)	123	12.30%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC2C

Please consider the following statement. Existing laws and organisational practices provide a reasonable level of protection for users' online privacy today.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly agree (A1)	10	1.00%
Agree (A2)	139	13.90%
Disagree (A3)	426	42.60%
Strongly disagree (A4)	339	33.90%
Do not know (A5)	86	8.60%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC2D

How do you feel about the fact that search engines and social networking sites like Google, YouTube and Facebook use your personal data for profit-making purposes?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Not concerned (A1)	168	16.80%
Somewhat concerned (A2)	223	22.30%
Concerned (A3)	254	25.40%
Very concerned (A4)	347	34.70%
No opinion (A6)	8	0.80%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC2E

How do you feel that data about online activity of the users (e.g. websites or online platforms visited), and the relevant personal communication may be shared between Internet companies and other organisations, such as the police, secret services or insurance companies?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Not concerned (A1)	199	19.90%
Somewhat concerned (A2)	168	16.80%
Concerned (A3)	200	20.00%
Very concerned (A4)	429	42.90%
No opinion (A5)	4	0.40%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC3A

In the light of any of the above concerns that you might have, have you taken any steps?

Answer	Count	Percentage
I have not taken any steps (SQ011)	136	13.60%
I have reduced my use of the Internet to the minimum (SQ001)	48	4.80%
I have stopped using open Wi-Fi (SQ003)	193	19.30%
I have stopped using the online service(s) I have concerns about (SQ004)	273	27.30%
I have reduced the frequency of usage of the online service(s) I have concerns about (SQ005)	305	30.50%
I have paid more attention to the terms of use and privacy policies of online services and Internet service providers (SQ006)	437	43.70%
I have changed my default privacy settings (e.g. on Facebook) (SQ007)	637	63.70%
I have blocked certain applications on social media (e.g. Facebook birthday calendar) (SQ008)	436	43.60%
I have used ad-block software (SQ009)	613	61.30%
I have used a service that anonymises or encrypts my online data or identity (SQ010)	263	26.30%
I have taken other steps (SQ012)	198	19.80%

Field summary for QC3b

Which service that anonymises or encrypts online data have you used?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	262	99.62%
No answer	1	0.38%

ID	Response
36	VPN and TOR
45	TOR
51	tor
52	Signal, GPG, TOR
68	Private Internet Access (VPN)
78	tor, gpg, ssh and generally TLSv1.2 for https, imaps, smtps, openvpn
82	Email encryption
84	Anyconnect
87	TOR, VPN
88	tor, vpn
89	PGP, encrypted ZIP, TOR
90	socks proxy, VPN, Tor, throwaway e-mail accounts, Duckduckgo search engine
97	Posteo.de for E-Mail (in combination with PGP), Contacts, Calendar and Tasks; ProtonMail for E-Mail; Signal for direct messaging; Keybase for direct messaging and cloud storage (KBFS); software like Cryptomator or Syncany to encrypt my data in the cloud (Google Drive, Dropbox etc.);
104	ZenMate
106	https, Firefox Private Window
118	VPN anonymizer, cookie/flash/JS-blockers, encrypted messaging
134	tor, pgp
140	Tor, VPN, GnuPG, OTR, etc
144	Tor
152	TOR, some VPN services
159	Tor, Nord VPN
161	Tor browser, VPN, HTTP Everywhere, Linux, Orbot with Onion Browser, location/cookie/JS blocking, Duck Duck Go, etc.
163	TunnelBear
171	I do not use facebook. I do not use Google for search. I utilize browser plugins and follow the advice and the technology alternatives at sites like https://prism-break.org/en/ and https://privacytools.io
184	friGate, uBlock
188	I have installed a PGP-key though I haven't used it. I used a cloud backup solution that encrypts the upload (though this was a few years ago so that I don't know the name anylonger). Luckily, Whatsapp does now encrypt messages too, I considered using Threema, but it would not work on my symbian phone.
193	tor
197	Tunnel Bear
206	Ghostery
208	Tor, VPNs, GnuPG, OTR
212	AirVPN
213	VPN
223	openvpn, gnupg, tor, signal, privacy badger
229	tor, ssh
236	Tor
237	Tor, VPN
238	protonmail, whatsapp, tor, framapad
244	vpn, tor, fingerprints, free softwares on pc and mobile
254	Ghostey and others
264	VPN
267	VPN
270	we have encrypted mail for survey purposes; Tor browser; VPNs (paid for) depending on which country we are in; we have paid online storage for project use rather than free (e.g.

Dropbox). etc I used third-party transfer blocking softwares. I used to use www.abine.com (DNT+), Ghostery, but now use Badger from the EFF (not all at once just one of them because they cancel each other out). Ocassionaly I use the Tor Browser but only for specific purposes as it is not secure. Indeed I use different browsers for different purposes and in different ways. I opt out of tracking companies with the Digital Advertising Alliance: http://www.aboutads.info/choices/ I opt out of this on Firefox but block cookies on Chrome so these are blocked any way. I opted out of Google Analytics, go here: http://tools.google.com/dlpage/gaoptout Then other similar opt-outs e.g. Block Yourself from Analytics (add-on from igorware), the IBA opt out, Adblock Plus, eShield etc. I also opt out of Adobe Flash Player web browsing history http://www.macromedia.com/support/documentatio n/en/flashplayer/help/settings_manager07.html and http://www.macromedia.com/support/doc umentation/en/flashplayer/help/settings_manager02.html. I check privacy policies particularly with apps. Albeit I don't use apps particularly not WHATSAPP and other messaging services. With Facebook, I have no authorised apps but I do use IM on browers but not on the phone and I don't have the FB messenger app. I do allow advertising on FB as I like to see how they are profiling me. I took Facebook and Foursquare off my phone along with a number of other apps which came with the phone. It wasn't particularly easy to do. I have no store cards e.g. Sainsbury's, Debenhams, etc. I never had them and decided definitively against after seeing Ian Brown speak about privacy circa 8 years ago. I use Skype for calls and IM because it is encrypted but Skype does save IM history as well on its server and will transfer information upon legal request and the servers are based in the US so subject to the Patriot Act. So sometimes civil society groups and privacy advocacy groups in particular don't want to use it so we use other encrypted softwares. I block ads on Mozilla, http://adblockplus.org/en/firefox. I opted out of Google tracking with Adsense https://support.google.com/adsense (also download the extension). However, it still stores IP address. I also block cookies on each browser. A VPN can override ISP monitoring, the Google bubble, traffic management and deep packaging software. In the UK we tend to use paid services. If travelling, we tend to use different VPNs depending where we are. e.g. HotSpotShield in the States but it supports itself by showing adverts. You can get around this by upgrading to a paid-for version but it means, implicitly, that they are collecting data on your use in a similar way that other companies are tracking you. HotSpotShield is based in the US so is prone to provisions of the US Patriot Act as e.g. Skype is. Other free VPNs like CyberGhost http://www.cyberghostvpn.com, SecurityKiss http://www.securitykiss.com/ and It's Hidden www.itshidden.com are all based in Europe. E.g. SecurityKiss' servers are in Germany and It's Hidden's are in the Netherlands. All of the above improves the situation only slightly because there are now super cookies, persistent cookies, ever cookies which you simply cannot get rid of. Plus location data harvested when apps are downloaded, interception of Mac addresses etc. Not to mention all the data sharing between different platforms e.g. Amazon, Facebook and profiling that goes on.

281	Tor, riseup.net
287	Various
292	Mainly Tor
294	AdBlock, Ghostery, uMatrix
309	TOR
314	Private Browsing on my browser
319	browser extensins (like https everywhere), TOR, ssl, unaffliated IRC cloaks, Signal (and other e2e encryption apps)
321	Signal, DuckDuckGo, Tor, browser extensions (e.g. https everywhere, ad blocker), Richochet, OTR, shard encrypted volumes, password manager, cloud backup with encryption...?, keybase, PGP, ... too many more to name, IRC cloaks,
325	I frequently use VPN to connect to the internet to bypass spying by my ISP
336	WhatsApp and Signal
344	Tor, PGP, MAC Randomizer
347	Ipredator
348	ExpressVPN
354	Tor Browser. Enygmail, Cleopatra, offline file encryption, Pidgin
363	VPNs
365	http://anonymouse.org/
375	VPN
379	VPNs, Tor, private browsing apps
383	Tor.
387	Password store software and paid VPN service
391	Tor
394	VeryCrypt, HTTPS Everywhere

401	Enigmail+PGP
406	opera browser VPN for average use - Onionshare for some files - ghosterly etc for taking blocking and warning about malware generally
416	TOR, Whatsapp
419	I don't remember he name but is a service provided by Mozilla Firefox.
421	Incognito browsing on Google Chrome
429	Tor/VPN
431	Veracrypt
449	VPN, [GPG]
472	I have a backup of my data in the iCloud, which is encrypted.
486	frootVPN, tutanota, GnuGPG/Enigmail, TOR
511	WhatsApp
522	PGP, uBlock, PrivacyBadger, Disconnect, Ghostery, TOR, Threema, Signal, Boxcryptor, TrueCrypt
527	I've set up a tor server that may or may not use depending on the task
534	none
548	Protonmail, Ublock origin/disconnect for staving off cookies and other unwanted ad-services, TOR, VPN's (various)
559	TOR
566	VPNs, Tor, HTTPS, uBlock, Privacy Badger
571	Tor; SSH, IPsec to connect to my own computers; Fastd on "Freifunk" routers.
587	email service posteo encrypts mail, telegeram instead of Whatsapp
589	VPN, Tor browser
605	Whatsapp
616	telegram, signal
617	GnuPG, Tor, Retroshare, Tox, ...
620	PGP and TOR
638	openPGP, VeryCrypt, TOR browser, Signal, Threema
651	Opera's, proxy server.
664	I have used Tor and email encryption occasionally.
665	gnupg, enigmail
688	tor, pgp
693	https://my-own.net/
712	ToR, PGP.
725	tor
726	Private browsing option in search engines
749	GNUPG, Whatsapp, Tor, Torify, Tails
751	VPN
759	Privacy badger, AdNauseam
764	Tor
769	Tor and VPNs
773	can't remember name
778	-
781	store and browse
782	Tor, VPN, Proxy
784	tor
791	Tor
796	Cryptomator
801	VPN
828	Tor/VPN
829	Tor, other anonymizing proxies and VPNs
832	tor
841	Private Internet Access VPN
847	Hidemyass
858	various.
869	Tor, I2P, Freenet
870	Tor, I2P
877	Tor
878	https everywhere, gpg, tor
880	PGP ENCRYPTION
886	Tor
887	Tor, PGP, AdBlocker
898	Tor
899	tor, enigmail, otr, some sw to remove exif from photos
902	VPN

909	sorry dudes
910	Mixture of VPN, Tor, fake users, wrong data
911	Tor, PGP, OpenVPN, Protonmail, public-key-authentification
913	gpg, tor
914	Smime, Tor, end2end chat solutions, otr, ssl, vpn,…
915	I use Signal routinely, I use PGP on Thunderbird with certain correspondents & I use TOR occasionally.
916	Tor, Secure messangers such as Threema and Signal, temporary email address services, bugmenot
920	Privacy VPN, Freifunk
925	vpn/tor/etc
926	pgp, vpn
930	CiscoAny Connect
937	Blur
940	Tor
944	I use multiple VPNs, Tor, noscrpit etc
949	Tor, VPN, signal, telegram, PGP
957	TOR, Whatsapp
981	FastMail
984	A VPN called Private Internet Access; HTTPS everywhere; occasionally TOR but I'm afraid of my government's security agencies taking a harder look at my data when what I'm a decent person simply trying to achieve is greater privacy :-/ it's a conundrum.
989	Tor Browser, duckduckgo
998	vpn
1004	DuckDuckGo and other things I can't remember
1005	tor, tunnel bear, criptex for gmail, pgp
1021	tor browser, privacy browsing
1025	when you force people to do data entry it encourages them to bail out of your survey
1058	GPG4Win, TOR, Ghostery, Tails
1066	Tor, including Orbot on my mobile phone
1072	Tor and Commercial VPN
1074	Tor
1083	tor
1084	duck duck go, Tor, VPN
1086	Tor
1089	tor browser ; ghostly
1092	PGP
1095	Signal, Tor frequently, GPG mail encryption sometimes
1103	Vpn
1107	several
1108	tor
1110	DNS traffic goes through VPN, avoid certain censorship
1112	Protonmail, and ProtonVpn. Occasionally, I'll use Tor.
1115	Https everywhere
1116	Tor, PGP, OTR
1127	TOR, VPN
1130	Tor
1131	Private Internet Access VPN
1138	PGP
1146	Tor, personal VPNs
1147	Search engines anonymising your search requests
1150	VPN
1153	Tor, Signal Private Messenger
1156	tor, gpg, otr, signal, omemo
1163	Retroshare, Signal, Tor
1165	Tor
1185	I use Privacy Badger, HTTPS Everywhere and uBlock Origin.
1186	don't remember
1187	Protonmail
1191	Tor, Veracrypt, ssl, Encrypt email.
1197	tor, adblock, privoxy
1200	tor, torguard, hidemyass
1202	Browser reset (or quitting) including wiping ALL data after using websites requiring cookies
1210	Tor; Squirrel Mail;
1214	Tor, Signal, Line, Whisper

1216	TOR and local encryption of data before storing it online.
1217	Vpn
1221	VPN, Tor, PGP
1223	Ghostry, signal, encrypted chats
1225	VPN
1227	...
1233	Tor
1236	enigmail; wire; threema; startpage; duck duck go; private window mozilla firefox
1238	Authy (2FA), DuckDuckGo(search engine), Riot (secure instant messenger developped by Matrix.org), Signal(IM), Tor, ProtonMail, AXANTUM encryption , and strong passphrase recommended by EFF
1245	Tor
1248	VPN and other routing applications
1253	CyberGhostVPN
1255	HTTPS everywhere, Tor, VPN
1258	Firefox Tracking Protection in Private Browsing
1262	tor
1291	I mostly just use a VPN, but I have also used Tor occasionally
1293	Private Internet Access
1297	Tor
1299	tor,
1310	Tor and Duck duck Go
1311	Tor
1313	VPN. I have two, since one of them sometimes betrays the connection I found. Windscribe and TigerVPN. I have also experimented with Linux as an operating system and tried to use FOSS alternatives to applications, but this hasn't worked out given the work I do.
1315	tor
1318	Pgp, tor, chrome incognito, riseup email, pseudonyms
1326	VPN service
1329	Avira Free Phantom VPN
1335	google incognito
1337	VPN networks
1340	t.a.l.e.s. linux
1345	cryptography
1346	PGP for email, MAC randomizer, and Tor
1349	Tor, VPN
1361	private ssh tunnels
1362	OpenPGP
1366	Tor Browser
1371	signal
1373	gpg, but its not a service
1375	SpiderOak, Proton Mail, Tor
1383	TOR, hotspot
1390	Paid VPN service
1395	Tor
1396	GPG, Tor, signal, OTR, VPNs
1400	A plug in that sends different search words to google.
1401	tor
1415	IPVanish
1418	Avira Phanton VPN
1421	NordVPN
1423	Secure VPN (e.g but limited to Tunnelbear)
1436	Tor, VPNs
1454	Firetrust Mailwasher and Hideaway
1459	vpn
1469	Duck Duck Go search engine. PGP.
1474	GPG, Signal, Tor
1512	vpn, ad block plus and firefox focus
1515	TOR browser. TOR. Various VPNs.
1520	tor, tor browser, pgp, gnupg, https and https-everywhere addon
1559	tor, spideroak, gnupg
1575	Kaspersky secure banking page, HBCI
1581	VPN services outside of 14 eyes member countries.
1583	dns
1597	Opera Developer

1617	Whatsapp
1618	I have had to use various encryption software and TOR -- but I find them all very cumbersome and not at all easy to use or efficient.
1624	TunnelBear, OpenVPN, Tor
1630	TOR (Sometimes), HideMeVPN (Most of then time£
1651	opengpg, tor
1655	Vpn
1691	Anonymiser
1967	Tor, SpiderOak (for encrypted cloud storage), HTTPS Everywhere to enforce encrypted website connections when possible
2068	Hotspot Shield
2087	private browsing of google
2136	tor and duckduckgo instead of google/yahoo/bing etc.
2140	VPN, anonymous search engines such as DuckDuckGo / Startpage, Private Browsing, clean cookies on exit from browsers
2175	VPN
2227	Messaging services like WhatsApp and iMessage have end-to-end encryption.

Field summary for QC3C

Please specify what other steps you have taken:

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	198	100.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

ID	Response
45	Changin surfing habits, paying more details to the security of websites I visit (https).
54	Strict script blocking, immediate elimination of cookies, anti-fingerprinting plugins
61	An Italian law that does not permit vending copanies to contact by phone or e-mail people registered in a database called "anagrafe delle opposizioni". As a matter of fact I am registred in "anagrafe delle opposizioni" but everyday I receive at least three calls about commercial proposals. As it always happens in Italy we have laws regulating everything but laws are not enforced.
81	Strong encryption (Mail, browsing) Own Mailserver Own Calendar system (not Google) Encrypted Devices Runing Tor Nodes
82	Self-hosted servers for most of my communications means
87	Script Blocker (UBlock Origin, Privacy Bader) Setting (hidden) browser settings
88	Using Facebook only from a dedicated virtual machine. I use Mastodon instead of Twitter. I host my own wordpress blog. I avoid websites without encryption; no login over http. I try to avoid login in with fb or google but use (different) e-mail addresses…
90	use a bnc (for irc), use encrypted protocols in general (HTTPS, SMTP/IMAP-STARTTLS, IRCS etc), use PGP, run own mailservers (several), run own server infrastructure for tunneling, run a Tor exit node; not using a smartphone, no social networks, no corporate-owned messengers, use several browser-addons and hardening settings, use privacy-aware search engines, use free-as-in-freedom OS and software.
93	Diversify the use of browsers
97	installed Lineage OS on my phone, besides the indispensable proprietary apps (like Google Play Services, Whatsapp, timetable app from national public transport provider etc.) only open-source apps are installed and granted system rights (like reading contacts etc.) are restricted to a minimum for untrusted apps (all proprietary ones); installed Ubuntu Linux on my notebook (in combination with dual boot to Windows for some rare but unfortunately necessary cases); using the Firefox and Chromium Add-ons NoScript, DecentralEyes, HTTPS-Everywhere, Self-destructing Cookies/Vanilla Cookie Manager, BetterPrivacy, Terms of Service; Didn't Read using uBlock Origin (an ad blocker) with various filter lists and pretty restrictive settings on my notebook as well as my phone; installed OpenWrt/LEDE (a linux distribution for network devices) on my home router to have full control and an up-to-date system (security fixes etc.); configured custom privacy respecting DNS servers planning to use trustworthy VPN (like Cryptostorm) by default
118	encrypted file storage
124	Researching them.
131	Use half-safe Browser cliqz
149	That would defeat the object of so doing!
154	doing critical socio-legal studies on that topic (awareness-raising);
161	To many to list.

188	I installed cyanogenmod on my travel phone. Generally, I'm reluctant to use this smart phone - mainly for procrestination purposes, but also due to an arkward feeling when a new app asks for access to my pictures, etc. I minimize using personalized google services. I have an email-account with a company that seems to be concerned about privacy (posteo). I try to use multiple e-mail adresses with fake names. I used a noscript for a few months, but honestly, it sucked, so I gave in.
194	Using a VPN when on public WiFi
198	Experiment Tor browser
199	I use open-source software where it is practicable, and use search engines other than google most of the time. I also Log Out of services when I am done with them as a general rule.
201	I am a digital and performance artist and I use this area as my primary subject matter. I do intend to take additional steps in the near future.
208	I pick my OS carefully. I don't install any apps which use my location or collect private data. I use cloud services only for encrypted data. I don't communicate unencrypted anymore (if possible). I don't have cloud-back-ups anymore.
218	For sites where you have to provide data to see the content, i use tools like fakenamegenerator.com and/or disposable Mailadresses. I also use alternating Browsers, up to tunning them in virtual machines... depends strongly on what i expect.
224	I have installed NoScript and blocked Facebook and Google Analytics.
226	I do not use any of the so called *social* networks since I do not want to be the product of such companies.
228	DNS queries via VPN
238	I repeatedly complain to companies and web platforms. I campaign against the web oligopoly's position.
244	I learned a bit on how to protect personal data.
270	I used third-party transfer blocking softwares. I used to use www.abine.com (DNT+), Ghostery, but now use Badger from the EFF (not all at once just one of them because they cancel each other out). Ocassionaly I use the Tor Browser but only for specific purposes as it is not secure. Indeed I use different browsers for different purposes and in different ways. I opt out of tracking companies with the Digital Advertising Alliance: http://www.aboutads.info/choices/ I opt out of this on Firefox but block cookies on Chrome so these are blocked any way. I opted out of Google Analytics, go here: http://tools.google.com/dlpage/gaoptout Then other similar opt-outs e.g. Block Yourself from Analytics (add-on from igorware), the IBA opt out, Adblock Plus, eShield etc. I also opt out of Adobe Flash Player web browsing history http://www.macromedia.com/support/documentatio n/en/flashplayer/help/settings_manager07.html and http://www.macromedia.com/support/doc umentation/en/flashplayer/help/settings_manager02.html. I check privacy policies particularly with apps. Albeit I don't use apps particularly not WHATSAPP and other messaging services. With Facebook, I have no authorised apps but I do use IM on browers but not on the phone and I don't have the FB messenger app. I do allow advertising on FB as I like to see how they are profiling me. I took Facebook and Foursquare off my phone along with a number of other apps which came with the phone. It wasn't particularly easy to do. I have no store cards e.g. Sainsbury's, Debenhams, etc. I never had them and decided definitively against after seeing Ian Brown speak about privacy circa 8 years ago. I use Skype for calls and IM because it is encrypted but Skype does save IM history as well on its server and will transfer information upon legal request and the servers are based in the US so subject to the Patriot Act. So sometimes civil society groups and privacy advocacy groups in particular don't want to use it so we use other encrypted softwares. I block ads on Mozilla, http://adblockplus.org/en/firefox. I opted out of Google tracking with Adsense https://support.google.com/adsense (also download the extension). However, it still stores IP address. I also block cookies on each browser. A VPN can override ISP monitoring, the Google bubble, traffic management and deep packaging software. In the UK we tend to use paid services. If travelling, we tend to use different VPNs depending where we are. e.g. HotSpotShield in the States but it supports itself by showing adverts. You can get around this by upgrading to a paid-for version but it means, implicitly, that they are collecting data on your use in a similar way that other companies are tracking you. HotSpotShield is based in the US so is prone to provisions of the US Patriot Act as e.g. Skype is. Other free VPNs like CyberGhost http://www.cyberghostvpn.com, SecurityKiss http://www.securitykiss.com/ and It's Hidden www.itshidden.com are all based in Europe. E.g. SecurityKiss' servers are in Germany and It's Hidden's are in the Netherlands. All of the above improves the situation only slightly because there are now super cookies, persistent cookies, ever cookies which you simply cannot get rid of. Plus location data

harvested when apps are downloaded, interception of Mac addresses etc. Not to mention all the data sharing between different platforms e.g. Amazon, Facebook and profiling that goes on.

272	I refuse to set up a Facebook account.
279	-I have submitted comments to the FCC about net neutrality. I believe I have also submitted comments about Internet privacy.
287	I don't open files or web sites from unknown or unsolicited sources. I only enter financial data through access via my version of their URL.
292	I use Adblock Plus; i have 'throw-away' email accounts; I have TorMail accounts; I use DuckDuckGo; I wipe ALL cookies/offline data/etc when closing my browser; I use Paypal except in rare cases; I use https everywhere.
296	I use an online VPN service. I delete internet history, browsing data, cookies at the end of each session on a browser. I regullarly scan my machine for virus/malware etc I periodically change my passwords and use a range of techniques to choose them.
305	One is to compartmentalise activity. That way I know who is raiding my accounts and I also limit the damage. I limit giving out info unless I have to.
309	VPN
314	I avoid searching for or visiting websites about certain topics or written from certain perspectives that might expose me to automated surveillance. For many years I did not download or store academic journal articles on terrorism, even though some of my research is on political violence.
315	I don't use any social media anymore, mainly due to privacy concerns though for other reasons as well
319	Using pseudonymous emails and user names to avoid sharing credentials between accounts
321	I use a VPN
	I have switched services to those that are more privacy protective (e.g. Signal, Duck Duck Go, etc...) I have requested information on what my carrier stores about about me via PIPEDA
325	My web browsers are set to delete all cookies on exit. I log out of social media and other accounts before leaving their sites. I use Privacy Badger to limit tracking. I consider the ramifications of filling out online forms and/or offering my email address or other identifying information.
328	incognito browsing and regular firewall updates
332	Carefully consider what information I personally put online.
333	I put electrical tape over my cameras on my laptop and iPad (but not my phone b/c I use the camera too frequently).
353	I'm not using Facebook and other social media for these reasons, but that's everything.
356	This info is confidential
365	Used privacy checking tools such as https://panopticlick.eff.org/ and https://amiunique.org/fp and https://haveibeenpwned.com/ Researched https://ssd.eff.org/
383	Use a variety of ad blockers, Disconnect, Perspectives, Random Agent Spoofer, etc. I teach my students these tools...
388	Sometimes I use pseudonyms and fake birthdays on websites. But I still need to use a real email address so it probably does no good. I also turn off location tracking on my phone when I can and when I remember, usually for specific apps as opposed to wholesale. Also occasionally I use duck duck go instead
390	I use https as a default, disable access to apps, and use Privacy Badger
401	Stopped using Google as search engine, use FLOSS,
405	Use of browser add-ons such as Scriptsafe and Ghostery, which shows and blocks trackers on a given website. Occasional use of a non-tracking search engine (DuckDuckGo) although I find I often end up using Google simply for speed and convenience.
415	Deleted main Facebook account [secondary account for research purposes] and am moving away from Gmail. Use Linux install of Window/Mac.
416	Created multiple online personas backed by different email accounts so I control what is exposed under what persona Intentionally garbaging data profiling by searching for unrelated stuff Educating people around me and through writing
431	Tor, Open Source software, Linux, Signal, VPN
449	Using alternative providers. Reducing information provided. Personal encryption (e.g. GPG) of data before internet storage
472	When browsing for products to buy (e.g. flights, hotels, etc.), I always use the anonymous navigation option in my browser.
476	other

486	moved from computer-internet to mobile services like signal
521	Share less data using online services.
549	give false/random info
562	I limit, or give deliberately false information to some web sites. I select preferences (e.g. to receive general rather than targeted advertising). I use separate email addresses for different engagements. I use privacy blockers in addition to ad blockers, when on-line.
566	Education.
567	more protection
577	Share less of my personal details
592	I never play online games.
616	I have limited personal data uploading to the internet to the minimum.
617	Help other people to protect themselves, be politically active
620	I always opt out of marketing
I use different accounts for different purposes
I use a VPN to secure my traffic and occasionally proxy servers
634	I blocked the computer camera.
638	being more attentive about what i do/share online; take this stuff onto a political level; discuss it with others (invite them to join more secure comm. systems);
645	Installed browser extension to block and delete website cookies and databases.
647	dfky,.jk
659	I changed my defaut search engine and I swiched off most permitions on my mobile phone.
664	I use 3rd-party request blockers (such as uMatrix), and have resorted to substitutes to some cloud services (personal backup server, e.g.).
665	i encrypt all sensitive directories on primary laptop
669	Removed pictures, deleted accounts and removed as much personal information of myself from the internet as possible.
688	my own private cloud, professional paid mail service
693	Various: VPN, own VM, own DNS domain...
712	I use AdBlock and have changed my security and privacy settings several times, also I blocked permissions on some facebook apps.
725	eff privacy badger on all my browsers
764	- hosting own email and web servers
- trying to find self-hosted alternatives for other services
- backing up to local media or own servers, not cloud
- avoiding unneeded cloud connections whenever possible (especially in IoT/home automation)
782	Change browser settings, periodically delete cookies, use fake emails to register to websites, use different browsers / incognito mode when needed
790	Privacy is one of the criteria I use for choosing online service providers
791	Turned off cookies in browsing
798	Use incognito mode in my browser
807	using encrypted chat applications like signal instead of Facebook chat
encrypting existing data on storage devices
837	private browsing
842	Tor
847	Trying to see what information is out there about the organisation who wants my data
858	various
869	Self-host more services, e.g. private email and XMPP servers.
870	Yeah, I'm not telling you THAT! :-)
878	chosen an isp that respects privacy, enable 2fa where possible
880	got a new email address through a service in Germany that does systematic encruption. i try not to put information in email or elsewhere that I want to keep private
886	Self-hosting as much content as possible instead of using cloud services
899	not using my real name for signups nor email address, using temporary email accounts, having different mails for different purposes, if possible choosing the safest canal to communicate (between private phone, phonebox, email, web form...)
901	We try to operate this kind of services by ourselves. For example, a local chat that you don't need to access Internet. That we control how data is stored.
902	Use alternative credentials
909	again sorry - but your survey is pretty too long
911	Using individual e-mail addresses for each service, random passwords stored in pasword safes
914	General opsec guidelines. Different email adresses for different services. I send cease and desist letters to companies that send me ads. Once a year I write to all the companies I can think of and demand an excerpt of all the data they have stored on me and rewoke any

	consent for storage I gave them
915	I buy via Paypal when that is an option rather than use my credit card directly on a vendor's site.
923	reduced web connection through insecure wi-fi networks
932	I don't give details to untrusted surveys
937	Erase cookies. Do hard sweeps of computers regularly. Encrypt messages or use services that encrypt messages. Never post personal images.
938	Proselytize for friends and colleagues with concerns over privacy to contact relevant providers to explain why they're no longer going to use their service.
939	I use sophisticated email filtering software to automatically detect spam messages.
944	?
955	I have made the passwords to my email accounts extremely safe.
957	cookie cutting, blocking cookies, blocking LSO's, corrupting personal profile by responding to irrelevant ads, rotating online identity, creating fake identities for specific activities, political lobbying, running awareness courses.
958	Discontinued some services; keep data about other people in Europe even if anonymized
968	j
984	I use DuckDuckGo as my search engine. I even click on their ads from time to time because I know it's their only income stream.
993	Installing extensions such as 'Facebook Disconnect' that explicitly stop websites tracking your internet usage across other sites, using a dedicated browser for sites I have to use like Facebook, but who do track usage across other sites even when logged out!
994	I sometimes use a VPN. I also activate do-not-track, and often use private browsing.
1004	A good VPN
1056	I use the private navigation with my browser. It has few effects apart storing less cookies. I installed anti-spams on my linux computers. May be it contributes to block some spywares.
1068	Block cookies and regularly delete history and cache data.
1072	I run a Tor relay and often surf through the local proxy to avoid a public entry node. I use a personally installed OpenVPN instance for access to my home network from the outside.
1083	I have a vpn that I use on my phone and home network. I also use a DDWRT router (at home) for added security.
1086	* Deleting certain accounts * Not accepting terms of use for certain services * Sent formal privacy complaints against some services, reported them to authorities * Removed data from certain services * Increased usage of free software * Installed NoScript and similar extension * Reduce my fingerprintability with EFF panopticon help * Used end to end encryption for certain communications * Encouraged my ISP to adopt STARTTLS * Used STARTTLS for a bigger proportion of emails etc. etc.
1095	Stopped using GAFAMs (even the OS, I switched to Gnu/Linux), switched to an associative ISP.
1102	He asumido que cualquier intervención mediatizada de manera electrónica a través de información digital es pública, puede ser convertida en mercancía y es pública aun a pesar de no contar con mi consentimiento para trascender el ámbito privado.
1103	I use incognito and do not track me when browsing online
1107	someonewhocares
1110	Multiple email addresses for each service provider
1113	anonymous browsing
1121	General de googlization
1126	i have stoped trusting/voting/giving my time or attention to the regulations and the goverments that enacts them and the companies that use my private information.
1127	multiple and temporary email addresses
1130	use different accounts online, temporary email addresses, etc.
1132	Whitelisting sites that are allowed to store cookies, and cleaning-out cookies regularly.
1138	I have made a number of complaints to Facebook, Google and others.
1143	pay attention about passwords, financial transations and using anonymous browsing.
1145	Use special email addresses for purchases. Occasionally browse anonymously.
1146	Education & outreach to others via university courses, community seminars, and op ed pieces; using only certain devices for "risky" online activities while keeping sensitive data elsewhere; become more active politically
1147	Installed privacy apps in the browser; Changed email provider

1148	Linux and OSS
1149	Contacted my congressional representation
1150	Use of VPN whether at home or abroad if security is suspect. Also frequent cache-clearing.
1153	Privacy Badger, other ad/tracking blockers, regular cookie deleting, signing out of platforms between uses, minimize app installs on mobile.
1156	Changed / patched OS of PC and smartphone. Used fake ID / profiles. Use of firewalls to use certain apps without allowing them internet access. Trying to be conscious about data provided online.
1160	I do not use any online social media (e.g. deleted my Facebook account and haven't joined any others).
1165	Use of pseudonymous accounts, routine private browsing, privacy browser add-ons
1169	Only in relation to Facebook I only use it for work related activities. Hate the idea of it harvesting and commercialising my ambient social digital life and making billions and users get a service only.... Have an ello account but haven't really used it, I'm surprisingly (surprising to me) not that enamoured of ambient social media like those platforms.
1174	I don't have Facebook Messenger on my phone nor Gmail on phone. I prefer using these services from my laptop.
1200	I tend to limit permissions on privacy settings of online services and social medias. I delete any online history I can delete on my accounts on quarterly basis. I make sure I only use paypal on any online transaction and avoid sites that doesn't have paypal as a payment gateway. I make my social media private to "only friends" view. I use adblock & ghostery extensions.
1202	Use of Private Browsing, cookies only on sites I visit with browser reset afterwards, browser reset after visiting sensitive sites requiring log in (e.g. shopping or banking sites), mimimum use of GMail, NO use of Google Docs or Google Photos, NO photo uploading to Facebook or similar, use of TOR or other proxies for sensitive Internet research and others.
1210	Use once accounts; reset privacy settings; home firewall; don't put sensitive data where it's accessible
1214	I have never gone near Facebook. I provide false information on sign-up pages when asked for unnecessary details such as my name and address and DoB. I have used one-time email accounts for signing up to a service I want to use, but whom I don't want to have my usual address. I have a home server running owncloud instead of using things like DropBox.
1216	Where available switched to alternative services which collect less data. Using local software to limit the amount of transferred data. Using fake personal data to limit its usefulness.
1221	Deleting cookies, history, traces, etc. after every Internet usage.
1236	put a sticker over the cameras on my devices leave my mobile at home for some occasions use anonymous search engines try to avoid online registrations use alias mailadresses if I have to register don't use apps I don't trust, don't let them use my contact list
1238	Only speaking vaguely not explicitly on proprietary platforms but discuss more explicitly in the noncommercial platforms, i.e., Ello, Diaspora, etc. Remove battery from mobile when I am in a secret meeting to avoid being snooped and tracked my GPS location. Any public communication on the financialised platforms are normalised and non-sensitive. Use cash rather debit/credut cards to avoid being tracked locations.
1252	somtimes I use services like TOR, PGP etc. to "hide my ass" and I like to disguise personal data to produce nonsensical data (for more entropy)
1254	reduced social media activity
1266	Do not use facebook
1281	curtailed certain activities
1288	Use DuckDuckGo as default search engine rather than Google. Very occasionally use Google if DuckDuckGo does not find what I'm looking for.
1297	Keeping separate work and personal email accounts
1299	anti-tracking software, vpn, always log off, deleted accounts on social networking platforms,

	anonymising (temporary) emails,
1302	Limited the things I say or share online - generally restricted by the rule of thumb that if I wouldn't say it in public in the presence of strangers, I won't do it online in semi-public spaces like social networks either.
1307	Accounts are, whenever possible, not tied to my real name or any identifiable information even if they're not made through an anonymity service.
1310	Do not install some apps, change my text message services to Signal, install blockers in my cellphone and computer, have another email service (Protonmail), install VPN
1313	At the time of the NSA/ PRISM revelations I decided to investigate FOSS alternatives, so installed various Linux distributions (Ubuntu, Mint, elementaryOS) and alternatives to the usual Microsoft apps. I have changed cloud storage provider from Dropbox (which got hacked) to OneDrive, which I then dropped because Microsoft started to use advanced telemetry to gather far more user data than it needed. I am now with Box, which has a bit more security and privacy. I had to abandon my Linux experiments because it compromised my workflow on my work computer. I don't have my 'own' computer, but have seriously considered a more secure OS like PureOS.
1315	you would need to contact me for more information.
1318	Use of pseudonyms and fictitious profile info
1320	I created multiple online persona for different platforms and/or purposes. It get's confusing and I'm not confident it works.
1322	I do not use any social media (i.e. Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.) and do not own a smart phone.
1325	Avoid any private details or ID into my messages. Never respond suspicious messages. Erase any suspicious software.
1326	Always ensure I read privacy/data use policies, don't click on those stupid facebook survey/games that want access to my profile, give slightly false info to some websites when their request for some personal data is unwarranted by the service they are providing me (ie obfuscating personal details).
1328	entry in Robinson Liste, data protection disclaimer in some of my outgoing business emails, demanded companies to disclose where they got my data from and to delete any data concerning me
1339	Joined ACLU
1340	proxy server
1349	Research
1356	Apply to the court but no result taken
1375	Separate phones for sensitive data transfer
1382	I rely mostly on being hidden in plain sight, due to the abundance of data. However, I would also exercise discretion in my electronic utterances.
1395	Every app or program I use has the tightest lock downs on privacy. I do not share personal opinions or details such as my face or name wherever possible on accounts in social media. If I do share opinion I create a false name with as little connection to my other accounts as I can manage.
1396	Communicating through encrypted e-mails; choosing to not use certain services / using replacements for others; obscuring data with wrong information (e.g. birthdates); using services that provide temporary phone numbers
1400	I switched to a different search engine (duckduckgo), started using f-droid to look for mobile phone apps, changed my name in facebook and associated it with a different e-mail address, that I rarely use. Avoid posting personal information on social media.
1414	I use alternative search engines like that do not collect users data and reduced the use of facebook and other social media to what is necessary for my work. I'm also moving to non-mainstream OS platform
1418	I have deactivated my Facebook Account and rarely click on anything that appears suspicious of being a malware or a virus or a hack trap.
1428	Erase cookies, historic, cache once a week.
1433	I have studied more on the privacy issues and seek to form a group that will respond to such violations of privacy.
1443	I hide all my cameras with a band-aid.
1467	I acted politically as to change the policy framework on privacy and digital rights more broadly.
1484	javascript blocker cookie blocker
1488	Use GPG encryption for email and files.
1505	Less usage of free wi-fi networks

Less uploads of pics

disabling Tagging

Usage of other Search Engines

1520	* i use browser settings and add-ons to make tracking tracking difficult and disable javascript by default (umatrix, privacy badger, self-destructing cookies) * I have steered away from so-called "free" services that utilize user data for profit-making * i have instead used commercial services that focus on privacy and security, have a good record in the privacy and security community and charge small fees for their services (such as mailbox.org or posteo) or operate on alternative business models (whisper systems' signal) * i have used and supported non-profit and activist servers and projects that promote privacy and data self-determination * i try to keep up with important privacy and security relevant news and adapt my behavior, service usage and software accordingly
1524	Another friend shared concerns about Skype and shared the alternative version he uses for online calls .
1539	I continue to read about new areas of concern and adjust my use or take steps as needed. I've taken significant time to make login information more secure, and do privacy checkups on the sites I am aware of that I have the most data with. But I know that most of this is terribly inadequate.
1603	I limit the amount of personal information I put online, including images, and use fake information where possible.
1624	Blocked ad sites with the hosts file Deleted and cleared cloud accounts Deleted my facebook Signed out of and cleared bookmarks from google chrome account Used an adblocker Changed my privacy settings on Windows, and switched off telemetry settings
2016	Not enough steps, it's too inconvenient.
2164	put a paper in front of my webcam, to make sure that no one is watching me

Field summary for QC4

Would you consider using alternative platforms instead of Facebook, Twitter, YouTube or Google, if this choice would provide better control of your data and privacy?

Answer	Count	Percentage
I already use an alternative platform (A5)	127	12.70%
I would definitely consider it, as I am very concerned about privacy and control of my data. (A1)	336	33.60%
I would probably consider it, but it would depend on my friends switching to these other platforms. (A2)	434	43.40%
I would probably not consider it, as I am used to Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, or Google. (A3)	82	8.20%
I would definitely not consider it, as I am not concerned about my privacy and data. (A4)	21	2.10%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC7

How do you feel about the amount of advertisements on the Internet?

Answer	Count	Percentage
They are too many (A1)	787	78.70%
They are the right amount (A3)	94	9.40%
They are not enough (A4)	7	0.70%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	112	11.20%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC7

Field summary for QC5

How do you feel about the fact that providers of websites, search engines, or social media sites can use your personal information to deliver targeted advertisements to you?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Not concerned (A1)	171	17.10%
Somewhat concerned (A2)	240	24.00%
Concerned (A3)	246	24.60%
Very concerned (A4)	334	33.40%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	9	0.90%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC8

What do you think about the idea that when you register your new account at an online platform, you have the option to choose whether you want to see advertisements or not?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Strongly agree (A1)	525	52.50%
Agree (A2)	338	33.80%
Disagree (A3)	26	2.60%
Strongly disagree (A4)	18	1.80%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	93	9.30%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC9

Would you consider using alternative platforms instead of Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, or Google, if this choice would mean receiving no advertisements?

Answer	Count	Percentage
I already use an alternative platform (A5)	109	10.90%
I would definitely, as I am very concerned about advertisements on the Internet. (A1)	307	30.70%
I would probably, but it would depend on my friends switching to these other platforms. (A2)	452	45.20%
I would probably not consider it, as I am used to Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, or Google. (A3)	94	9.40%
I would definitely not consider it, as I am not concerned about advertisements on the Internet. (A4)	38	3.80%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC10A

Let us assume you live in a city where there is only one Internet service provider. How would you feel about that?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Not concerned (A1)	214	21.40%
Somewhat concerned (A2)	186	18.60%
Concerned (A3)	226	22.60%
Very concerned (A4)	329	32.90%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	45	4.50%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC10A

Field summary for QC11A

How do you feel about the fact that Facebook is the social network site that most people use?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Not concerned (A1)	205	20.50%
Somewhat concerned (A2)	213	21.30%
Concerned (A3)	201	20.10%
Very concerned (A4)	299	29.90%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	82	8.20%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC11B

Please justify your answer:

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	733	79.85%
No answer	185	20.15%

ID	Response
36	Most people has no idea of the machine they are running. Facebook etc. gave world visibility to people who is not at the level of the tools they are using (misusing).
44	I use Facebook rarely. I maintain the social relationship using other communication platforms.
48	I only post nonsense on facebook.
49	for many important reasons: the mai one is that FB (and other social too) are the vehicle of dangerous fake news, expecially for young and unexperienced people.
50	Most of the people will lose knowledge of free web over time
51	Maybe "concerned" is not the right word... I think that the software quality of Facebook is really, really poor, but it is the only serious alternative to keep in touch with friends.
54	Because of the nature of social networks, it's probably inevitable to have few large hubs, but Facebook has zero transparency and social media buttons can track users even when they browse other sites
63	If most people use Facebook, what can I do?
65	not too interested
67	It has control on nearly every relationship , on people's habits and personal data (birthday... but it could find more!)
68	Being part of a social network is a choice, therefore, even if I am aware that Facebook collects data, I can still de-register when this may be problematic for me
69	Facebook has clearly demonstrated its limits and questionable policies for protecting users.
70	1) Lack of pluralism. 2) Too much "data power" to one company.
78	At least in my peer group, Facebook is kind of over. Twitter currently is certainly the most widely adopted, but I do more see a fragmentation into many very different platforms: Diaspora, Friendica, Whatsapp, Signal, Threema, HipChat, identi.ca to name the most frequent ones, but I do get invites into new things every other week.
81	- No alternative if Facebook does things which are or concern. And I guess people would still stay with Facebook anyway, even if they do nasty things. - Facebook can basically track and surveil almost the whole population. I guess now it is still kind of OK what they do, but imagine they get into financial trouble. I guess Facebook would not hesitate to make "more out of the data".
82	They know more about me than my spouse does, or even me. And have not interest to forget.
84	Since FB has different levels of handling personal data in different countries, I feel more or less ok in Germany. Traveling through other countries and being connected with friends all around the world is a great thing about FB, but not knowing how FB will treat my data in those countries is somewhat concerning. So, FB being the worldwide mostly used social media site gives FB a great deal of power. Since human beings are easily seduced by power I can´t project where it leads those who run FB.
85	Stop forcing me to text!
86	collects lots of badly-protected data
87	Even if you are not using Facebook, it is very probable, that Facebook can rebuild large parts of your social graph by having access to the (especially) mobile devices of many of your friends. Apps most people use like Facebook, WhatsApp, Twitter, ... have access to thinks like Mail, messages, contacts.
88	There are other platforms.
89	Facebook is a means of publishing the users' personal lives. I feel personal lives should normally be private, not public.
90	it's sad that people don't use decentralized self-owned services and use corporate-owned infrastructure instead.
92	i don't care since social media are not strictly necessary
93	I do not use Facebook. Others don't know what hey are doing
97	Facebook not only lives off violating your privacy by selling your personal data, it also tries to

	aggressively create a "parallel internet" which consists of Facebook only (the ultimate goal seems to be that users open just facebook.com and nothing else in their browsers); as the (certainly hyped) media reports about the data analytics company "Cambridge Analytica" showed, Facebook is, mostly due to its predominance, an extremely powerful attack vector to manipulate people and public opinion; it simply can't be a good thing if a single company knows that much about the average internet user; for example, as an oppressive regime, intelligence service or whatever you have to pressure or hack only a single entity (Facebook) to get almost everything about almost everyone...
98	Abundancy of fake news, and hypes
99	I hate monopolies and this is a a case of an implicit monopoly
104	All data is going to one provider whose basis is in the US, therefore a lot of national or European laws do not apply or are without sufficient effect
106	I don't use it myself.
108	I never use Facebook. Young people must be warned about the dangers of facebook.
110	many people use fb for different purposes. I'm satisfied for what it does for me (1) swiftly keeping in touch with friends and colleagues from abroad; (2) keeping in me updated on what is relevant to my "friends"/acquaintances (i.e. press articles, new publications, scientific blogs, interactions among people in different groups/circles) and (3) spreading news or organising/coordinating events. I'm probably not fully aware nor too overtly concerned (yet) about the reach of spread of my personal info (esp. my children's pictures risk of being stored permanently, downloaded or misused beyond my capacity to make them accessible to friends only).
111	Power corrupts; monopoly power corrupts absolutely
112	too much power for one / only few players
115	It gives the Facebook unlimited power
118	The amount and resolution of data, including preferences, social, and behavioural, that is visible to Facebook for its users is staggering. The resulting profiles can be abused by companies, criminals, and governments.
122	Actually, the use of Fb is a "preference" because people could decide to use other similar networks. Nevertheless, my concern is about the ethical policy behind economic decisions regarding the use of the data.
124	I find it incredibly interesting and fascinating. My concern walks along with my curiosity.
125	There is a network effect so the dominance of Facebook is understandable. On the other hand the network effect means that it is difficult for another entity to challenge Facebook. At the individual level, it means that one company as more and. more information about us. Such information can very well be used against us .
126	It gives Facebook enormous power.
130	concern over homogenization
131	To much power
137	Facebook has too much power and are unaccountable. They do not answer questions from media as to their activities.
138	I prefer it that way because I do not see the end of social media for some time in the future. If other platform gained popularity I would have to switch towards using that platform more because our University expects us to keep up-to-date with general trends. In the current situation, I am used to Facebook and I like it more than other platforms. Nevertheless, I detest other platforms because they are undermining writing ability of younger generations who are only getting used to writing short statuses/tweets. I also think platforms other than Facebook will in a long run contribute towards decreased level of intelligence among youth and further decrease their attention span (already lower than a gold fish). Do not get me wrong here. I am not one of those non-Millennial generations who refuse to adapt to changes. I use everything and I am actually a trained Word Press website developer and experienced social media manager (currently doing social media promotion for my University in addition to my academic role). However, the fact I adapted to digital world does not mean I like or appreciate it. However, I do not think Facebook is that bad because at least we can write longer statuses and exercise writing as well as properly chat and interact with contacts, which is not the case with other platforms where the only purpose seems to be encouraging obsession with selfies and short captions.
141	1. The data mining discussed above. 2. You somehow don't seem to be able to dropout, hence you loose connection to friends. This gives you a certain dependency which fb uses.
143	Facebook gathers data from its users and uses them for commercial purposes (without paying the users for providing these data). Facebook tries to hold the users on its platform

	even when they read a newspaper article. Thus it is suggested that you get every information from Facebook rather than from media coverage produced by professional journalists.
149	Facebook has been used to mount campaigns of unfounded personal vilification against members of my family. It has also been used to organize a student hate campaign against one of my teaching colleagues.
150	The consequence is the increased social pressure to use it (and also to raise the barrier to switch to another SN)
154	very problematic monopoly position;
156	Besides my data, Facebook knows all the relations I have with my friends and relatives. They can know more things about me and about us as cluster of people and play with it.
159	All these so-called social platforms and similar online services are commercial entities driven by profit. All the more, these commercial entities are work in tandem with political entities. All the users and their use of the such platforms and services appear to be just an enormous data, as objects are that classified, interpreted, stored, manipulated and employed in various ways that we are not clearly aware of and have no control over. A life that is lived in such a "glassed" condition, an insecure life lived under the voyeuristic eyes of global economic and political monopolies does not satisfy any conditions of life as a democratic activity. Even if under such a technocratic reality a power balance cannot be shifted into a more democratic way, then at least we should be given a chance (probably, a more technical one) to be able "pixelate" our private lives against greedy and mistrusting eyes of economy and politics.
163	They advertise to people also based on their emotional status and their filter settings are highly intransparent. I would prefer to see all statuses on my dashboard in a linear way.
164	it means they have access to a lot of personal data - no one knows how this will be used in the future - it is already open to abuse.
170	it unites us all
171	Concentration of power. I don't use facebook. It baffles me that others do. There are much better ways to get better results.
175	I think a non profit org would be the preferable than a private company
176	Too much dependence from one medium is dangerous for demoracy
178	Too popular but not reliable mot credible and accurate one
181	Facebook has almost become a monopoly, which can monitor almost all of our online social behaviour. If need be the company would not mind sharing users' personal information with government agencies to retain their power and control that can have great ramifications.
183	There is a fair amount of information available about the privacy issues with regard to Facebook. Users can control at least some of their information.
184	I don't use Facebook, and I am not much concerned about it
186	It's easy to use and convenient. I use it often.
187	Facebook is biased towards "Israeal" a state with Zionist ideology that believe in extermination of the people of Palestine, occupying Palestine since 70 years +, > Facebook is part of this ideology. "Israel" and Facebook is dual structural forces that aim to override any Arab liberation movements. In addition to that Facebook does belong to US law Terms and conditions which is a law that serve the American elite and special interest groups. Facebook uses our participation and engagement data to feed "Israel" and US intelligent agencies. it also benefit from it to commercial it. hence, Facebook is an ideological platform that merge between commercial and intelligent business.
188	I generally think that companies with a market share like Facebook, or worse Google, should not be allowed. I think it's not right for privacy concerns and for creative competition.
189	I would like to see more options for social networking like Facebook, but most of the options are currently small and not that many people use them. I do not like the fact that Facebook seems to be more like a monopoly.
194	I feel that many users don't realize the extent to which Facebook has access to information, or really understand with whom they are sharing it and for what reasons (primary profit driven). Also, the fact that Facebook decides what posts you see is troublesome.
195	As a social networking site, one prefers that most people you want to interact with are also there. If there are too many platforms it will become necessary to subscribe to several and that can be confusing to keep track?
196	monopoly regimes
197	Facebook is very large and powerful because of all of these users. It collects data about users and targets advertising in less than transparent ways. There is no option to use Facebook without your data being collected, and seeing advertisements. The fact so many people use Facebook also makes it difficult to switch to another network, or to set up a new social network.
198	There's potential for misuse by Facebook but there's also some degree of control by the people

199	A Single privately owned corporation with that much information about that many people is simply a bad idea. That corporation becomes too powerful
201	I am somewhat resigned to the fact that if I want to participate in today's configuration of social media software, wireless hardware, and corporate structure, that there is little I can do but submit to it. Nevertheless, I also believe there are more activist steps that I can take to try to change or undermine it.
202	I know that Facebook is the social network site that most people around me use. I am concerned about the implications of this because our social relations, who we think we are and what we believe about each other is then ultimately left to the whims and wishes of those who dominate the market (note, not the market itself!). It is a mechanism of social control like no other in history.
207	A single dominant platform leads to peer pressure (to use it) and is able to collect a huge amount of personal information of it's users. This also includes telephone numbers and the social graph of nearly all citizens (even those who dont use these services).
208	Facebook's own rules apply to millions of people how mostly ever read them. The company is opaque about their techniques of manipulating the messages you see and about their algorithms in general, although they form the opinions in many countries all over the world. Facebook is about advertising, I don't like that business modell at all.
209	A monoply is, by definition, unresponsive to customers and manipulative of government regulations.
211	monopoly, intrusive data practices, inappropriate research without real informed consent
213	They are like MONOPOLISTIC but it all depends on peoples' intentions whether to stick to it or go for varieties.
214	Facebook's unproductive/vampiric business model is of critical concern as while it leaches value from users, it also undermines the potential to create commons online. The funneling of users to a single platform, and a profit-oriented one to boot, should be of concern to anyone who would like to see true community develop through the use of digital technologies.
216	It is their own choice, They can be aware of some dangers
217	Facebook is destroying peoples' ability to be informed (echo boxes), to read and to discuss. According to statistics, it is used in my country by almost all young population instead of any other media source for staying "informed" - a particularly grave effect on institutionalism, democracy, rule of law etc. for countries in the global South.
218	Until now, i see FB as the most "collective" miner in the field of data. With a lot of space to it's competitors...
223	People expose not just their own relationships, but also those of others.
224	Many bars or pubs do not have own web page but only Facebook page. Many people are limiting their contacts to only via Facebook - which gives this platform to big power.
226	Facebook should not become a world wide registry office who knows people better than their close friends.
228	Political/social influence. Internet killed by vertical web platforms
231	Too much trivia
232	I think that FB and Google have become too powerful. They are involved in too many aspects of social life. For example, health and health research, military AI and robotics (I was very concerned when Google acquired Boston Dynamics), all of our social interaction online, and news and media, shaping our perceptions about what we read. It's all very concerning. People don't seem to understand that FB is funded by advertising. Advertisers will always want more targeted data, that draws ever more clear links between the tendency to view an ad and the tendency to click through and actually purchase. To do that necessarily requires more and more personal data, demographics, habits etc etc. Consequently I don't really see an end to the intrusion. At the same time, contact with family and friends, interaction online are essential services. So people can't even opt out.
233	It is what it is. You need to be careful if you want to participate in such platforms.
236	A strong monopoly can be dangereous and can give too power to a private company that hold personal data
238	FB is a huge scam, and a danger to democracy, run by a bunch of greedy, dangerous fools. How can this full on privatization and commodification of interpersonal communications not concern one!?
239	The problem is about oligopolies: Facebook, Google, Amazon, the Telcos own even more information about us than the States we live in (and even the States shouldn't have so much information about us)
240	It is a market driven option for the users. I use Facebook only a little and LinkedIn slightly more. Certainly the concentration of names makes it easy to find people and some information on them.
241	I don't want to use Facebook as a precautionary step for my privacy, in the following meaning: I don't want to mix my private and professional life and I don't think this is truly manageable

	with Facebook. Yet I had to create a Facebook at some point because I had no other choice if I wanted to access the information I needed. I am concerned that it is becoming more and more difficult to "not use" Facebook.
242	More variety would be better
244	I think they have such a big monopole, with internet.org and they expansion, some people don't see other plateforms or ways of communicating.
245	It's an unaccountable monopoly which doesn't give users sufficient control over their data and privacy and it makes unreasonable amounts of money out of users' data.
251	too much knowledge of poeple leads to abuse of the power this gives
255	makes it difficult not to use it
256	Plurality as an overriding principle is a good thing as it would force sites such as FB to cooperate more with privacy concerns. However, my instinct is that most data collected is not as potentially harmful as some would thing, and is done more so to sell stuff - and we know about the harmful effects of that already, so it can be resisted.
259	If you want to connect with friends, you all need to use the same platform. Google+ didn't take off because of the initial throttling of membership so noone signed up. Now I automatically have an account bundled with google, but I don't use it and neither does anyone I know. Eventually Facebook will go the way of Live Journal and everyone will use the next big thing. (BTW FB is only the main social media platform in the West - China is very different.)
261	It has become a de facto monopoly, and in addition can effectively subvert national laws.
264	Facebooks algorithms result in vulnerable people being shown right wing, inappropriate or extremist content
266	Facebook has trillions of data packages about its users, selss data for huge profit and has too much influence/ control.
270	FB isn't great but it is visible and more prone to consumer regulation and less government control than services established in authoritarian states eg China.
272	As I have made a conscious decision not to use it myself, I find it irrelevant.
276	it tends to generate bubbles and gives to a private owned corporations an almost monopolistic position
281	I am concerned that Facebook is a for profit company the social network part of it - is fine
287	It sucks up data, and it over-encourages tenuous connections to other people.
288	Filter bubbles.
289	I believe that people don't understand how much information Facebook actually uses for its own profit.
292	Concentrating that amount of power in one private enterprise is a recipe for abuse. Classification of and rights around user data needs to be clarified judicially and socially. Additionally, the lobbying power of these major economic participants is a source of abuse.
294	Otherwise it would be a different company, so what...
296	Facebook is the current social media platform, but like anything, others will come and go. It's not possible to predict what platform or social interactive solution will be next. So trying to legislate for and against privacy, adverts etc will be difficult.
297	I am concerned about the fact that most users cannot understand the consequences of their use of Facebook, and about the fact that many users use it as a source of information.
299	I wish people used Facebook, or any other platform, less often. My concern is that people spend too much time online and are beginning not to talk to each other face-to-face anymore. This will not improve is the platform we use is better in any sense.
304	It's limiting and alienating, the idea that everyone is there and if you cancel your account you are sort of cut out of your social circle.
305	If that is what people want to do, so be it. I rarely use FB because it is a dog's breakfast. Targeting works very badly as well. My objection is the mess not the spying.

Old fashioned policing kept paper records in the local police station (did you know that). But the purpose wasn't to spy. It was to understand so that it could keep the peace rather than get involved.

It is the idiocy that irritates me. |
| 306 | I quit Facebook, so I don't care that much any longer |
| 307 | It is worryingly dominant and it concerns me that the algorithms which determine the content and other see are so opaque |
| 308 | Facebook is becoming a monopoly as a result of economies of scale and the network effect.

They are stealing videos from the original creators who uploaded content on alternative video platforms.

Facebook also owns WhatsApp and could use the information people talk about in their |

	messages to send targeted adverts.
309	Monopoly
314	I am concerned but it probably isn't any less ethical than other companies with a large customer base eg most clothing companies.
315	I HATE facebook - its vacuity and ubiquity
316	It is a private profit making Business.
317	I think they fail to take proper responsibility for the platform and their use of personal data is not transparent.
318	It is the platform that makes the user instead of the opposite
319	Facebook is a steaming pile of garbage and is a form of global imperialism.
321	Facebook actively harms communities (e.g. real name policy) and spreads the silicon valley toxic hegemony globally. The fact that we live in a world where some people's window to the internet is gate-kept by Facebook makes me sick.
323	Concentration of users - networked effect - gives unseen powers to Facebook
325	Facebook has come to replace other forms of communication and interaction leading to dependence on the service for social activity. For many, using this service is not a choice if they want to stay connected to friends and family. Meanwhile, Facebook controls how people express themselves by limiting expressive choices (e.g., limited number of "reactions" to choose from). Facebook also tracks all activity including social connections and build invasive profiles based on engagement with posts and pages. Users are at the mercy of FB who decides how they will use the information and who they will share it with.
326	The boss looks cruel in the film
329	I found many of my old friends there
330	Information leaks too readily between subcultures that you belong to and thus you either have to self-censor or to be totally unconcerned about the impressions that you create.
331	Lock-in or a sort of critical mass creates a kind of inertia with respect to alternatives, and the sense that regardless of the downside issues if everyone else is using it, there seems little choice but to sign up as well
332	The majorly of people using a specific platform adds value to its users. I'm concerned about the amount of information triangulation that can be done with facebook and other information on the internet (public records etc) to identify, and even predict behaviors. With enough information, even information that we consider public and not related to any privacy issues, human behavior/location/relationships etc becomes pretty predictable and thus manipulatable.
333	Too big, too powerful, too unconcerned about its size and power.
336	Facebook vacuums up a lot of our data and particularly, interactions.
338	Facebook in and of itself is not the an egregious privacy violator, Facebook has clear and abundant help on privacy; the onus really is on the user; However, the add-on apps the people agree often are more opaque, and frequently gain access to much more than should be shared with them.
344	Too much power (and personal data) in the hands of one company.
345	I really do not like Facebook platform: its privacy policy, commodification, advertisements, like policy, aesthetics, overall conception. I find it awful but there is no alternative option and we keep using it, so it is useful due to people practice.
348	Facebook has far too much control over what we see online.
349	This questionnaire have so many manipulative questions: question of your reliability of this research needs to be revised I'm more concerned how you draw the conclusions from this poorly designed questionnaire
353	I'm somewhat concerned because I'm not on Facebook because of my concerns for privacy. But some how I'm "excluded" from group dynamics, above all professional.
354	It makes me sick to the stomach that all this sharing translates into a multi-billion profits and current and future control of large portions of the populations of the world.
356	Facebook become a overcrowded place, full of add, with no idea who is looking personal info.
360	I am concerned but in the same time, I think that it may not make a big difference if everybody's private infos are bought and sold among those networks.
364	For my generation the use FB is not as "natural" as for younger generation. My lack of concern is therefore based on this fact.
365	Facebook creates a wall-garden, discouraging people from visiting other sites.
366	FB is monopoly, there is no reasonable or realistic alternative at the moment, so yes, I am concerned because monopolies are detrimental to democracy, they give to much power to the people that control them, as well as to economy, because they destroy competition, so the users have no alternative to chose from.
375	Majority of people do not understand that facebook owns their content and has and is

	manipulating their emotions and is constantly invading their privacy.
378	Facebook has gained powers to induce behavior by disseminating information, false or true, and manipulating people.
379	It is clear that the recent US elections were influenced by advertising and propaganda distributed via Facebook. No private website should have that power.
380	I need Facebook for business.
381	My only concern is with how Facebook's presentation algorithms may express bias that manifests itself in what is presented to users.
383	Although I do not use Facebook, I am well aware of its ability to foster and spread "fake news." In my mind, this leads to individuals spreading propaganda & disinformation on a wide-level.
384	I am concerned about Facebook's somewhat cavalier attitude to the use of personal profiles and lack of transparency in terms of changing privacy protocols. Even more concerning is the way that it enables microtargeting of users with political and campaign messages. Advertising is one means of funding platforms and content production. Facebook's sharing of income (or lack thereof) is problematic. The main alternative at present is payment, which is resisted by many consumers. Compulsory licensing may be a solution but there is relatively little enthusiasm or this at present.
387	Facebook has a track record of pro-actively changing terms and conditions, as well as default settings, to better suit their business purposes at the cost of user privacy. This includes obfuscating user privacy controls by making them difficult to find/understand, as well as retaining user information indefinitely.
388	A lot of these online services are basically necessities but they're still treated by regulatory bodies and by the companies themselves as opt-in services. Facebook for me is opt-in but others need it for more than casual social use -- for example, businesses use it to advertise themselves, patients use it to connect with other patients to exchange very important health-related information, etc. Facebook deserves credit for enabling these interactions but I am not sure they deserve as much power as they get by knowing so much about us, especially when there is little popular understanding of and little regulation over what they do with that data.
390	It makes it easier for me to reach a number of people if there is only one site.
393	since most people are on Fb, fake news and propaganda posted there can have devastating effects
394	Monopolis are never good.
395	We are creating a very unequal relation with this monopoly
397	A social network in online spaces basically mirrors a person's social network in the offline world. Since Facebook is a "general" SNS, it is not surprising that slowly but surely it became the "only" site as such (in the western world at least). It would be frustrating for "ordinary" people to maintain social interactions in fragmented places, and dealing with the uncertainties it would create (e.g. who saw exactly what on which platform) and creating/maintaining the same "face" (in a goffmanian sense) in different virtual spaces. So I think the main question is that whether Facebook behaves responsibly or not, and this can not be guaranteed as a profit-oriented entity.
401	For some, the whole Internet is reduced to Facebook, a private platform with private and arbitrary rules. It's as you'd think the world is just a big shopping mall: their space, their rules, freedom while you accept them give them your personal data. We are consumers, not citizens.
405	Most people are unaware of the extent to which their personal data is collected, collated and sold by Facebook
407	A major private company should not have access to so much private data.
409	/
410	It is useful that people mostly communicate in onle place. It would be tiresome to have to search for which social media service each person had registered with. I assume I would have to have accounts with all the social media services in order to communicate, which is a backward step to the early 2000s.
411	I use facebook to socialize, read shared articles, join groups , get academic papers and write opinions. Using facebook gives me the opportunity to listen to music and enjoy paintings.
412	Concerned because there are hidden algorithms that decide what do I see in my timeline, there is no control over fake news and some companies are making political use of facebook capabilities.
413	If people like it as a platform, fine with me. I use it very seldom.
414	Facebook is a cesspit
415	Consolidation and commodification of personal information through user convenience.
416	Siloing of system prevents choice of T&C. Facebook should at least be open to degree that other social media users can interact with FB prosumers. Facebook are either naive, stupid or evil in terms of understanding their own role in society.

FB needlessly impose single set of rules on all cultures and all users

Many FB users think FB is the entire internet

FB consistently changes privacy settings to undermine user choice

FB experiments on users

FB causes digital alienation through commodification through promotion of limited set of personality characteristics (Dainow. 2016. Digital alienation as the foundation of online privacy concerns. SIGCAS Comput. Soc. 45, 3 (January 2016), 109-117. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2874239.2874255)

User ignorance of FB activities

Promotion by schools and universities of FB as education platform, despite above

418	Participation is difficult if you object to or dislike Facebook as it appears effectively a monopoly due to scale /concentration of users. Implies Facebook is excessively powerful as an organisation given the data they have, arising from the 'monopoly'.
419	People use Facebook too much slightly.
421	It appears to me to be an unregulated monopoly that is abusing its market dominance.
425	Social network websites depend on popularity and usage. Personally, I never liked the design of Facebook, I was a big fan of Orkut, a social network that was owned by Foogle, and allowed users to create "communities", which were segmented forums of disscussion. Although Facebook, does allow for the creation of the same kind of forums, it is not its focus. Anyway, Orkut, was discontinued and shut down, due to its users migrating to Facebook (especially in countries like Brazil and India, where it was very popular).
430	power of such platform
428	There will always be a market leader. Yesterday it was MySpace, today it's facebook, in 20 years it will be whatever else. The concern should be whether facebook is handling all that data in a responsible way.
429	Facebook is the portal to much of the Web for many people, which leads to a highly curated experience whereas the value of the Web in a cultural sense is in its diversity.
431	It becomes almost compulsory to use Facebook and nothing else.
434	If it is monpoly it should be a public service!
435	It gives too much power to Facebook, in particular as to content to be displayed, and in using data for advertising. I mistrust monopolies
436	Why should I be?
438	because of this they have a fairly big impact on the opinions of the users, what they can see or not see, as well as the amount of data they are collecting and how that data might be used or where it might end up.
440	It's difficult to answer. I think FB is basically a useful platform to connect people, despite its limits and its monopolistic weight
442	I believe that competition promotes efficiency.
443	Popularity has been born out of it being one of the earlier social media platforms that happened to excel at the beginning of the social media boom. There is not a monopoly. So it doesn't bother me. I tend not to use it anymore other than to sell things on a closed local page.
445	I'm not concerned about Facebook or social media because I don't use social media.
448	any other platform would not be much different
449	The critical mass and lock-in of the mainstream providers means unpleasant choices, personally, of sell-out or risking loss of information/networks, and with with respect to small groups e.g. campaign groups I am involved with, again there is a choice of compromising principles (anti-proprietary/capitalist) vs. irrelevance.
454	The Internet oligopoly (GAFAM), not only Facebook, is dangerous. Facebook has too much personal data, too much power over what people read and how their interactions are shaped, too much political ambition ; political regulation is way insuffisant.
455	What about other social media? Many social media have large followings. To me, Facebook is one of several to be concerned with here.
457	A basic anti-trust problem.
460	Concentration of power
464	Everyone has the freedom of choice, what to use, anyway.
467	I think facebook is the medium that most people use. I use it for academic purposes to connect with other academics and researchers and know what they are doing.
471	somehow it seems Facebook is overwhelmed by the huge number of subscribers and therefore not in control
472	I don't see any issue of being Facebook the social network that most people use. It could be any platform.
473	Monopoly almost always is a bad thing, but i also can see the reason to be on the biggest social media sites - everybody is there, so you need to be visible there, too.

475	This gives a tremendous power to a one company.
478	I would like to receive information and take part in discussions on some Facebook groups belonging to organizations I am a member, but I don't want register in Facebook
480	Facebook knows much about world´s people. But it´s the best existing option for me.
482	This is just my feeling, I have no facts.
483	Facebook is a major reason fake news spread widely, and several of its features have been intrusive. I am already thinking of deactivating my account.
486	Some people don't even realise that facebook =/ internet
489	So much data that there is anonymity in the mass. I personally only post things I would say in public, so the privacy issue is not big. When someone invents the next Facebook, people will migrate there. If Facebook becomes problematic for many people, they will migrate.
492	I am not that active in Facebook as i am busy with my real life and what others do with Facebook is least of my concern.
494	They are becoming global infrastructure of our daily lives that has a monopoly of our digital personal and public lives/communications
496	Obviously, the fact that most people use it means that it does what it is supposed to do, which is to connect people. The problems arise from the issues discussed above.
506	A lot of personal information is potentially unprotected. Even if I am not on Facebook, my friends could upload a picture of me & my family or details that concern my privacy.
507	I do not use Facebook as I see that people do not think much about privacy risks
508	It's never a good idea to concentrate power in any entity. Facebook is so global that their policies should be formulated at the level of the UN but they're probably done by some teenager in FB office.
510	I do not use facebook except to see posts I am invited to by family or friends so this does not concern me unduly.
511	Indifferent
512	monopolies provide illegitimate power
515	I don not like Facebook
517	I worry about Facebook, they've already openly admitted to doing a social experiment through Facebook and I feel that in itself is becoming Orwellian. To me Facebook is one of the worse social networks and despite it's popularity I don't use it. I know a lot of people do but a large percentage of people have long tired of it.
522	It gives Facebook a monopoly like position on the social media landscape. In contrast to, for example, telephony providers, I cannot communicate between networks or take my profile (equivalent of phone number) with me if I decide to change my provider (change to another social media platform).
523	It is a monopoly. I am concerned that corporations are taking over the business of elected governments.
524	Too much monopolistic power - they are effectively another state in terms of their power in the world. That kind if influence and social importance should not be controlled by privated interests - it is a public service. Something better than Facebook that was publicly funded and did not exist to spy on people could be even multiply greatly the beneficial sides of social media.
525	I know that my interactions are monitored for targeted advertising but it's the platform where I can stay in touch with diverse friends worldwide.
529	Concerned in the sense of the amount of data they have; moderated by the usefulness of knowing I can find all my friends there
530	i am not concerned because i cannot decide the use of the platform for other users
531	People have a choice to use it or not. If you use social media they have to earn money in some way and advertising is that way - if you dont have advertising and an income stream then users would need to pay to use the service.
533	I don't use Facebook very often but I am happy that people have found a platform that gives them pleasure.
534	I have stopped my participation in Facebook to the minimum, I was very concerned how the platform is targeting the messages and the information I am receiving. I do prefer to find my own options in a contextualised situation.
536	Most people I know use Facebook but there has been a shift recently to a lot of my friends moving to different platforms. If Facebook didn't say anything about privacy I would be more concerned.
537	I don't think there are any issues with Facebook
542	Sorry to say so, but I think the view that Facebook is the platform most people use can only come form a middle-aged person. Teenagers do not use Facebook - so Facebook a platform mainly used by a certain generation and age group. However, I would be concerned if there are no alternative ways of publishing and distributing information. But there are. Try snapchat!

	By the way, I find your way of questioning slightly concerning. Earlier, you questionnaire seemed to suggest to people they can choose less advertising but you do not mention this services would cost money. You should have asked, if people are willing to pay for a service if they then see no advertising, instead of just asking if they want to see less advertising - would that not be more real and less suggestive? Everyone wants less advertising so it is quite suggestive.
543	I am against any form of monopoly that corporations, such as Facebook have.
544	There should be a variety of platforms for people to choose from rather than one application that dominates the entire market.
545	There is an inherent danger in monopolies, whether it be in the 'real, physical' world or the virtual world online. It makes it significantly easier for those who have malintent to do far larger amounts of damage, to attack a more significant number of people than they would be able if there were a greater array of social networks. It gives Facebook, a company, far more power, knowledge and information than any single nation state on Earth. There is no automatic right for redress or accountability, there is no way the hundreds of millions of users could realistically hold those in charge of Facebook to account - even where national laws exist, Facebook can simply circumvent them (e.g. tax dodging by setting up in one country and avoiding tax elsewhere). It is more than a little disturbing.
548	The growing monopoly on vast amounts of personal data and the fact that this is monetized is concerning. It's becomes almost impossible to escape the influence of the platform even as a non-user, as place-holder accounts are generated and photo's posted by others in which you are present (by choice or not) are scanned and indexed. The commodification of communication is one of the most concerning aspects of the internet at present.
550	It must be providing utilities that meet peoples' needs
556	I'm sure there will be a 'new' Facebook very soon.
557	I am uncomfortable with the fact that so many people are connected under one organisation and that their data can be used in ways that cannot always be predicted or even imagined...
559	Read Orwell's 1984 and you will understand the concerns.
562	This gives Facebook a route to distort news, influence democracy, sensor content, and otherwise manipulate a large swathe of the population.
564	I don't use Facebook.
568	People use what they enjoy and i feel i cannot stop that rather other social media platforms should find out what they are doing that is right and give them a run for their money
566	Facebook is a walled garden, one in which you are segregated based on an algorithmic determination of which flowers you like, flowers arranged by a tyrannical caretaker who watches you through the dusty curtains of his potting shed whilst taking notes on your behaviour and selling them to the gift shop.
567	Yes, I am concerned because of all discussed above and especially about privacy but it is a matter of a personal choice to use it or not to use and to what extend to use it and how to use - in fact it is a matter of trust or distrust the people with whom you communicate not of the engine, we, the people are making the fakenews and the posttruth not the engine.
571	Facebook is well-known for not caring at all about privacy and using all available data for their own business purposes. Furthermore they have a very biased, almost ridicolous US-centric view about "acceptable content" (no boobs, even on pictures of statues, but "hate speech = free speech = no problem", sex is considered worse than violence). Therefore I do not and will never use Facebook or Whatsapp.
578	Facebook is not a secure site, and it is like a restrictive silo, and the level of ideas is pathetic.
587	its a horror to know that more than a billion people manage their net of friends and other social contacts by such an agressive enterprise, which tries to manipulate people
588	All information collected in one place.
589	Facebook's de-facto monopoly position means that a huge amount of people's personal data is in the hands of a profit-making corporation. This is a position of considerable power, open to a wide range of potential abuse, in particular in relation to manipulative (political) advertising that targets identified personal weaknesses, and granular surveillance by both governmental and commercial actors. The full implications of this will likely only become evident gradually.
592	They have a personal data monopoly, and therefore act with impunity re sharing it. Their repeated statements that they 'care' about me/my privacy, are bollocks.
593	Excessive power in the hands of a single entity has historically proven to be a wrong solution for the common good. The case of Facebook is not different (if we consider its business model, content moderation policies, disputes with regulatory entities, etc.).
596	Can't do much about it ....not sure question is relevant
597	I do not use Facebook, so I care not about it.
598	Facebook is not the internet. It is a privately owned space in the Internet. It reduces freedom and horizontality. It is deceiving. It owns peoples data. It is potentially invasive. It is not

	transparent. The rules and norms are not clear.
600	I don't trust them with personal data, I hate the fact that there is a possibility that starngers can access information/photos even though I restrict everything.
602	facebook has no competitors yet
603	I don't see a problem with that.
604	You need competition
605	I hardly use Facebook personally so I am not really bothered
609	by the very definition of that social media relies on numbers. the question is how to counter this monopolisation effect
611	I do not use social media platforms, since I do not accept them 'social'
612	I use it without issue and so do many of my friends and colleagues.
613	it is a social site used to link people so I would expect it to have high usage
614	it would not be a good social network if most people did not use it. however when many people join they do not know how much information would be used and kept by facebook.
615	As its so popular I don't have to use multiple sites to keep in touch
616	Monopolisation of social media services erases privacy-friendly alternatives to switch to and find friends and concentrates social power.
617	Facebook is not an open standard and not community owned. It is a company that gets advertisement for free on television, media and other companies, because those companies are on Facebook, that is very disturbing.
618	Monopolies suck
620	I have minimal details on FB and haven't logged in for nearly a year. I only opened an account to use the log in for another service. I feel that if you are not paying for an internet service, then you are most likely the 'product'
629	Facebook is facebook. I don't need to use it, and it's none of my business if others do.
634	What concerns me is the level of power that Facebook has, and the amount of data about people that has stored. It is like a supranational State.
636	control
638	Problem is: SNS live from the mass. The only way to change this principle of monopolies would be to tear down walls around the gardens and build on interoperability (again). This is not very probable to happen so soon. Of course, it would be great to have everybody on the perfect, self- or commonly (even publicly?) organized, non-commercial open source platform. Well, they are not. With a state, we cannot trust in, also socialization of basic infrastructures isn't really an option.
639	Don't see the problem since it is a matter of choice.
640	I do not use Facebook - I have an account but do not use it.
644	I think because it is so popular, it means its user will forgive it of anything. For example, allowing inappropriate material to be shown and to taken down unless numerous hoops are jumped through, allowing grooming and extremist material to be circulated. Because people have become so dependant on it, they don't mind giving up all their data and pretty much their lives in order to make other people rich. Maybe they don't know that they've done it but the fact that Facebook own the rights to all content worries me. I think they can continue to push the limits of what is tolerable in terms of consuming adverts and allowing political parties i.e. the Tories to tap into people's feeds with 'promoted' ads. I came off Facebook about 6months ago and it was the best decision I've made in terms of accessing social media.
645	I hardly use Facebook, and if I have to I have an account that does not contain any real personal data.
651	Two billion users. All tied to one platform, potential for abuse is very high.
653	For a social networking site to work, it needs to have lots of people on it. Otherwise it doesn't do what it sets out to do. The greater concern is how the algorithms that make up its workings shape the relationships formed on the site.
654	it is in a dominant position without the responibilities that should come with that position.
659	Monopoly is always a bad thing.
664	Facebook has a terrible track record in terms of management of personal information, as well as their own transparency with regards to their policies. The experience the platform provides also gears people away from the idea of the web as an open and collaborative network, to one based on few centralized corporate platforms.
665	Facebook is for morons. Have never, and will never, be a Facebook user. 1984 wasn't meant to be a training manual.
666	It gives Facebook such power to be the main network site...givng them universal control over what we see, how we get information, etc
670	Facebook is a for-profit company and the knowledge gathered generates power to manipulate people toward commercial objectives
678	I hate Facebook, created an account solely for the purpose of being reached via email by people who think Facebook first (or only...)

688	monopoly having a significant power on people's life, intermediating social and economic relationships . (completely agree with Brandeis "curse of bigness")
692	Centralized power, opaque moderation rules, no control over data-gathering and little control news-feed curation
693	target diversity is good
699	I'd rather it was something more along the lines of a platform cooperative-based system or a non-profit, but it could be a lot worse -and if you're that concerned; stop using it.
702	They have such dominance in the market, and have become so (or are considered to be so) indispensable, that individuals are willing to compromise on their own data security and privacy in order to continue using it.
703	none
707	There are better tools
710	Market concentration
712	I think people don't matter these issues. People use popular services instead of their concerns, because they want to be connected with their group of friends.
715	It gives too much control to a single organization
717	For the last one? Why should I've concerned?
718	Monopoly and possible abuse of monopoly
723	Being popular does not equate to being dangerous. It is the handling of information that matters, and I do believe Facebook could do a better job at it, however that has nothing to do with the number of people using it, in my view.
725	They provide a free service that everyone likes and uses. If someone creates a better "facebook" then people will use that
727	People provide sensitive information such as holiday photo's, leading to criminals knowing that your house is empty.
730	Strong position for user data management
736	Concerned because of predators
740	This is because users derive emotional satisfaction from using the platform.
746	Facebook now has 6b people and posts that have others tagged on it are open to all people to view as well as when friends like your posts everyone else sees it. That is a concern. I don't post personal things on facebook anymore.
749	I am concerned by this as it means Facebook as a private entity may mislead the public and steer public opinion in one direction instead of encouraging open dialogue and fair critique of ideas.
750	People are on Facebook because it provides what people need, there have been other networks that people didn't join and actively participate. Business is solution based, once a need is met no worries.
751	The more people on 1 social site, the more reachable they are. You don't have to troll other social sites to find someone.
755	Because of its user base, Facebook knows everything about everybody!.
759	Facebook has a social networking monopoly
764	Centralizing mostly local communication ist simply structurally wrong and dangerous, on a fundamental level. Even if I trused FaceBook (I don't) or Google or Apple as a company, I still think that level of concentration is unresponsible. Such service should all be federated (such as email or Jabber is) - every community, family, company, organisation should be able to host their own social media server.
766	aAa
768	we need our privacy
769	privacy level in facebook is known to be very low and changeable with short notice.
771	This type of "monopoly" means that the network has great power thus the ability to effect user's experience, opinions and privacy.
772	I think about Facebook or any software platform selling their product as a low-cost solution the way Facebook tried to do in India with Facebook Basic to lock in an entire region/population ..
773	I am not concerned about a particular site. I'm more concerned about how the platform handles the information of anyone under 18, what their harassment policies are, the ability to have privacy settings, etc.
776	Facebook can collect lots of data and also understand connections among people
779	Facebook locks people into it, somehow very quickly everyone started using it and it became such the norm that people feel as if they have no choice but to use it, and this involves for many people putting personal information - photos, videos, including of their young children - up on their account which then Facebook legally has ownership over. Facebook keeps track

of everything we look at and then uses it to gain advertising money - this is concerning but not the most concerning for me; rather, for me it is their monopolization of this form of communication, their ownership over our data,and the tricks they use to try to get more and more data from people.

Facebook seems to permeate more and more into people's lives, used for many things now which I realize I am not aware of as I rarely ever use it. At the same time, I keep my account mainly for the private messaging service as there are people on there that I don't have any other way of contacting, or where it is the easiest way to contact them. In this way, Facebook traps people into using it.

780	To much informations given to a single company. The people give a lot of informations to facebook without thinking about it.
782	People do not realise what they do on Facebook, how many personal information they share, who has access to them and what Facebook uses the data for.
784	Facebook is storing data even after the death of people. It uses data for its own purposes. It is impossible for users to discuss the company's terms of use. Basically FB is a dictatorship with 2 billion inhabitants without freedom of speech towards the company. FB hires low-paid workers f.ex. on the Philippines to filter violent content such as pictures of murder, rape etc. The workers do not get psychological back up and suffer from PTSD. FB does not pay taxes but founds own school, research centers etc. pp. Plus, it fosters white supremacy, according to ProPublica: https://www.propublica.org/article/facebook-hate-speech-censorship-internal-documents-algorithms
790	Facebook have a lot of social influence but do not take responsibility- if they did they would lead rather than having to bre pressured into change. They are manipulative and opaque - arguably just the result of good marketing - but it's not an ethical position.
792	Both about its dataveillance power and the power to shape opinions
796	It's a monopoly. Facebook can draw connections between people, gather a lot of information shared on their platform, thus creating an almost perfect picture of people, what they like, what they don't like etc. This is annoying and invading when it's used to send targeted ads, but it is terrifying when it comes to share it with secret services, or it is used to political purposes. Given that companies like Google, Facebook and so on spent a incredible amount of money on lobbying, it is relatively easy for them to achieve their means and "help" pass law useful to them. Even worse, Mark Zuckerberg started to show some interest in politics. What if he decides to run for the White House. With the data collected on people, he could easily choose to use specific ads to target people and shape undecided people's opinion. Where is democracy in this process ? Where is information ?
797	such is life.
798	I justify)
803	I am not concerned about the most used platform.
801	I use Facebook, like practically everyone I know. Despite my "concern" I can't pull away from the platform. However, I'm disturbed by all the ways that Facebook collects and sells the personal data of users. In the wake of the nightmare election of 2016, I'm also very concerned with Facebook's troubling attempts (and non-attempts) at the stewardship of a shared conception of truth and reality, and also its condoning of hate speech.
806	The use of Facebook as a dominant social media platform is a consequence of its popularity and the current market conditions that allow for its rise amongst new demographics. With time, I believe newer platforms will be able to take over, with innovative strategies for attracting consumers.
807	FB knows more data about people than they would ever want. At the same time, it is so difficult to shut it off because everyone is using it to connect, chat, work, leisure, and even posting news. So, even if I deactivate at certain periods of time, I feel obliged to go back, because it's where all the activity happens, especially if I am travelling and want to connect to family and friends.
808	I am an adult. I am able to choose whether I engage in the platform and it is my responsibility to understand what the impact could be.
814	I have no Facebook account, and this makes me somehow insulated within my group of friends. Moreover, as far as Facebook is becoming an increasingly important means to obtain political information, I am concerned by the lack of pluralism in the society.
815	it's probably not my role to tell others what platforms they should or shouldn't use.
819	Facebook is too dominant. There is not enough diversity of platforms. This is bad for diversity of opinion, views and democracy. Facebook can, and has, bowed to both political and commercial pressures, and while I see the need for some control, the problem is that the control can vary depending on who is in power/charge. What was once 'free speech' becomes a target for being shut down, and I'm not talking about extreme cases or hate-

	speech, just an opposing point-of-view.
828	Too much metadata collected.
829	Facebook is market-dominant in a niche that a lot of people seem to care about, and uses that piwer abusively, e.g. "Internet.org."
832	Too much power to one platform, which is known to sell data for purposes that users are not aware of. Sometimes, results can more serious than we think (see Cambridge Analytica).
836	There should be a decentral social media network
837	I won't switch because I used Facebook for various communications, including publicity, that wouldn't be as effective anywhere else (or even available). The amount of market power they have is extreme, and I wish there were alternatives, or even interconnections, something that enabled viable alternatives. I would and do use other services too. Your questions seemed to treat it as an all-or-nothing option. I use the network or service that is most suited to the purpose, and sometimes that requires connecting with the most fans or correspondents. LinkedIn has similar power over business or job-seeking networking (and sometimes worse privacy practices.)
838	I am worried that the FB will swallow the web one day.
841	Facebook has become so essential for people to communicate. Many do not understand how their data is mixed with third party data providers for marketing purposes. Such an essential communication medium should operate with a less coporate purpose
842	Monopoly is always bad.
843	I stopped using my own Facebook account several years ago to post anything and never comment on anyone else's posts. I only look at friends' photos / posts when i get a notification that they have put one up. I became concerned about what happens to stuff I post on there and the fact the stuff you put on the internet is out there forever. I think people post all sorts of inappropriate stuff on Facebook. I don't think Facebook safeguards people's personal info and photos enough - you can just take people's photos off there, just copy it and send it to whoever you like. I think that is wrong. I look forward to a day in the future when Facebook is passe and no-one thinks it's cool any more, like MySpace, but then something else will come along instead I suppose. Facebook is too powerful, too ubiquitous. I think I sound like a bit of a dinosaur, but I don't want my kids using Facebook.
845	Fb has become too powerful in many ways. Many people discuss many private things online, upload pictures and so on while people can watch what other people are doing or where they are at any point in time. It is all too much.
847	They can easily spy on their users.
849	Facebook seems to promote a culture of public self that I do not find healthy or attractive.
852	I hope facebook uses data and information honestly
854	It is always dangerous when there is a major player in the market
857	it is a very good central tool for collecting information about everybody...
858	It's a tool. It's free - it has to make money somehow.
860	I'm not using Facebook. I do not want to use such dominant and no neutral service.
862	i dislike the idea of make make aware the globe all kind of personal information, which is , unfortunately, one of the main reason people is using social like Facebook. People loves being in the spot... Crazy!
868	Cause of my business and Professional activity
869	It's generally fine for individuals to choose to use Facebook but it becomes a problem as soon as official events etc. get only announced and planned on Facebook. In those cases, the choice of using or not using Facebook is taken away.
870	Bubbles! Bubbles everywhere! Same-minded people end up in bubbles together, missing the big fcking picture...
873	Facebook is playing games with our privacy and there's nothing we can do about it.
876	Facebook is a platform with the purpose of connecting users, its efficiency in connecting users is its value and I use it for this reason. At the moment I don't consider this fact a threat.
877	The level of detail Facebook, google etc. hold on people is so sophisticated that it's a historic change with frightening potential. Governments have always been interested in this sort of detailed information about the public for persuasion and/or control. The book 1984 was a warning about what governments tend towards when they have this sort of power. Now that government can legally hack people's computers, as well as gain access to their internet browsing history/social media use, the relationship between the state and the individual has shifted dramatically. If the government wanted to ruin someone, they could simply hack their computer (legally) place child-porn on it, alert the police or arrange for it to be discovered, and watch as the consequences befall the victim. We are trusting GCHQ that they wouldn't do it. I believe there are plenty of examples through history, that show governments are only too willing and enthusiastic to do such things. You could argue that big data and internet surveillance is taking us toward a dystopian reality.

878	people don't understand facebook's business model, or simply don't care.
880	I am not sure what I need to justify... I am concerned that almost everybody is communicating through one plateform and that this plateform has mediocre privacy standards. I go rarely on facebook and mostly to share political messages (and not private)
883	I do not fear that companies collect data. Data is needed in order to make progress and advancements that can be beneficial for humans across the world for example in medicine. I am not concerned of there being a few technology companies in the world who collect these data, and almost all of them being the USA. What I am concerned with is the fact that other countries, perhaps governments, have not seen the opportunity, the gold in having this type of companies as part of the national development plan. We have all been content to receive what we are given, and letting one country own almost all the information of how the Internet is used (the one we see at least). These companies are not evil in having found a way to impact and influence the world. As individuals, and as our governments, we have allowed this to happen.

My concern however, is in having our data collected and stored in the hands of few companies who do not make this information available for others to evaluate. For example to researchers interested in human behavior or even to governments for them to know the interests of their citizens and make improvements; take action.

I believe there are assumptions made about human behavior, "age groups", gender... The data seems to be taken from the people willing to share it who are of the most interest to companies. I know a lot of friends who use Facebook for example, to share news and have open discussions about topics of their interests. But I don't hear about this type of uses on such platforms; alternatives to the use of these tools, really. I see a lot more assumptions made on cultures, "age groups" especially from across the world and narrowed down to one type of behavior; to one type of interest; to one type of possibilities about seeing how humans are or prefer to do. And that concerns me. I tend to not see a discussion about the people who do not participate in social networks. They participate in society but their data is ignored from the social conversation. |
884	It is frustrating that we rely so much on one service, which we all accept is by no means perfect. However we continue to depend on it as it is convenient
885	I am concerned that the data is not aggregated so that originator cannot be traced (proof is targeted advertisements that follow).
886	It's problematic that a single entity contains the main communication platform for social, without any oversight; especially when that entity makes it money by selling userdata for advertising.
887	FB is the most popular SNS at the moment. I am not concerned because I know this trend is changing. What concerns me more, is the fact that FB owns few other social services and may aggregate peoples' data. That may result in some serious privacy breaches and violations.
888	There were similar problems already in the past. Microsoft is the operating system most people used for example.
893	Facebook does have power but the media does hold it accountable.
894	I think you can live without Facebook, so I'm not concerned that other people use it
899	Fb is a commercial company that is being amoral, there are serious privacy concerns about the way they treat data. In fact they are above countries' laws and regulations, as long as users sign Terms of use. Their community have no democratic decision power over it's structure, only some decision power over the content. In many context people are being "forced" to sign up to fb, for example to register for events, concerts... There is censorship on fb, so some thoughts are not being allowed, meanwhile many people are not aware of this and they think that the visible views are representative to the societies diversity, that is directly causing damage to minorities or struggling minority views, that must be included for democracy to function.
901	It's bad that the majority is using a service that is based on private software, that is not based on communication standards. There's no way to exit facebook (and this kind of services) when you are in; and this is very dramatic because you feel socially excluded when you exit it or you don't want to join.
902	Facebook itself as a social network it's not harmful, it's how they try to make everything profitable what makes them a monster... and most people doesn't know it or have no idea, so it will be hard to show them the truth
910	In general I am concerned about a lot of stuff going on in the last 10 years.

Companies selling my data.
Facebook showing me stuff I don't want. |

	Facebook selling my data. Spam everywhere. This is not my internet.
911	If most of the people use it, Facebook knows relations between each other, knows their interests, knows who they (potentially) meet, when and where. They can link these Information, predict behavior of individuals and at one point influence their behavior.
912	Well, despite the horrendous cluttered settings page(s) and that FB orders what you get to see or not, people tend to simply dismiss their own concerns - and FB does simply nothing against that. Well, from the point of FB,that may be ok, but nonetheless.
913	ISP: No chance to oppose malicious behaviour like DPI without risking connectivity FB: Network collects too much personal data and prevents not logged in / anonymous people from seeing seemingly public posts like announcements for (RL) social events
914	Monopoly is bad mkay
915	I am concerned about the monopoly or, at best, duopoly, in Internet service providers in the US and about monopoly ISPs elsewhere in the world. I am less concerned about the large market shares of Facebook, Google, etc. as I do have alternatives.
916	- Most people are unaware about facebooks business case - Facebook will use all entered data by users to create the best profile possible for advertisement customers - Facebook verifies identity of its users by asking friends for someones real name - Facebook is an american company. Due to the NSA leaks it is possible that this data is also used by the US government
918	I use Facebook to connect with people and for me it's good that the majority are on Facebook. It's a great, especially if used for the right reasons.
920	Because they own a lot of personal data, too much data on one spot, could be abused
923	Facebook has long ago crossed the threshold for massive online medium what of mass of 2 billion users. This makes it a monopoly, therefore there are only scarce chances that another social network platform will jeopardize its status. meanwhile, FB can do whatever she wants with our data as most people do not even consider leaving the platform
924	Not using facebook
926	I do not like or trust monopolies.
928	In my opnion there should be more social platforms to choose from, which are actually used by my peers. If I post something, it could be deployed to multiple platforms to reach my friends. This might make it easier to shift away from a platform that I choose not to use anymore for privacy/security reasons or any other reason (and still be able to reach a majority of my online friends).
930	No diversity of views.
934	Well, it's that Facebook has a big power gathering information and somehow providing the connections between me and my friends. The history is the most concerned characteristic from this network.
935	I myself have chosen not to join Facebook because of its power and intrusiveness.
937	I read the policy (and keep up with all their revisions) and avoid placing any personal information on FB because of the provisions in it. Most people just click agree without actually understanding the language they are agreeing to. Post nothing personal is a good way to handle FB. Post only pictures of people that have agreed to be posted (not your kids). The privacy settings of FB are subject to their control and change, which keeps me from doing much beyond re-posting news stories and liking pictures from others.
938	I don't use social media at all, as I hate the principle with a passion; so I have the same feelings about all such time- and mind-sucks, and not just Facebook.
939	I don't believe that young people in particular - who use it most - understand the extent to which they enable the violation of their own privacy.
940	everything is being concentrated in one source, and that is scary.
941	Its ubiquity is its strength. I can stop using it whenever I chose to.
943	A monopoly is never a good thing
944	Facebook is a terrible platform - it's ugly and not fun to use. It's an incredibly boring interaction. However lots of people use Facebook and claim to enjoy it. I am therefore concerned about the apparently low level of intelligence and discernment in humans.
946	I don't use facebook anymore - combination of boredom, annoyance with the opinions of my 'friends' and dislike of the organisation and its monopoly and its devious practices
949	It is a private monopoly. Too much control of information in few hands. Obfuscation of what happens with data. It is a corporation.
951	concerned about monopoly
954	Any social phenomenon has a history. For now, Facebook is the most widely used, but another social site can take its place anytime.

955	There are risks to your privacy on Facebook. Also there is a very low level of intellectual culture on Facebook - it is basically postmodern neoliberalism.
957	A full answer would require a multi-volume book. For simplicity, refer to Federal Trade Commission. "Data Brokers: A Call for Transparency." Federal Trade Commission, 2014. https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/documents/reports/data-brokers-call-transparency-accountability-report-federal-trade-commission-may-2014/140527databrokerreport.pdf.
958	There is only one fixed line service where I live Facebook is the choice of the local community; I used it to follow local events
960	I do not agree with the ethics Facebook demonstrate in their treatment of users. I use Open Source / Libre software as much as possible. I closed my facebook account years ago and they are still emailing me even though I have blocked them. I do not think it is healthy for our society if one or just a few giant providers dominate the online environment.
966	i am concerned that the internet is not private anymore and companies are minting user data for profit making purposes we are more exposed than ever before
969	They have monopoly over lots of personal data so they can affect people's lives: consumer, lifestyle and even political choices.
970	na
971	I think facebook is evil.
976	I don't have a Facebook account because I think It is invasive and alienating
978	-
981	As a writer and scholar, I have a problem with the fact that users create copious amounts of free content for Facebook--content that belongs thereafter to Facebook, by the way--without receiving anything more than access to the platform in the bargain.
982	I don't have any concerns as my decision is a choice that I make irrespective or social media customised and or not customised adverts.
984	It seems to me that most people have not considered the wider implications of participating in facebook's business model. What does it mean for tomorrow's society that so many allow profiling? Are Facebook, and by extension security agencies, equipped to comprehend the rich adaptability most people demonstrate? Are we "locking in" models of "acceptable" online practice that will place others on the wrong side of the fence, simply for preferring the types of freedom privacy enables? Also, what are the implications of young people habituating their biological neural networks to interact fluently with Facebook? Maybe social media fosters practices of immediate decision-making that encroach on richer modes of thought, especially in the young, when the political and environmental concerns of our age are so very worthy of seasoned and profound thinkers.
985	I am interested in alternatives but afraid they won't work
986	I am concerned about the development of hegemony trusts on the internet, but do still have a hope that (especially Western European) civic infrastructure will be developed which may counter market concentration and state surveillance.
993	It is excessively invasive, tracks too much and its privacy controls are labyrinthine. On mobile devices it asks for permission to use the mic and camera at any time. It is too invasive and people give over too much information to it. We do not know exactly what happens that data or how it may be aggregated with other data to profile activity.
994	Ultimately, we're using a service that's "free" to use, meaning we generally speaking are the product (for the consumer, which is the advertisers). I'm concerned that one entity has access to this much data and information of so many people, but I also don't think there is much I can do about it (especially if we all voluntarily use the service).
998	I think facebook especially creates a filtered bubble. I tried to avoid it - but it is hard when every one .. even newspapers, universities, event places etc uses it. I also think that the polarization of everything which concerns the internet is just google, facebook and microsoft is quite disturbing. (A newer thing which does not totally belong here, but is just one step more is the new update policy of companies as Microsoft - which for example tell you 'some settings on your computer are manged by the providing company' that means for example you cannot turn off being updated automatically 'we are shutting down the PC for you to update ...' etc)
1003	???
1004	The very fact that everyone uses it means it is too powerful. However, it is also useful. Rather than submit to its diktats, I think it should submit to ours: if it wants to be our primary social network, it should have to behave in a manner we can put up with.
1005	Facebook is by far the company with worse practices regarding the rights of its users. Their

	disregard for the right to anonymity, the net neutrality, the transparency of the mass management of data, copyright of the content and personal files of the users, the abusive time that they keep copies of the data and files of the users even after To close an account, all in function of its economic model and yet is the most used social network, being fed daily by millions of interactions, make its economic model is successful and sought to replicate. And the threat is perpetuated.
1006	Monopoly leads to misuse and user disempowerment.
1009	It gives too much power to one enterprise. Facebook is an enterprise which aim is to make profit. It´s not a benefactor which wants all the good things to people.
1010	I'm not really concerned about the fact that a lot of people use Facebook. But concerned about the private data collection on Facebook. If the private data collection is restricted, then it does not matter to me how many people use Facebook.
1012	For years did not go on Facebook but of course I was on it in other people's photographs. And it brings you into its ecosystem anyway through other applications. So it is not just FB.
1013	I quit using Facebook so in that sense I don't like it that everybody uses it, but also because of the power it gives Facebook, for instance if it is the only medium people receive news through
1014	Concentration has always been dangerous. Study History!
1016	I'm concerned in te sense it means a concentration of power that makes all users week and vulnerable. But I'm not sure any other solution would work better.
1017	Because Facebook has the power to influence us politically
1018	I don't want FB to hold all my data, tell me what to buy, think or who to connect with.
1021	facebook collects a huge amount of data and most of the users are willing to share their whole life on that platform. That is terrifying. You can make a real good profile out of that. Maybe, facebook knows them better than they themselves. And facebook invites one to provide very much of your life - things you maybe otherwise do not share on a webpage or not on the same; like your cv, where you are right now and what you are doing, what you like and what you dislike, how your personal network looks like...
1024	The fact that most people use Facebook makes many social interactions dependent on this one provider. As a result, the constantly changing privacy settings, image-search, face-tracking can be very annoying and difficult to keep up with. There is a lot of peer pressure to use the same platform most people use and the messages are not encrypted. People use FB as a private online space and publish many private images and information (also about their friends) often without knowing what this information could be used for by FB.
1028	It can be used to reach important information about me
1031	Facebook has become the largest 'government' on the planet. It has the most information on the most people.
1032	Too much data and information concentrated in one company giving them too much power and profit
1041	In facebook everyone place all their personal information and this allows Facebook to have a better understanding of human behavior and be able to manipulate or create better marketing plans at all most no cost.
1043	Risk for personal use and security
1049	It seems that Facebook operates almost as a monopoly and therefore has considerable power and influence that is not effectively regulated.
1050	Monopoly's are never good in any situation, however users have a choice to not engage so to say there is 'no choice' is incorrect.
1057	its good people are together in 1 medium
1058	The huge monopoly it holds, makes a huge agregation of data possible - especially since the company provides many different services.
1059	monopoly, too much personal information, but convenient to have everyone using one platform
1060	Facebook collects more and more data maintaining its dominant position in the market and it is expanding in other digital sectors becoming in my opinion a danger for people'security, privacy and freedom of choice.
1062	monopoly
1066	Walled gardens are a problem. Single sign-on is a problem. Media concentration is a problem.
1068	I think it is detrimental to people's mental health and well-being. I think it invades on our privacy and people have become too open about the kind of information they are willing to share on a platform full of strangers.
1070	This gives an unchecked amount of power to a single website.
1072	We're the product, not the customers
1073	I prefer multiplicity in any case for a better democracy

1074	I feel concerned about the filter bubble created through the news feed. I loose sight of people I used to care for because they never show up in my feed(s) and I know this happens to everybody else as well. I feel even more concerned about Facebook's NGO internet.org.
1075	I am not too concerned as long as my privacy is protected.
1078	no concerns
1079	It is a matter of time that people will like another social network.
1082	It bothers me the fact that Facebook exists in the form it does. However, I can not complain as I am using it knowing about its implication for personal data, anonymity, social safety of people/citizens
1083	It seems dangerous that one corporation or entity has a monopoly on information on the majority of social media users.
1084	Facebook, google, Amazon have become far too powerful. Facebook in the past (probably still) will conduct unethical research. Their ability to identify fake or extreme ideological groups is either lacking or not a concern for them. Facebook's system encourages homophily and filter bubbles, sometimes even if you make an effort to include "friends" outside of your political pereferences and social values.
1086	Facebook is probably the most dangerous entity in the world after the USA army
1092	this monopolistic position gives them to much power.
1093	I do not know about any proper option with that much function. If i would not be a part of it i would be left out
1095	The network effect makes its usefulness grow with its size, up to the point that it become informally mandatory to use it. And Facebook is profit driven and collaborates with states-affiliated agencies, making it the perfect hegemonic vector for capital and state power.
1102	Muy preocupada pero incluso ese dato es producto de la visión hegemónica (occidental) de las redes sociales, si hablaremos de PengYouWan, Qzone, RenRenWan o KaiXinWan
1103	Personal information is now being hoarded by Facebook and that could potentially lead to abuse.
1108	FB drives the usage over the Internet
1109	Dominant platform status makes it difficult to establish and enforce regulations of that platform
1111	Lack of accountability
1112	Facebook is beholden to no-one, apparently, other than Mark Zuckerberg's lust for control, money and the exercise of power. I believe that we'll find, for example, extensive (with plausible deniability, of course) culpability between Russian efforts to sway the election and Facebook. (The initial self-reporting by Facebook of $100K in Russian disinformation is most likely the tip of the iceberg). Apart from the corruption of public dialogue this represents (and the dangers that it marks, for 21st Century democracy), there's just an enormous account of mundane, self-produced dossier material -- textual, photographic, audio and video -- that Facebook is continuing to assemble, without any real accountability, to the rest of us. And the anti-regulatory sentiment in the U.S. just makes the political will for this necessary oversight nearly impossible, during the Trump years. We also need some Sinclair Lewis-type of journalistic muckracking (as found Lewis' "The Jungle") as well as the work of organizational ethnographers, in league with coders who could do the necessary code-to-function translations for informed lay audiences. As it stands now, FB does not open itself up, at all, to digital and organizational scholars and ethnographers who would allow us to encounter and evaluate the internal logic and practices of the organization. And we are the worse off, for the lack of transparency. I've found the argument in Bruce Sterling's "The Epic Struggle of the Internet of Things" persuasive: "The Big Five" (Amazon, Apple, Facebook, Google and Microsoft) have ushered in a period of early 21st Century digital feudalism. Facebook is a large part of that development, which is why I signed off, years ago.
1113	lack of competition and diversity, big data for Facebook's use and control of population(s)
1115	It makes it easier for me to connect with people I'd like to be in contact with
1116	It is directing towards a monopoly platform
1119	OK
1121	At meast a variety of platforms would avoid concentrztion of data
1123	The are too many advertisements and data violation, however, in order to function, informational capitalism needs to generate revenues. Sites such as Wikipedia operate through donations, but how would an alternative network sustain itself in the long-term? People are very unlikely to switch off Facebook, unless there is a major disaster such as

	major leak of data. More regulations are needed for protection of privacy, and instead of alternative online social network, maybe consider alternative online community, especially in such fields as digital health, where people would have more reassurance about their privacy.
1124	I'm on Facebook but I find it intrusive (too many anecdotal updates that clogged up my email, not iteresting). I don't use it, and I've put updates into spam.
1126	if facebook is the only news site/social generated news site then what they say must be the truth. like the tv news in the XX century.
1128	I think FB is great.
1130	the network effect is what maes the sites useful- i.e., there is no point going to a social network without others there. The amount of advertising is about what I expect for a free service- free to me, but obviously bills have to be paid by them somehow. I also understand my privacy settings and can end up with an acceptable mix of advertising.
1131	Although it provides a nice way to connect the maximum number of people, having the concentration that Facebook has leads to several incentive that are concerning: specialized hacking and exploitation using FB, selling FB users' data and information, creating robust cross-platform identities that permeate the internet experience.
1132	Their tracking buttons are everywhere across millions of websites.
1133	Facebook has become an economy unto itself. That most people use it means that we're all on a sinking ship together. It's concerning that so much information about so many people is in one place that I don't believe is very secure at all (but I'm also skeptical about anything being secure).
1134	Facebook has access to an incredible amount of data provided by individuals around the world that is used to generate profit for the company, aside for the privacy concerns, that is changing the perception of what labor is in our daily life, transforming us into productive beings without compensation
1136	The fact a lot of people use the single service does not overly concern me - it makes sense to users, as it is free (in the monetary sense) and compatible with multiple platforms, therefore it doesn't surprise. It also seems to me plenty of people move between (equally homogenous) platforms that they use for most of their social media purposes - most of my friends post more to e.g. Instagram, but still keep a Facebook account.
1138	Monopolies are never good. I also have concerns about Facebook other activities.
1143	in all the websites or another on line services the access is from Facebook. I am concerned because it´s a way to map desires and after suggest products for me. I detest the supremacy of Facebook. Is a matter of vigilance, beyond what Foucault has taught us.
1144	Platform Monopoly is dangerous.
1146	A software or platform monoculture is risky and subject to abuse (as we have already seen!)
1147	Too much control and power thanks to the data Facebook collects of its users - could be used for purposes that they weren't planned for
1148	Monopol Status
1149	A monopoly service run by a young man in California can lead to information domination slowly but surely
1150	It's very convenient that most people use it, but it is therefore also very dangerous in that we can all get our data hijacked.
1153	Facebook profits from our rage and conflict. It has replaced other non-mediated social interactions. Facebook has too much control over social interaction, threatening civic discourse.
1156	Facebook has a monopoly both in terms of the data they can access and the influence they have as a gate keeper (see the recent debate how facebook should or shouldn't control fake news). Either of these is problematic.
1157	Too much power and responsibility concentrated in a very few private hands with no accountability and no record of CSR or other principles of social equity.
1158	Monopols are very dangerous.
1159	It generates the power of Fb as a very powerful company - it can control and dictate too much.
1160	The growth of virtual monopolies like Facebook, Google and Amazon is a concern to me. They have a worrying amount of data about us as individuals and incredible tracking capacities and I'm not comfortable with that. I've noticed that younger people (I'm in my 40s) don't share my concerns, so I think conceptions of privacy have transformed radically in my lifetime (largely as a result of the internet and social media). I'm prepared to sacrifice a certain amount of privacy for convenience, although I don't like it (e.g. I use both Google and Amazon) but am always aware that I am being tracked. I minimize my use of social media (I only use Pinterest, because nothing I pin is intended to be private) and I do not own a mobile phone.
1161	Facebook has some kind of monopoly about digital social relations; that is/could be potentially dangerous.

1162	FB just grows big on big data accumulation, why shoud one not be concerned
1163	Threat to people's privacy and to democracy
1165	I have read research about emotional manipulation and fake news on Facebook and am greatly concerned about its scale
1169	amplification of like for like opinions and views so diversity of experiences, knowledge, information, risks being diluted.
1170	Any monopoly is generally not a good idea, as it centralizes control and allows for more abuse of power.
1173	It makes sense for there to be a single dominant social network. I dislike that it is commercial
1174	They have monopoly over data and influence too many spheres of our lives. In many cases, they continue to define the users experience of the internet for example in developing countries. We need alternatives of Facebook to be known so that Facebook can take concerns such as hate speech more seriously instead of dragging it's feet in changing policies to protect users.
1179	Almost everyone I know use it frequently and everything is almost shared there. Basically Facebook kind of knows my whole life and this is very concerning.
1180	I think most people use Facebook as a convenient social media platform❓not only for communication❓but also for habitual sharing with friends in daily life. In light of the scientific recommendation and alternative information of Facebook, people enjoy themselves and gain more benefits in essence.
1185	Facebook has its pros and cons. I think that FB is the principal way of communication with people you know and don't know but have similar interests. Facebook has done something good, and that is the platform of the people, everyone (with a connection to Internet) have access to it, simple and with the opportunity to raise a voice with a certain free of speech, something that is really important for a democracy in the western societies we are part of. Something that I criticize, not only for FB, but other platforms to, is that they are not entirely compromised to make known that they aggregate, organize and sell many of this information/metadata to third party organizations, and we don't know these organizations, they are under the shadow.
1186	We have some freedom to choose and to create
1187	That creates dependence on a privacy online platform. And furthermore Facebook acumulates loads of power through the data of the million users the social network have. It is difficult to scape from the influence of Facebook as it becomes a place to socialize with people.
1192	Which answer?
1194	monopoly
1196	It is a monopoly, and if one day it decides to introduce enormous fees there nothing we'd be able to do about (just one example from an economic perspective).
1197	Facebook sucks!
1198	Facebook can have access to a lot of information. Further it has became an apparently anonymous bar/pub where people thinks it is possible to write everything.
1199	Because whether people realise it or not, they are participating in a network that promotes a silicon valley ideology - white, western, male, neoliberal, capitalist, imperialist. We have seen how powerful its design has been in shaping the outcome of world events that uphold the values of that ideology. We've been sold a lie. Facebook is narrowing our perspective and reducing our ability to think critically. The promise of the internet is that it would expand our worldviews and introduce us to ideas and people that we may never have been able to experience in the physical world. But Facebook has simply boxed us all into segments and categories based on banal inputs such as 'likes' and emojis.
1202	David Eggers - The Circle (book NOT movie)
1204	Having monopoly/duopoly of internet provision would mean concentration of data in the provider/s hands. Without public oversight or a mechanisms of accountability, the set-up is worrisome.
1205	i don't see the question
1206	Of course, the fact that most people use Facebook is part of the attraction, but it does mean that a range of social activities are surrendered to proprietary algorithms. Given the variety of human interests, a choice of different algorithms would be beneficial.
1208	Users are somewhat at the mercy of what other users post about them
1209	Facebook constitutes another form of concentrated ownership, this time for media and social network, in other words a quasi-monopoly, and that is suspicious in itself
1210	Monopolies are rarely benevolent or beneficial
1211	There is no alternative and Facebook is powerful over users
1214	Email allows anyone to use it through various approaches because it's an open standard. Facebook uses open standards such as HTML only when it can't impose its own proprietary model on it. There seem to be people who pay little or no attention to email, but use Skype,

	Facebook, etc as their primary mode of connection. The network effects of this are taking us back to the days of monopoly phone companies, except that for many of them at least they were publicly owned.
1216	Having a monopoly of (social) information exchange is dangerous, regardless of who has that monopoly.
1217	It makes it very hard to use alternatives as they have the monopoly.
1219	Facebook being _the_ social media platform means that it has too much power over how other platforms are developing as well. Being in a dominant position and making acquisitions of competitors makes it difficult for alternatives to gain ground. Facebook could lead the way and choose an ethical code of conduct, but I am very doubtful it has interest in doing so.
1221	The masses can easily be influenced by Facebook via advertisements, fake news, etc. Facebook can become the world-wide single source of "truth".
1225	FB is nothing new in the internet. THere are companies like google that basically know everything about us. It is the way today's net works. However, the question seems to assume that people use FB in very similar way. The number of active updaters, for example, is quite low comapred to passive use. For example, I my self do not update frequently - perhaps once a year - but I do follow my friends actively. The validity of the question is problematic in terms of research methodology.
1226	"The next Facebook should never happen," says Moglen going on to call the company's founder and CEO, Mark Zuckerberg (though not by name) "a little thug in a hooded sweatshirt" who "made the Web easy to write, and created a man-in-the-middle attack on human civilization."
1232	Facebook is a waste of time. It is addictive and false. I shapes how people view the world and it strengthens their biases and consumerist desires. It dumbs people down and steals valuable time to do other things more worthy of using one's time, like reading or thinking!
1233	In this position nobody can not guarantee the respect of rules. The platform uses technology and data to sidestep traditional restrictions on monopoly power. In a world organized by tech monopolists, could be a change in power relationships that no one voted for but has been imposed nonetheless.
1234	Only one Internet service providers means the existence of a monopoly. Over time, I am afraid such a company will be able to control almost all aspects of our online practices and sometimes even offline practices too. That single provider will be able to decide which sites we should watch in the absence of net neutrality laws. It will also collect and control vast amount of personal data that can have negative impact on privacy and misuse by the government.
1236	Since it has this monopoly it gathers a massive amount of data. As there are no real comeptitors who could compete for better terms of agreement e.g. better privacy standards there seems to be too little control. Especially since regulation in general is far behind actual demand. Data can be used for many different aims, commercial or political microtargeting, psychological experiments. Higher danger of misuse and also data fraud if everything is so centralized.
1237	Facebook becomes to powerful
1238	Facebook becomes the monopoly of social media companies and it makes me feel like there is a small chance we can have the free internet for everyone as its infrastructure was originally designed by Tum Berners-Lee. Many know what FB does with their metadata but are still obliged to persist on the platform, since leaving FB means that they also leave the large community. But it is necessary to convince our networks to migrate to alternative platforms but it takes time to educate others who still buy the nothing to hide argument.
1241	Facebook is trying to become the Internet, and seems to be slowly succeeding. I am concerned about what this means for communication, news, echo chambers and general digital innovation
1242	- single Points of information increase the significance of filter bubbles
1243	It allows Facebook to collect a vast amount of private data. I feel concerned about this because it means a concentration of data in the hands of a private, not very well regulated, enterprise.
1244	FB has a double image, one official of being nice and cosy, and one internal which is more that as an employee at FB you should increase the power of the company in society and the worlwide markets.
1245	Private business having access to so many peoples information.
1248	I believe there are many data concerns that people are unaware of or unconcerned by, for example the fact that Facebook uses one user's imported contacts to make friend suggestions to another user that they are connected to, and the fact Facebook have a degree

	of ownership over the content that is uploaded.
1250	I think that it's very problematic for a number of reasons. I don't think that it's a very good platform for social networking - it's about performance plus likes. Could there be a way of socialising that was more horizontal? I don't like the way that people are working for Facebook through providing content and the way that the platform is making money out of their data. We don't know what data is being used and how. Facebook follows us around the internet and I don't like that. I don't like that fact there is a monopoly on social networking. I think that Mark Zuckerberg is really problematic. Although some of his politics is good (e.g. around immigration), he is an uber neoliberal who believes in entrepreneurialism, is against unionisation etc. He is the second richest person in the world and he's spending his money on problem forms of philanthrocapitalism e.g in education. I could go on...
1251	I observe some of my students use it for sharing very personal information. I also observe news on how these things misused.
1252	I do not care - I do not have to use it
1253	Facebook has too much power in terms of pushing publishers around and turning the open web into a walled garden. It has too much power in that it knows too much about individual people which enables it to determine mental health issues/vulnerable teens (as it once claimed to marketers) or even to influence elections
1255	Monopoly positions are rarely in the interests of the wider population - a monopoly position on social data gives a great deal of power to a single entity that has questionable practices.
1258	It monopolizes internet ad investments, along with Google, and structures user habits and needs. It's never a good idea to have only one option - especially commercial ones.
1259	It's helpful to have everyone in one place
1264	big brother changing society
1265	READ LANCHESTER'S 'YOU ARE THE PRODUCT' IN THE CURRENT ISSUE OF THE LONDON REVIEW OF BOOKS
1266	The huge power of a single company to access users data and trade with it is concerning. There is not much regulation about what they can do. They pay small fines for data protection breaches but do not change anything
1268	I strongly dislike the narcissistic culture encourage by Facebook use. I stopped using Facebook for this very reason.
1273	Can collect a very large body of data, but probably won't remain as popular as it is now so this will decrease in time
1275	I am not concerned because I don't think Facebook uses its users' data in a risky way. However, I think we should all be aware of the data they possess.
1277	There is little basis on which trust can be fully justified as internet providers are concerned about their own profits above all else.
1280	Facebook operates according to its own ethics which are self-interested, and in particular it isn't bothered about objectively improving the cultural and intellectual level of the population.
1281	People give awa y all sorts of rights when they open an account, but are not really aware of this. This is why i very rarely use Facebook.
1283	they collect far too much personal data
1284	I am somewhat concerned about Facebook usage, because I got a lot of friend requests from strangers/guys earlier this year. Therefore, I changed my profile picture. I only connect to family and close friends in FB. I don't need these friend requests from strangers. It's annoying.
1286	Facebook have too much power no next to no regulations or transparency. I'm not antiadvertising, that the price of free services - however transparency about advertisers and an ethical code of conduct is vital for platforms that now function as new providers.
1287	-Issues with single point of failure/single source of truth, etc. -Issues with market dominance allowing it to buy out any competitor (monopolistic behaviour etc). -Issues with it being built around capturing as much of our data and not being clear about what it is doing with it.
1288	Market domination allows corporations to act in their interests (to maximize profits) rather than the interests of users of the service.
1289	It´s too big, global enterprise which has too much power over ordinary citizens. And its power is invisible.
1291	Facebook is a mess of security and privacy concerns. Their anti-harassment efforts are ludicrously poor. And I deeply dislike their grabby attitude to media that is posted to their service. Unfortunately, many people are unaware of these problems or do not care. By being free, highly cross-platform and relatively easy to use, they have become ubiquitous to the point

	where they have replaced other methods of communication for many people to the point where not having access to Facebook, ornot checking it regularly, or, of course, being messed about by its algorithms can leave one missing out on important social engagements.
1292	Because many friends of mine currently using facebook as a communication medium.
1293	-
1297	Walled garden data platforms control too much of who sees what. They can bury stories they don't like.
1298	Centrality of data emission and concentration of power on just one or very few corporations.
1299	In questions on the alternative, the option 'I will not switch, even though I am concerned' misses. I don't use facebook, but isn't only for privacy reason (i.e. it's a sucking time-attention-life machine), and I will not use any alternative! The same can be said for other web-based platform. Regarding ads, I use: a web filter (adb) and an anti-antiad detector, and a firewall on my mobile devices, so I cannot clearly states how the issue concerns me.
1301	Monopoly
1302	It concentrates a lot of power in the hands of a company with no particular obligation to us - on the other hand it's the nature of social networks to have only a few dominant networks - and it's been demonstrated that social networks can die very quickly indeed (which mitigates the concern).
1304	one provider only will dominated everything and it might affect us security wise.
1305	Its a fundamental social network now but we have to know how to use it
1306	I am frightened about the concentration of information/power
1307	Facebook is a fucking monster. It eats personal data, censors what you see, and literally supports dictatorships in some parts of the world.
1309	For a number of reasons it is obvious Facebook does not have users' privacy as priority, so you never can trust what they do with your data, how and why they manipulate what you are able to see. That this company is now "installed" to decide what is fake news and has the right to execute exclusion from their service whenever they want, is awful.
1310	Fb has more power collecting all our data and people doesn't concern about that
1311	Monopolies are risky in every domain
1312	Facebook have a virtual monopoly on ownership of certain kinds of social activity previously private and uncommodified
1313	Having been brought up with very basic computers (8-bit) in the UK, I was in my 20s when the WWW came about. Logging on through a dial-up modem, there was not much content but there were no advertisements, and most content seemed to be about sharing knowledge, ideas, expertise. It couldn't last, but I'm not sure we all saw to what extent the entirety of the internet is now driven by commercial concerns and actors. In the US, where I live now, I am astonished at the lack of competition amongst ISPs, the soft touch of the FCC under Ajit Pai, and the huge digital divide that runs along predictable faultlines in terms of low income groups that cannot afford mobile telephony or internet access, as megacompanies (that are in control of content creation and TV networks, as well as data to peoples' homes) cream off the profits. I am angry about this and want to do something about it. It is *such* an important issue. Although I was an early adopter of technology and social media, I am no longer so, and have deleted all my social media accounts. I am extremely concerned with the intrusiveness of advertising, and the stealthy gathering of private user data through cookies and tracking. Even more so after the recent election, where the cumulative shaping of the perceptions of mass populations are influencing election outcomes - this is horrific. We are so far away from the original idea and intention of the internet, and as individuals we have no power in shaping it. It requires transnational regulation, and I am at least grateful that the EU, if no-one else, is increasingly the watchdog here.
1315	I deleted my Facebook account. I feel the data mining they have done and the services they provide have very few protections for the users. They have been built on the company's use of free data to generate profit and presence.
1316	Once collected, data lives forever. With data-mining, algorithms, and aggregating tools, the value of any one piece of data is multiplied. As data accumulates over time, the value is further multiplied as it may be used to develop trend data (secondary analysis) or, eventually, models. Combining this model-making power with the consolidation of ownership of other resources (money, political access, ownership of land, businesses, natural resources, and even people, etc.) makes it increasingly possible for oligopolistic authority to create a state of tyranny. This could be within a single country, within a region, or with multiple regions. Since I am not a member of an oligopolistic authority, I would be grist. I do not desire this fate.
1317	Monocultures are damaging, as much as a monopoly is bad for business. I would hope that people always understand that the content they feed to FB becomes lost to them, and then they may make more informed less subjective approaches to being online.
1318	I feel like a lab rat on Facebook, and hate it's business model and political activity, but it's where the people are

1319	What I read about the ethics of Facebook is concerning e.g. https://www.lrb.co.uk/v39/n16/john-lanchester/you-are-the-product
1320	It's harder to get a critical mass of people to use other platforms. Secondly, facebook, like every platform, has features which shape the kinds of interactions possible. I think these features on facebook have mostly negative impacts on interactions.
1322	Facebook's global monopoly is very concerning as the company has no respect for the privacy of its users and is only interested in profit-making. Moreover, it grants access to individual and group sites to police/secret services/etc. unlawfully.
1325	Facebook and Zuckerberg share a philosophy of profit and power as more important than people. They have no concerns when expansion and earnings are the question. Manipulation of affection using the material you put into that network. Banalization.
1326	as with all things, when there is a sole provider of a service, they can get complacent in terms of how they treat their users. User experience tends to be less important than revenue to the company, because they see the users as captive with no alternative and thus that they will suffer shoddy treatment etc because they have no alternative they can go to.
1327	Because Facebook is such a monolith and so integrated into many people's lives, it has become the first choice of communication over more open forms (like email) and in many cases participation on the platform is required (e.g. for accessing class discussions, or events from certain groups). Even not participating on Facebook you can still be profiled by the company; you can be tagged in photos by other users, your email can be collected from other users' address books, and facebook can easily speculate on who else you might know given known friend connections. Finally, facebook 'like' buttons are all over the internet so both logged-in facebook users and anonymous browsing habits can be tracked by the company.
1328	Not every fb friend checks privacy settings, personal information could slip through; fb has a wealth of knowledge about us, but doesn't allow us to control every detail.
1329	What's the difference for me if Facebook is used by 1 million or 2 billion users I don't know?
1330	I'm concerned about monopoles.
1335	network effects make the platform more valuable to users, so good for Facebook for winning the social platform war. but that gives Facebook an undue influence and reach into users' lives. the role of fabricated accounts and spreading divisive fake news has had real social effects. FB has a level of influence that outstrips its recognition of responsibility for the effects it creates.
1337	too many eggs in the same basket; concentration of power; monopoly; way too much power in their hands; lack of choice
1338	Most of the people I have talked about this and continue using said services either feel that they do not have a choice in terms of having a social networking platform that is adequately professionally recognized. It feels social pressure from friend of coworkers (if not the employer) make them use these platforms. There are also people who seem not to be concerned about this at all, as they lack the perception of how it impacts our society and consumption habits as a whole.
1339	Without competiton vendors can ignore customers needs
1340	facebook is a commercial corporation and it's service is designed to serve commercial purposes. facebook is more a commercial network then a social network.
1344	It's more than just social. They are trying to encapsulate more and more web activities within their "walled garden"
1345	All data recorded on the same servers, They could be hacked and such data would be stolen and sold to criminals
1346	I'm not concerned about a social networking site existing, but far too few users understand what Facebook is doing with their personal information. Furthermore, this can have consequences for getting a job, especially when users do not conceal embarrassing photos, posts, etc.
1349	I feel that Facebook is becoming a kind of de facto government that practices things, that should be decided by democratic governments, with no regard for ethical concerns.
1353	Facebook is a multi-million business who not only operates a social network but also owns many other applications such as instagram, snapchat.
1356	visit websites and search engine
1357	My concerns are around the opaqueness of terms of service, the way they are changed, that few people have any awareness of how data is used (I worked in arts marketing - I have an idea of what Fb sells), of the way that social media is manipulated in how it is offered to view for the benefit of the platform owner (while being less than open with users), that there aren't paid for versions that cut out advertising (and clearly facebook want a comprehensive database of everyone on fb, no exceptions), that Google uses its (almost) monopolistic search engine power to favour its own products (especially YouTube)... is that enough to be going on with?

1361	This means that there is one gatekeeper that can control what most of the people see, or even feel.
1362	I am mainly concerned about facebook being the prime social media network because it is not a publicly/cooperatively run platform but rather a private corporation aiming for profit rather than public service
1363	There will be little competition for them, which means they can do whatever they want without worrying about losing users.
1365	I guess that I am used to the fact that Facebook is the predominant social network. I know its downside, but it doesn't affect me to the degree that I would consider deleting my account. What is more, I think that so far it hasn't appeared/proposed a better alternative.
1368	No private organization should have exclusive access to the behavioral data of so many people and control over how those people use the internet. I'm simply against such concentrated political power.
1371	FB dominance worldwide exemplifies the dangers of cultural hegemony. Clearly, the latest revelations about FB ads targeting hate groups amplifies concern over the prevalent use of digital propaganda to sway the electorate.
1373	Mediating social relations with a capitalist platform leads to alienation.
1374	Facebook is killing the web by building silos in which people are trapped. their data can't migrate to other platforms (see Tim Berner's lee's talk, on magna Carta for the web on its 25th anniversary). Facebook is a los a breeding ground for pedophile, terrorists and generally egomaniacs who spend their entire time either looking into the mirror or aping some "celebrity", so it's an entirely vacuous enterprise as far as I'm concerned. Although it could be used for food (finding missing people, helping people in times of tragedy), its nefarious uses unfortunately outweighs its more laudable uses... needs to be controlled by the Internet regulators.
1377	I don't have FB. When I received an invitation to join, I read the T&C. I read that essentially whatever I posted would not be my own, but property of the platform. So I didn't agree with the T&C and didn't join. I understand that maybe this changed, but it concerns me that so many people have willingly given up ownership of their data including personal photos.
1378	I think the worts thing is that 90% of users do not know anything about what facebook does to their data, and, even worst, i believe that in the country I live (Brazil), the great majority of users don't know how the facebook algorithm works, anda how a bubble of social themes is created around them exclusively for comercial and marketing purposes. This has many impacts on the potencial of the internet to social organizacion, political mobilization and other possibilities tha are being shut by those systems .
1380	It's a private near monopoly, one company would be okay with democratic oversight, ie a municipal provider.
1382	Some monopoly effect seems inevitable. A possible counter to this would be, on the model of the postal service from the mid-19th century, as I recall, to treat internet access and searching as public utilities.
1383	Facebook, as a popular platform, is concerned to provide a sustainable environment for the users such that they can be in a balance with the service provider and experience a safe communication with others.
1389	There is little control or public oversight of Facebook (and, even if there was it would not be useful to anyone not living in the USA) and the increasing use of social media for news consumption gives Facebook a significant amount of control of a broadcast medium. This is particularly concerning if the rumours about Zuckerberg preparing for a run for the presidency is true, but in more general terms as well.
1390	Answer to what?
1394	this is great that so many people are connected - but our datas and private stuff are used for analytics.... There are a lot of paralel facebooks for different groups, I suppose
1395	They steal your content. They refuse to delete your account properly even when they are asked and they ring fencebhuge parts of the net that do not or should not be locked to other users. I have no clarity either on their use of my data, it's sale or use to target content to me. It does not control the promotion of content that is harmful or damaging to political and social processes and is anti democratic by nature and constitution.
1396	Oh dear, this is a long answer. One part is that a singular company is not just collecting a huge amount of data on inernet traffics, actions, behaviors, and social connections, but it is also controlling what news and information we have access to and the ways it is presented to us.
1398	I do not have any legal right to see who is collecting my data, whom they are giving it to. I fear, that scores based on my data could lead to disadvantage such as higher rates for buying goods, insurace, make problems to enter a boarder or select the available data in the internet.

1400	It is a platform based and central to data-mining that delivers data to other corporations and governments.
1401	Facebook relies on advertising income
1406	Market-related and sponsored contents have taken over user-generated ones on news feeds and essentially all sections of this social media platform.
1407	Bacause it is a natural thing in capitalism.
1410	About my concerns re. Facebook? Just that it's so big/has so much information. A company having that much money + info (=power) is always a bit scary...
1412	Could have been any company with a different name.
1415	Facebook is a horrible company that exploits its users for profit, while also exploiting their own employees for massive profits.
1418	When most people make use of the services provided by the single service provider. It leads to a monopolistic situation, the service provider may attempt or eventually manipulate the information supplies, may also supply the internet access and usage data to third parties and cater them with a specified possible docile market, ready to accept what is being supplied to them.
1419	its about privacy matters.
1421	I used Facebook up until about 2011, but left after I became concerned about the amount of personal data I was making available to the company, especially considering social and familial networks.
1423	The walled-garden of Fb, the fact that: a) people are contributing the increased wealth of a capitalistic companion through their use of the site and sharing of their personal data, b) because people mistake the news feed for reality, rather than targeted ads, news and discourse from within a narrow range of sources and opinions (e.g. socio-political views that only match their own) and c) because what people see in their feed is throttled by Fb (e.g. people don't see all of their 'friends' posts, just an algorithmically selected subset - yet most think they see 'everything'
1425	I don't think Facebook users take enough care about their privacy settings.
1426	I am concerned about the monopoly position of Facebook, and the power that goes with this position. For myself, I have chosen not to join Facebook.
1428	2 billion users is a lot of people,
1431	I am very concerned about the amount of private information that is available to and used by formal social networking sites and many programs and apps
1433	It can become the only company that stores people's personal data which can be used, in the long run, in any possible way.
1436	Monopolies are inherently dangerous. Facebook has emerged as the primary social network worldwide (except for China), but their policies around privacy, communication, harassment, and ethics still speak to their origins in Silicon Valley.
1437	We cannot just have people all clustered in one area, there has to be a choice for the reasons of security and so on.
1442	now I minimised my use of Facebook but I still have the account because I have friends there that I can contact only via facebook. definetly I am looking for alternative platforms to whatsapp.
1443	Facebook is a monopoly and does not respect people. It manipulates people's emotions and is responsible for boosting the hate in the world. It has not only economic implications but also political, cultural and of health consequences.
1448	A neutral, non-profit site would be better.
1450	Monopolies/monopsonies etc are not conducive to the public interest
1451	It appears to be a powerful monopoly. It's like a powerful psychopathic town gossip that has files on everyone using it. It sells those files for money and also damages people with its "features".
1452	Facebook has a massive database of human behaviour, and their main interest and allegiance is to making money. The commercial basis of Facebook concerns me and there needs to be better legislation. Ideally, there should be an open source SNS like eg Diaspora was meant to be.
1459	there are many other social platforms, among which people can choose
1460	The _network_ effects around social _network_ sites are very strong. This gives most users very little options to switch, leading to positions of market dominance.
1468	Facebook still makes it too difficult to separate activities meant for subsets of your personal network, e.g. work colleagues vs. personal friends. Furthermore, open communication among friends may end up reflecting badly on your work reputation, thus limiting your free expression.
1469	Facebook uses us as the product and farms out our data. I am a little concerned about what they might do with my data. I accept that as the service is free to me to use (no financial cost) then they will do something to generate income to provide this free service. I'd like to use it

	less but I continue to use it because (a) I sometimes am required to for work and (b) as many of my friends use it who live a long way away, it's a good way to keep in touch and see what they are up to. So I put up with the harvesting of my data, and my strategy is to minimise the personal data I add to FB.
1471	Facebook is a Networking platform. I like to see my friends, how they are doing and whats going on in my circle. I don't want to loose them and don't want to put too many restrictions which will hide me from world. At times very old and lost friends find me and connect with me. Its too valuable to stop this with restriction and limited privacy settings. Its life. And I personally have nothing much to hide. Its good to be seen and known the way I am.
1473	Too many people rely on Facebook for too much communication. But it's not Facebook's fault, it's theirs. Such users could seek news elsewhere and communicate in more personal and effective ways. The burden is on the consumer.
1474	I think that Facebook turned to be a monopoly monster using our data for making a profit and support the system that I personally fight against. The depressing part about Facebook is that it grew out of proportion, it has so many users and so much money and influence in the centres of power such as the European Commission, governments etc. It has become very difficult to put Facebook under any legislation or control. My impression is that majority of users are not aware of various violations of users' privacy, selling data for profit etc. Another thing is the Facebook mantra - "It's free and always will be." Well it is not free and it could be read as false advertisement.
1483	they have build already an monopoly which controls the public debate in many country very strongly
1486	On the one hand, the proliferation of "social"sites complicates one's life. On the other hand Facebook practices are obscure and worrying.
1487	run by americans, results in a flow of funds from poor countries to a rich one
1488	Monocultures are by their nature non resilient.
1500	It creates a monopoly situation and as such it becomes more powerful
1505	Facebook Salience and Pertinence is both its advantage and disadvantage As a comm scholar I don't have the option but being there. A complete majority of my colleagues, friends and students is there
1512	Facebook keep your life in a bubble filter and don't let you control what and in the order you want to see news or status. They permit now a greater control, yet totally insufficient
1515	I don't use Facebook myself, but I am tracked anyway.
1520	I am concerned that people are obviously loosing their sense for a right to privacy and data self-determination that is a prerequisite for a democratic society. I am concerned that people not only choose to carelessly give away their own data to institutions and corporations which the public has no control over whatsoever, but also other peoples data (think of photos or personal information in address books, calenders etc). Basic pillars of a democratic society are being deserted out of habit, complacency and laziness. Alternatives do exist, people even know, yet they seem to be unwilling or unable to make a collective change.
1524	Not concerned that FB is the most used social media platform, but they really should be less 'hands off' in allowing Islamist and far-right elements to have such a big presence, ditto Twitter and YouTube.
1538	It is very popular and well disign
1539	It is difficult to move away from using Facebook - the platform I have the most concerns about above any other - when all my friends are there and only there. No one has a personal website anymore. Every organization I want to keep in contact with, is there. Few update their websites or use email newsletters anymore. For some small businesses, I find better information on Facebook than on their website. Discussion groups have moved away from other online forums to Facebook groups. Event planning for so many things I'm involved in are on Facebook. So many friends and organizations would rather DM me on Facebook than send a text, call or email. If I leave the platform entirely, I lose so many personal, professional, hobby and interest communication channels. I'd be completely out of touch with long-ago colleagues and friends. Those few that have left are entirely absent in my life now. I wouldn't even know how to contact them now. I would not be able to RSVP for many events, both personal and professional.
1540	Concentration of power
1559	there is always a certain fear that a centralised service (e.g. a single provider, a single social media platform etc.) gains too much power which can be abused. the problem is that there is lack of accountability. I personally trust ISPs more than social media. a main reason is that ISPs are nationally regulated and have some restrictions. but if there would be only one central provider it may be more difficult to scrutinise this provider (which usually happens

	from other ISPs as well as from the regulator). The main service an ISP offers is access to information/ ICTs, but (at least currently) not to exclude certain content. a main part of the social media business model is exclusion and content filtering for e.g. ads. this is something completely different.
1563	This is a skewed question. Where is 'pleased', because it means I can find all my friends there?
1571	Though not all share the same views, such a quick access to the vast majority of people's family, ideas, interests, on the part of one company, person etc. is rather disturbing especially given this entity the opportunity to share this info with other public or private institutions.
1575	Not a serious communication and interaction platform
	Allows for uncontrolled populism
1581	I am not against data being collected and shared with security agencies, Facebook is an amazing platform that can provide that by having people give it all up themselves, which I don't believe anyone in national and international security would be interested of pictures with your dog, the issue lies with the security of those agencies themselves. If they collect all this data, one day, someone will be able to breach the security and bypass their firewalls and use that maliciously, as unlikely as it may sound, it is not impossible.
	As for Facebook being used by so many, in truth they were simply the ones to succeed. Over my life, since internet became easily available to everyone, there have been countless platforms that attempted to do in large what facebook does/is today but all have failed for one reason or another. Facebook deserves this success until a better competitor will come around and take that business.
1583	if no other socils media site is available , they can manipulate thenews.
1585	Creepy.
1588	The questions presuppose that the advertisements are a distraction. The easiest way for me to deal with them is to filter them out/ignore them which, just because that is the way I am, I find easy to do. I find them very occasionally irritating if I scroll over them accidentally but if, for example, they help news websites I engage with to survive I am quite happy to go on ignoring them. On Facebook (the others I do not use) I only use this because I am currently doing a course where communication with the others on the course is done through Facebook. Otherwise I ignore it and keep my own usage/information to a minimum. I am, generationally, a text and e-mail user with no wish to share my life with the rest of the world so can safely ignore most social media sites.
1590	I think Facebook is an amazing social media platform which connects all people around the globe and also spread love and peace among them.
1591	No thank you
1597	That everyone uses one platform, such as Facebook, mostly concerns me regarding the power Facebook holds in his hands thanks to all of our data. I don't think that Facebook is controlling the information stream in one or the other political direction - this depends on your friendship circle and connections.
1603	Facebook has a huge amount of personal data so a lot of people/organisations want to get their hands on it. It also means that advertisers want to be sure that they are advertised on Facebook - directly or indirectly through posting - and others - governments, social organisations, celebrities, etc - will want to be sure that they figure prominently on Facebook. This gives Facebook significant social and political power.
1607	WhatsApp is owned by Facebook => extreme monopoly, when it comes to data about each individual user
	All apps "generate" extreme rights for themselves, once the customer downloaded and agreed to their app: (using your camera, accessing your contacts and apparently even CHANGING your phone contacts, if they feel the need to do so) : I tried for a long time not to use Facebook Messenger. However, Facebook literally forces you to install the app: when using the browser to access Facebook, you cannot read any "private" messages (this example only accounts to smartphones), you get directly rerouted to the messenger app . After a certain time, I felt the need to install the app because it was so inconvenient.
1609	Sure there is a lot of shit on Facebook, however, it is still a good way to communicate with friends (especially via messenger). I don't know whether you could say one social media platform is better than the others, as they all have similar issues. Issues include things such as fake people portraying fake realities and fake news. However, i found when i was younger and didn't watch the News, it was a good place to see the most important world issues.
1614	It allows them to acess a lot of personal information which makes it easier for them to sell their product(their users) to other companies who would like to advertise themselves on fb. They even allow the company to choose their own target audience and more things.
1617	It's really common
1623	I am concerned that the vast amount of data that Facebook collects will be used in the future

	as a method of controlling the mass population and as a way to manipulate and influence opinions and choices.
1624	Facebook collects data on its users and sells it.
1626	While Facebook employs many methods of data harvesting, this doesn't concern me too much. I'm not a frequent user of Facebook and using adblock software I don't tend to see the effects of anything they may collect. However, considering most users aren't aware of how their data is used and what it is used for, I'm more concerned about their lack of knowledge over Facebook's intent to promote and sell us stuff.
1630	Social media is a paradoxical plague that must be stopped.
1631	memes
1639	Quite easy for hackers (see Russia, 2016 US Election - ongoing) to morph public opinion.
1643	The homogeneity in using a certain platform is suspicious at times but at the same time the generation has forced us to get involved because most of the information is online. I tried being off facebook for 6 months but once I returned to university I had no other option. The news, announcements, current media scenarios, everything is online.
1647	.
1651	They manipulate people opinion better than government-owned tv.
1654	Facebook is all about collecting data on its users. It has lost sight of its raison d'etre.
1687	Facebook's dominant position is a cause for concern in terms of its market dominance, its ability to influence news and information flows through the use of its algorithm, and the degree to which its platform has proved to be manipulable by political campaign groups. Facebook also has a significant impact upon advertising revenues for other media and content organisations,
1691	Concerned about concentration of information and lack of choice.
1714	Privacy issues, collective ideological filtering
1921	They harvest way too much data - we are not the customers, we are the product
1967	Facebook makes its revenue off of the monetization and exploitation of user data, yet most users are either unaware of this fact--or if they are, their online privacy is simply not a big concern. This is a concerning problem for me, as I have a number of long-distance friends who have indicated they would not be interested in pursuing a personal relationship through other, more open technologies (such as email) outside of Facebook. I am then faced with the dilemma in that if I wish to remain connected to these people, I must maintain a presence on Facebook.
1969	Too much information is stored in one place
2004	I am concerned about the socio-cultural impact that Facebook has on people: knee-jerk, short-term habits of thinking, the exposure to only the opinions you agree with (as far as the algorithms know) because the reason for doing that is profiteering. Facebook is here to make money, not to help society, and the fact that the company has this much influence on attitudes and cognition and so little accountability is distressing to me. TL;DR - Facebook seems to make people boring and selfish and it just doesn't care. I do use it for events organising though, and I find it useful for that.
2016	Facebook is terrible, although it's possible there could be even worse platforms. Facebook offers no real customisation of either content or layout and any illusory customisation is just to get better data for targeted advertising. Nobody really has control over the rubbish shown in the Feed and its ordering. It even continually suggests 'related' content of Pages you aren't even subscribed to. It just decides you are 'interested' in something with no regard to whether you like or hate it. So people are shown superficial, polarising content and/or meaningless rubbish that is viral. Just getting attention and reaction is all Facebook cares about in calculating relevance and popularity (rather than quality, nuance, meaning, or users' actual feelings or opinions) so it just shows things that get outrage or braindead agreement. If you click on something because you are outraged you will just be shown more of it as if you agreed. For example, Facebook kept showing me offensive sexist content for at least 18 months after 'Gamergate', even though I did not support Gamergate and don't know anybody who even had heard of Gamergate. Facebook's Reactions, such as Angry Face, are meaningless. Are we angry at or angry with? Angry at what? The story? The poster? It's the type of superficial 'self expression' that is only there to manage dissent. People click Angry Face and feel better (for example, on the page of a politician or brand) and actually it has no effect. I don't like that Facebook data (and social media in general) is used for research as if it's scientific. Data 'science' isn't real science! It's not a controlled experiment. It just gets dubious inaccurate data from who knows where and 'predicts' things based on superficial correlations and risks not proven causations. It's very dangerous if such 'risk' is used to calculate things about people for purposes of employment, insurance etc. e.g. they 'might' have a disease, be

	mentally ill, etc. Money is wasted on trying to 'predict' and 'diagnose' mental illnesses from people's Facebook and Twitter activity. It's like the Thought Police. I hate the general societal shift toward instrumental data science as if it's analogous to proven causation and controlled experiments.
2044	Maintaining a social network of millions of people for profit is not a good idea.
2050	I feel that we are being pushed into using this platform which is at best an advertising site, and at worst a platform that will increase the monopoly of big businesses.
2057	I am particularly concerned that people use Facebook as a source of news. I am a lecturer of International Political Economy and I became aware of how my students get their news from Social Media, and it is very disturbing the amount of counter-information that is published and not double-checked. Even the people that follow the social media of respected news outlets, they still follow bloggers or other types of websites that publish information that is really not confirmed scientifically, e.g. food blogs (where the owners are not nutritionists) or climate change deniers (that take the small part of information on which scientists are still looking for answers and use to base their assumptions that f they are not sure of 10% of the data, then all the rest is equally doubtful).
2068	I don't think it will last - before Facebook there was myspace and that disappeared. Plus I work with young people, every year, fewer of them have facebook accounts.
2069	I'm not concerned if most people use one organization's platform. It makes communicating with others easier but it raises the responsibility of the company providing this service to consider the possible security, privacy, and hacking concerns and take steps to reduce these risks.
2070	Facebook is one of the worst companies when it comes to the privacy of it's users.
2080	Too much power in one platform
2087	Facebook is about commynication.. easy, direct (get those notes from co-students-> pass the exams)
2089	Many people have created fake accounts on facebook in order to deceive other users so as to gain money, or worse.
2090	It' s a trend of the current era. Societies and people evolve so it is a normal fact.
2103	It's the first big social network and it's kind of easy to use.
2114	Facebook is a very useful and entertaining social network. I think that people should be more careful as to what they post and what information they give. I am concerned about the fact that once you create a profile it can never be erased.
2118	That's why I have no facebook account.
2122	It is logical
2136	too much data given to facebook
2140	A strongly centralised company such as Facebook, collecting such a vast amount of data globally is really terrifying. No such concentration of power should be allowed.
2146	Facebook manage all the info that tkaes from us for others perpuses, so most of people do not concern how this work and what kind of alliences facebook has done.
2149	Facebook has some political views I do not agree with, and they are not taking responsibility for the level of influence they have on people.
2153	As we have read many times, it's a platform that profits for every single action ones does (or doesn't) regardless of any privacy or security concerns. Moreover, it spreads fake news (or no news) without any concern. In sum, it doesn't seem to think it has any responsibility towards the users or more broadly, the world.
2175	Don't use facebook.
2227	The way Facebook uses data doesn't seem to be very clear and with their recent debacle with Fake News (initially ridiculing any accusation that they had any role to play in that before admitting that over 100 million people could have seen fake news articles being shared across Facebook) worries me about the fact that they don't seem to be able to admit real responsibility and acknowledge the role they have, not only as a business, but as a key mechanism in society, meaning I fear the way they use data may also be irresponsible.
2235	most of my foreign friends are use it.
2237	It provides good services and the majority of people are used to it.
2246	It is essentially a monopoly, but all social websites such as Instagram and twitter are monopolies in their specific niche. This however does not bother me as I use them all with care.
2253	I am focused more on the service provided by the social media.
2256	By definition, a social network site will have more value the more people are on it. Joining a social network without other users has no purpose.
2261	monopoly, too much access to data
2264	The fact that most people use it means that it's harder for people to switch to another social media and thus gives a lot of power to Facebook and allows them to change privacy rules almost as much as they want

2267	Facebook is currently gathering data on over 1 billion users, which means they have a tremendous amount of data they can dispose of (e.g sell to other companies)
2300	Too much personal information on line is a threat to democracy
2304	Because the concentration of information, and the abuses of being a bussiness monopoly

Field summary for QC12A

How do you feel about the fact that Google is the only search engine that most people use?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Not concerned (A1)	203	20.30%
Somewhat concerned (A2)	261	26.10%
Concerned (A3)	203	20.30%
Very concerned (A4)	290	29.00%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	43	4.30%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC12A

Field summary for QC12B

Please justify your answer

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	760	79.41%
No answer	197	20.59%

ID	Response
44	My only concern is that Google can control the results of my search. However, this problem is true for any other search engine.
48	There is the concrete risk that Google shapes people opinions by filtering the results of the web searches. Furthermore, there is the risk (actually, I guess it is already like that) that Google builds a profile of the user based on your searches and sells it to third parties (or uses it for other purposes).
49	mainly concerned with the use they do on my personal data and on my activity in internet: it violates my personal and universal rights on privacy.
50	Lack of competition is always bad
51	I do not see special drawbacks in this. Sometimes I tried other engines, but the quality of their results is usually quite poor (although even Google got worst recently)
61	Google is the only owner of the information concerning myself.
63	It works.
65	not interested
67	It could bias information and page visited, putting in the first places some pages he "prefers" or he has be payed for
68	The quality of the results are important, so there are practically no valid alternatives, and the collection of data related to searches may provide advantages to Google
69	I can use different search engines, if I want.
70	1) Lack of pluralism. 2) Too much "data power" to one company.
78	It gives google way too much power to dictate how the web needs to work. And with Chrome they are also start to influence the internet. TCP and UDP were good enough for the past 40 years. I do not yet see the real need to have QUIC to replace those.
81	Google could/can easily bias the opinion of people. Also, by doing search engine optimization it is possible to achieve a biased view for the average googler.
82	There is too much power concentrated there, without democratic control, with influence on our daily lives, society as we know it, and policymaking, if they want to. And often it is not even under my control, as friends using Google services reveal some of my data.
84	Same reason as for FB.
85	Stop forcing me to text!
86	it essentially defines truth these days, though google appears aware of (and working against) the problem
87	Many people are not aware of how Google creates a history of your searches, especially if you are logged in to your Google-Account, but cross-tracking also allowes to identify you otherwise. Google presents you with strongly filtered results that try to strengthen your current believes. Even if you are aware of this, it is often hard to escape your bubble and receive neutral search results.
88	Search engines determine what we find/see/access on the internet – at least for 90% of the people.
89	Google is the best search engine for many purposes. So it seems normal that most people use it.
90	search bubble
92	search engines are basically necessary to internet users
93	Alternatives exist, and are increasingly used
97	since Google's search algorithms aren't open-sourced, nobody knows if they really aren't manipulating/selling out search results as they claim in their slogan "don't be evil"...
98	Googles collects too many usage data, and tries to correlate them with data from other sources
99	There is an incredible value in the data that are collected from many users although not individually. I don't like that even this possibility could be given to some of the big player. My

	privacy is my privacy as a single or globally
104	same reasons
106	It's their choice.
108	Competition is good. However Google is by far the best tools (efficiency, functionalities). My concern is that advertisers must pay to appear in the very first pages. For some of previous questions and next questions : please analyze my answers via realizing that I never use facebook.
110	afraid of monopolistic gains, I recently switched to ECOSIA, but definitely half as efficient in the searches I'm doing. Confident it will all probably run smoothly for a time, and wishing more alternatives will spring.
111	see above
112	too much power for one / only few players
118	There is a "you don't lie to Google" aspect, which gives Google vastly detailed information of what the interests of its users are. There is also a filter bubble effect, with Google using that information to show people the results they want to see, not the results they should see to form an opinion. The political fallout of this has already become apparent.
119	I use google all the time, usually find it satisfactory, but would like to know more about alternative search engines
122	As above.
124	Accumulation of power and state-like powers.
125	On the one hand we are learning that there is. a monopoly effect in search. So the monopoly is understandable to a point. However, the monopoly in effect means that other competing search engines are crowded out and that the dominant engine becomes our gatekeeper.
126	Likewise.
130	I believe that google has an unprecedented mass of information, which surpasses any governmental agency in history
131	to much power
137	Both Facebook and Google should be regulated, as monopolies they should be subject to regulation and be broken up if they become too dominant.
138	I do not see the problem. It is free anyway, and if there were more providers it would not change anything.
141	Alphabet is one of the richest companies on the planet, right? It's not only a search engine, it's going to be our complete knowledge archive of the world, and it is in a private company's hand.
143	Google is an almost monopolist in the field of search engines in many Western countries. Especially the personalised search results may end in a filter bubble (in a lack of pluralism with respect to information sources).
149	Google search ensures that people searching online find opinions and information which reinforces their existing worldview, regardless of whether contradictory factual information exists. In that way, Google reinforces prejudices and assumptions, rather than challenging them with reasoned knowledge. The result is not a knowledge society, but an opinion society. Google is reversing the Enlightenement.
150	The usage by many people increases the quality of the search results (in terms of effectiveness) and makes it more difficult to establish a significant competitor, as well as driving other existing search engines out of business. Moreover, because of the nature of the search algorithms, the more people and the more usage both concur to narrow the "breadth" of the results, reducing the possibility to escape from our own "bubble".
154	very problematic monopoly position;
156	Possible risk: Monopoly of information
162	A monopoly may not be in the public interest
163	Their selection of search results is not transparent and they display commercial pages first. If Google is the only way we find information, they can be seen as an information monopoly.
164	Google data could be used for many positive but also negative outcomes - also the political use of Google data and Google political motivations are not fully positive - so it would be better if the data were not all owned by one organisation.
170	why should I?
171	Use alternative search engines that do not track.
175	Idem
176	Google's influence on how people see the world is too large
178	Lack of credibility
181	Google as a monopoly can control (in terms of ranking sites) what users' should be reading

	and not reading.
183	It's difficult to tell what private information is available through Google tools and services.
184	It is certainly not the only search engine!
186	I've tried multiple search engines over the years, Google is my favorite.
187	same as Facebook above.
188	This is some big crap too! I tried to use other's, but usually they did not offer the precision (and probably I'm also quite used to the interface etc., given that Google has been the one constant in internet use since the early 2000s).
189	I think that Google is very good, but it is somewhat of a monopoly and has too much power over what it does with private information.
194	With the general lack of information literacy, and determining good and relevant information from convenient information, it is troublesome that most folks are using a search engine that can be gamed, and where the first results can be bought, instead of representing the best answer for an individuals question.
195	There should be several available, so that one can have searches delivering different results. Now whatever Google gives through its algorithms we have to make do
196	ditto
197	Google also collects and uses users data in non-transparent ways. There is no option to use Google without this happening.
198	There's potential for misuse by Google but there's also some degree of control by the people
199	See previous answer
201	Because of all the collective and individual data it collects, and the lack of control that users have and overall secrecy and opacity of the control mechanisms unseen by users.
202	It is almost as if internet/the web is entirely in the pockets of Google. If you dont have any special skills or any knowledge of any other ways of aquiring information through internet you go through google. It is obvious when you google nowadays (as compared to 10 years ago) that Google has refined their algorythms to direct people into certain categories of thought. Something like so: First page-conventional sponsored sites; Second page-"dodgy" alternative sites lacking in meaning and often void of political content.
207	Google prevents competition by controlling the market and therefore has a negative influence on a free market.
208	It is in general not a good idea if one company decides under opaque circumstances and their own rules what whole societies can find and what they cannot find. I also have the concern that people are in fact not able to use the web anymore, that they cannot find anymore without Google. Third concern is that Google was and is complicit in some countries (like China) in censorship actions.
209	See the comment above.
211	intrusive data pratices
213	Is an option. There are several Search Engines that are amazing. Looking for academic stuffs or articles for instance, I know where to go to rather than Google.
214	See above and add to it the increased collection of GPS and fitness/life data.
216	I use it myself
217	Monopoly of knowledge in the hands of a company whose data is and has been used by US secret service....enormously powerful. Could, and probably does, manipulate of information, markets, elections and research (many universities use google mail service nowadays!) worldwide.
218	It is still the best search site out there, which of course is "them" knowing several of my interests. However, if it's necessary, i know how "go dark", regarding google.
223	Information bubble and personal tracking
224	When something is not on Google - it does not exist. Also - Google has already been e.g. promoting its own services by ranking them high in search results.
226	Most people do use Google directly and reveal very personal information which is stored and commercially used. They might pay that bill years later by not getting a proper health ensurance anymore or so.
228	Same as above
229	filter bubbles controlled by google / total intransparence
231	Avoid monopoly!
232	Monopolistic. As above, the ability to cross-reference search behaviour with data and projects in health, military, intelligence, education etc. Too much power for one organisation. The algorithms that drive search now seem to me to be 'essential services'. Being online is necessary for individuals for a whole host of social, cultural and educational reasons, as well just performing the basic functions of modern life. I don't see why people should effectively be compelled to use a service that harvest personal data. The innovation contained within search algorithms should be broken up and exposed to competition.
233	Again, it is what it is. Google is good at what it does. It's the price you pay for using these

	services. If you don't want your info to be used in such ways, don't use the services.
236	In the search engine services the potential competion with the big players can be an alternative
238	I'm a little less concerned because I could live with there being a small number of SEs, and indeed one dominant SE. I'm not sure competition between SEs is necessarily useful, but again for the same reasons as above I'm concerned because these services ought to be publicly owned and collectively controlled. I.e. by confiscating them from their current owners and placing them within a UN institution framework, for example.
239	We are delegating the organization and search of humanity's knowledge to a private company with economic interests that affect the way content is provided
240	Examples on issues such as Brexit and Holocaust Denial show how users are directed to more of the same. This is unhealthy for democracy.
241	What if tomorrow Google is in the hands of some bad guys? what alternative do we have? I don't know and I am concerned that I don't know. I am concerned that Google is a network of so many different applications and services, through which they connect so many different aspects of our lives. PS I am not very sensitive to the different questions you ask. I tend to answer the same because I don't perceive the differences. PPS : I hate advertisments but I am conscious that if there was no advertisement I would have to pay. I am afraid my willingness to pay is lower than my willingness to endure ads.
242	All our data is kept in one place
244	They profile and select information depending on our profile. They digitlize lots of books and prevent free and totally open access even if they got the hole file.
245	It's almost an unaccountable monopoly which doesn't give users sufficient control over their data and privacy and it makes unreasonable amounts of money out of users' data.
251	too much power to on company
256	As above, but mores as Google can skew results with ease.
259	Google is better than other options and I know how to optimize my searches to get the results I need. Why should people use something inferior?
261	I worry that t has too much power - however most of its services would be open to competition in principle.
264	The use of a search engine isn't an issue, is the collection of data related to google accounts that is more concerning
266	Similar to the above, never a good thing for a dominant player in the market to the near-exclusion of everyone else. They collect vast amounts of and know too much about us.
268	It's always good to have good choices.
270	people are waking up to other search engines like Ecosia. Google is also not so evil as it could potentially be. If Google were truly evil, we would be in trouble.
272	I dislike the dominance, and advocate more targeted search engines (Google Scholar, although this is still Google) to my students, as well as a number of databases that my institution gives access to.
275	As an academic, knowing that there are different ways of finding information is important and overreliance on a single approach / mediator is bad practice.
276	Indexing results of a search is maybe the least neutral/value-free action you can do, so Google has a monopolistic position on which are the relevant data people can find. Even if you are skilled in what you're looking for, there is the risk of being "caged" inside a precise world-view.
281	Same as above
287	No problems, really. They haven't abused their advantage yet, in my opinion.
288	Control on information.
289	I think Google is an incredible platform, though advertisements and privacy violations are serious problems.
292	See above. The ability of Google to bias results and privilege one source over another (plus the data issues) creates, in effect, a closed market. "Net neutrality" does not exists where there is a monopsony/monopoly context.
294	Because it limits the variety and in contrast to Facebook a search engine is kind of a gate to the online world you need to actively search for information
296	Google is a great tool, and more needs to be done to help people understand what google can do, and how to protect their own information on line
297	Of course, if people would use many different search engines, that would mean that they have a more aware and critical approach to information retrieval. Unfortunately there is no such awareness in general, and very few good alternatives to Google. Also, Google algorithm is getting worst everyday, especially in terms of so called "personalization" of the search results, which is based in a wrong interpretation of the users habits.

299	I don´t really see what would change if people used more the other available search engines.
303	better than Baidu
304	It's a good search engine.
305	Google has been deteriorating. They have other interests. They also only index a very small fraction of the web. They point is that people don't really care. If they did, they would organize an alternative.

Begin with what people want and put time into? |
| 306 | I must say I tried many other search engines and have not really found any that produced satisfying results, though there are of course some work-around search engines, that use Google indirectly. I am more concerned about many other aspects of Google, like personalized search results etc. |
| 307 | It effectively gatekeeps the internet, giving it tremendous power |
| 308 | Google is one of the most innovative technology companies, which I believe will contribute to a dynamic global economy.

Their business model is highly diverse shown by the multitude of products and services they offer e.g. Gmail, Google Maps, Google Translate. |
309	Monopoly
314	As above
315	Unfortunately it's the best, but I would use another one
316	It is a private profit making
Business.
317	No monopoly on this scale will end well. It gives unprecedented power to a non-democratic organisation.
318	Misuse of data to an unknown extent
319	It should be either (inter)nationalized or at least heavily scrutinized by whatever technocrats want the job.
321	As above, Google actively extracts knowledge from communities and spreads the silicon valley toxic hegemony globally. (yet claims to do no evil, so that is good right?). I do not support training their next-gen drone fighters to recognize helicopters through recaptchas.
325	Google profiles its users based on their knowledge of the use of their entire ecosystem of applications and services. These profiles are used by Google in ways that are invisible to the affected users and may include being shared with commercial and government entities. While Google claims to keep most of this data in-house, their ecosystem is so vast, that means the information is shared with many thousands of strangers. Google also fashions search results based on these profiles, offering a limited view of the world based on the goal of satisfying user preferences instead of providing an accurate or truly helpful picture of the world. Unlike a library, which is curated by (hopefully) well-meaning information stewards, Google simply offers whatever information is believed to be desired by users without concern for how users build their knowledge of the world.
326	Google often promotes useless ads when I am using an APP
328	It performs better than some of the other well known search engines. My only concern is the private data collection and circulation. For example - gmail profile details. However, there are options to keep your details from sharing, but it is not very affective.
330	As a centralized system, it can gather far too much of a profile of its individual users...
331	Presumably, the dominance of one search engine is tantamount to acceptance of one algorithmic structure, which narrows possible search outcomes
332	Search engines can control the type, amount and quality of information people gain access to. That gives them a lot of influence over what the population believes and values.
333	Edges out competitors, so we do not have a choice in how we find information.
336	Google controls what we see thru search and that's a problem.
338	Yahoo sucked as a search engine. Bing is there. As are other search engines.
343	Duck Duck Go is a good alternative but they don't have the same resources as Google so fail to evolve at the same pace.
344	Google's algorithms can affect the way information is presented to people, reaffirming existing biases.
345	In my view the problem is not Google itself, but Google as a capitalist firm. It would be fantastic as a collective, democratic, company. I find their services really more useful than Facebook, for instance.
348	Again, too much control of data
349	Nothing to be worried but more worried about this survey
353	Because that make Google the "big boss" of all kind of information.
354	Same as with facebook. Personally I do not use google for search. I do have a google email account, but i slowly reduce to minimum.

356	There are a unique point of view in our time because every body accept the first answer they received. Orientated and manipulated public opinion destroy democracy by uniformity and lack of reflection
360	I think it gives Google the power to shape the "public opinion" pr at lest, orient it.
366	The google is oligopoly - there are other search engines, but Google is also having many other digital and internet related services, such as android OS, YouTube, Chrome etc, it is integrating other digital companies, it integrates vertically and horizontaly and is getting more powerful. Most worrying is that Google (and Facebook) are intermediaries that are stealing advertisements from classical media, making classical media economically unfeasible, especially newspapers and magazines.
375	Google's dominance in the search engine field means it gathered and gathers obscene amounts of data of its users, therefore having a specific in-depth information on all of these individuals that it uses for optimizing advertisement and limiting choice. It's predominance is also not healthy for independent websites and consequently independent and alternative information to the mainstream media, governments and corporations.
378	There must be a limit to the control that corporations exercise from the information of the people.
379	Political extremists have been able to game Google's search systems in order to spread misinformation. However, I am not more concerned because in cases where such problems have been identified Google has worked to resolve them.
380	Their search rankings are better than DuckDuckGo or Bing, but I try to use to mix it up.
381	My only concern is that Google's algorithms are vulnerable to both intentional and unintentional introduction of bias. Google has commercial interests that might be promoted by such bias, regardless of other values related to those commercial interests.
383	I don't believe that "google is the only search engine" most people use. Perhaps certain age groups and/or individuals who have not encountered any kind of information literacy training do... I use Start and DuckDuckGo; so do friends, colleagues, and the students I teach (I'm in the US).
384	Google's dominant role in search and the lack of transparency in algorithm design places it in an extremely powerful position. Of perhaps greater concern is its dominant role in pay-per-click advertising that draws income out of traditional media and content economies.
387	The scope for misuse of Goggle is extensive. Without reliable alternate options it may be impossible to tell when search responses are shaped by corporate drivers, and/or what content is not presented.
388	It's practically a monopoly and brings with it all the problems associated with monopoly
390	There are other sites that provide this service, like Duck Duck Go, and those can be used.
393	that makes Google powerful but does not necessarily harm society. Besides people Google because of its reliability and quality. If another seaarch engine can provide similar results people would love to use it.
394	Monopolis are never good.
395	If the EU itself has trouble batteling its supremacy, tax dodging tactics, privacy violations, etc... poor us.
397	In my opinion, the main problem is that people usually know very little about the logic behind a Google search. It is a very sophisticated and useful product. And as they say, since it is free the users are also products... Comparing a search results of Google and an anonymous search engine (or a Google search in anonymous circumstances) is really interesting.
401	Nothing outside Google exists. That is quite a power.
405	Again, people are largely unaware of the extent to which their data is collected in using these services.
406	Concerned - more from the facto what people are missing out on - as well as the info Google are racking up on the individual
407	Same as above
409	/
410	Google seems to be the best. It is only a route to information, being concerned would be like being concerned if most people used Yellow Pages and not Thompson Local.
411	Google is that engine we used to get information from. Even we ask our collegues to "google" and it becomes a generic service even if we will use an alternative engine.
412	Google has the power to shape our world, push us to filter bubbles and the winner-takes-it-all economy
413	Don't see any reason to be concerned.
414	Giving one company that much power over what information is accessible feels incredibly dangerous
415	Consolidation and commodification of personal information through user convenience.

416	Search engine effect - ranking order swings opinions. Ranking can be gamed, as seen in SEO industry and demonstrated by domination of alt-right sites. Naive trust - technololgists believe rankings are "objective" and some believe God directs them by chosing what is listed first
417	We need a search engine that provide enough and good data.
418	Excessive power as a provider of search services and concerned about the amount/use of data about every aspect of user lives, and how this is/could be used.
419	I think that Google use information only for trading purpose.
421	It appears to me to be an unregulated monopoly that is abusing its market dominance.
428	Google finds me what I'm looking for. That's all I care about. Bing doesn't find me all that much.
429	Again, Google has become a key portal to the entire Web but makes no secret of its curation practices that are intimately linked to its own commercial needs and political agenda.
431	Google not revealing its search algorithm creates unaccountable search filter bubbles that are different for different people without them even being made aware of it. It also knows too much about people's profiles, habits and networks.
434	I have previously trusted Google but now I am beginning to wonder.
435	As with Facebook - Google can collect too much data about too many people and so be in a position to make connections that could seriously threaten privacy, and be subverted by a more dictatorial state.
436	It is for a reason - it works best. It permeated our culture and 'Google' became a synonym for internet search. People can easily switch to other search engines - the fact that they don't is just a result of a sheer quality difference
438	again, the same concern as Facebook (answer above). Concerns for privacy aside, their gatekeeping potential is quite scary. e.g There was an article in the Guardian about how Google search autocompletes or suggests keywords or search terms which was related to fascism.
440	It's a matter of habit.
442	When Google has a good competitor or even competitors, users will have choices and then go for the better.
443	The interface is easy. So I am one of those "most people"!
445	I'm concerned because of the opacity of Google's algorithm more than its ability to collect data, though both are concerning.
448	same as above
449	Marketing, state surveillance, and over-control.
454	Same as the above on Facebook
455	It would be nice to have other choices that are as effective in a general manner.
457	a basic anti-trust problem.
460	Concentration of power, control over knowledge
467	I think google is the platform and the search engine that most people use. I think google knows more about us than we do, since it accumulates information permanently about us.
471	Google has done a good job
472	Once again, is just a brand, it doesn't make me any difference. In the past was Yahoo, now it's Google, maybe in a few years, it would be something else.
473	Google really is a superior search technology and the other services of Google are amazing, too. So it is no wonder that many people use it. But i also am concerned about Google being a monopoly and determining my view of the world...
475	This gives a tremendous power to a one company: Google becomes the goggles, through which we see and understand the world.
478	I am not sure it is optimal or good enough
480	There are other options as well. But I use Google because it´s somehow the best (fast and so on)
482	Because Google occupies a monopoly position.
483	Lately Google has been prioritising ads in its search results, and that gets in the way of my experience.
486	Google is liaised with the US security
489	Again, mass of data protects anonymity. Google has good search algorithms if you know how to use good search terms.
492	Google is the most easy and convenient search engine i have used so far and i heavily relay on Google to search for online information. Again, what most other people do is least of my concern.
494	Creating a monopoly on how information is shared and found gives too much power to one corporation
495	The information of so many people is falling into their hands, into one place. That means they also hold a tremendous amount of power and influence. Who's to say they will use it for good

	purposes or at least neutral ones
496	Again, the problems is not the fact that it is an efficient search engine but the issues discussed above. (Plus the lack of transparency of its algorithm, which you seem to have missed out on in your questions.)
500	There are enough alternatives to make switching possible if Google becomes a bad actor, so I not too concerned. Search doesn't have nearly as strong network effects and is not a natural monopoly like social media
506	Biased search results that protect corporate interests. Privacy is not guaranteed.
507	there is no single area where monopoly is good
508	It's never a good idea to concentrate power in any entity.
510	Google has been reliable and useful.
511	I'm aware there are others people use
512	beyond democratic control
513	I don't think it makes a difference which search engine you use or how many are available.
515	I like Google
517	We need to use other search engines. I'm concerned that google has become a verb in common parlance! Google certainly are good at what they do and are an excellent search engine. But I loved Google when it appeared circle 2000!! How things change.
523	I am concerned that corporations are taking over the business of elected governments.
524	Again, gives them an incredible amount of spying power over the private thoughts of the entirety of society.
529	Leads to the possibility of manipulating the market in information
530	there should be more alternatives
531	We need competition - Google is too powerful - it considers it is above the EU laws on privacy.
533	I think Google is fantastic.
534	I do not trust on the google's algorithms, in particular, google's news algorithms. I don't know who are they supporting but I can guess, what I really don't know is to who are they putting aside.
536	I think Google are pretty good. Other search engines seem to have a lot more ads.
542	A monopoly about the approach towards information is never good. But our governments have so far failed in financing, building and providing non-commercial, alternative tools. Neoliberalism is the biggest problem here, not Google!
543	It's somewhat concerning there is no good alternative to Google at the moment.
544	There used to be a time when you could use a variety of search engines, e.g. ask jeeves, yahoo, bing, google. Now it's only google and what concerns me is how ingrained it has become into our everyday culture. Dont know something? "Ask Google".
545	Google is NOT the only search engine used, which suggests that if people are dissatisfied with Google, they can and do look elsewhere. If anything this, index of humanity, that Google is almost forming is a hugely positive thing for the spread of information, communication amongst humanity. It is a greatest of levelers, allowing people across the globe to be as informed as each other.
548	When a service like Google becomes synonymous with the activity of searching for information on the web itself, that's when you know something went wrong along the way. It starts off with the fact that Google is primarily in the business of advertising which means data is harvested from users. On the other side of the equation, websites start competing on being the most visible which also might involve heavy sums of money being forked over. Personalization of search results is another damning aspect of Google's practices.
550	It is easy and dependable
557	For the same reason as above.
559	There are better alternatives like DuckDuckGo around for some years now. Google is just a data-harvesting machine
562	This gives Google a route to distort purchasing, distort news, influence democracy, sensor content, and otherwise manipulate a large swathe of the population. They also have the opportunity to form a view on which sites people interact with, and infer demographics etc.
564	Doesn't worry me.
568	Again, if Google, delivers what people want, they will continue to subscribe to it so i should not feel too concerned. Google develops their brand in so many ways, browser for children, indigenous language browser and so on, naturally people will use them.
566	See: data profiling.
567	Generally, not concerned, again a matter of choice and freedom means to be careful and

	responsible first in front of you, it depend on your personal value system, the companies will always use your data for their commercial purposes, on the one hand, and on the other you choose to pay them and to use or not to use or to what extend to use the services they are providing; I am a communicator and do not want to be an isolate. This is one of the approach. However, I am concern what may happen if we as human beings do not have any moral attitudes about what is going around us, we must live together and it seems to me that sooner or later some moral rules will regulate this system, whatever it may mean.
571	Google controls mostly which parts of the internet are "visible" to users. As "THE" search engine, Google is a primary target for government regulations. So search results are routinely censored for the audiences of many countries by IP address space of said countries.
578	We often need to get our information from a variety of sources.
587	Its a horror that Google knows what I am searching in the net. (I try to avoid google by using and promoting other search engines). Especially, Google wants to manage al human knowledge, but maniputlates by personaliziong answers.
588	Google has many information about everybody from different services (e.g. Gmail).
589	Like Facebook, Google have been and are collecting a huge amount of behavioural data, which has put them in a position of considerable power, considering that new applications of how this data can/will be used are still emerging. They are for-profit corporations, so the ultimate motive for making use of this data will be generating/protecting company profits. Besides, Google control the access to information for a large portion of the world's population. Through this, they could choose to make certain kinds of information disappear, and their algorithms are ripe for manipulation by malicious actors, as is happening already with various far-right propagandists.
592	Again, it's a monopoly thing. And new entrants to the market cannot compete.
593	Google is a case of even greater concern than Facebook. The search engine part of its business represent but a fraction of its 'presence' in our daily lives and such immense power (and the negotiating strength it gathers when discussing with regulatory authorities) will always be detrimental to pluralism, transparency and civic autonomy.
596	I don't like the idea that Google responds to searches that it thinks are relevant....I don't like it having a monopoly.
597	Google had the best algorithms during the key period in the internet's expansion/global take up, therefore it's rise to dominance is completely understandable.
598	Again: too much power in just a few hands.
600	I don't believe in making people rich from what should be public service!
602	Google is more useful than facebook
603	Google filters answers based on user data which can lead to biased results.
604	I like compatition
605	I wouldn't say it is a matter of high concern for me
612	Good results and use it for all searching.
613	It is what I use and they are the most well known
614	It is a good search engine. But the concern relates to the fact that they store use, share and store my information
615	Monopolies are never good
616	Monopolisation of search engine services erases privacy-friendly alternatives to switch to and find friends and concentrates social power.
617	Results are tedious and Google decides what can be found. They do not honor my privacy at all.
618	Again, the coordination problem in game theorey.
620	There are options out there if you want them.
629	(1) You cannot get access to the service without signing their Ts&Cs (2) Not totally subject to EU laws (3) No way of knowing what they do with my data
634	The same as with Facebook: the level of power that it has, and the amount of data about people that has stored. It is like a supranational State.
636	information and choice control
638	Google/Alphabet is not just a search engine. It is probably more powerful (and sustainable?) than Fb. People on Fb know they are on Fb. People on google believe that it is 'the internet' or, at least, the only access point.
639	There are alternatives, so it remains a matter of choice.
640	I think it is a clear and useful search engine.
644	I don't think this is conducive of a trust worthy relationship with the internet as it leaves it vulnerable to editing the results for a) advertising / business revenue or b) political gains. If people are only using one search engine, it could be open to all kinds of interventions from perhaps the share holders or associates. Not saying this happens, but it could be more open to corruption.

645	Google is 'Big Internet' and cares nothing for anything except power and profit. It needs to be broken up, like big oil in the early 20th Century.
649	Google has become univerally accepted as the go-to search engine because it works very well. I feel that the way that results are weighted has so far been controlled and has not led to undesirable consequences. Other search engines are available.
651	Again, all tied to one platform, potential for abuse is very high.
653	I use ecosia which is a not for profit which plants trees. The dominance of google is problematic particularly because of the lack of intervention into rightwing gaming f the algorithms
654	It is in a dominant position and can be seen as an information gatekeeper.
659	Again, monopoly is always a bad thing.
664	See above.
665	See previous. "Don't be evil" - lol.
666	Using just one provider means information providfed can be controlled and the user is getting just one view of what is available. The monopoly is plain and simply wrong
668	Google and Facebook are a basis for postmodern capitalism social relations. It seems people won't be able to exist and to communicate without them =) So, competition at the global market will create more amount of aggressive advertisements. At local markets, most people use not only Facebook (i.e. in Russia we use Vkontakte social network, which is more user-friendly and thus more popular).
670	As above ... a lot of private knowledge in the hands of a corporation
678	The rankings are manipulated. Should be a public service.
680	It gives them a virtual monopoly and too much power to control what we see on the internet - they can effectively censor our knowledge
688	monopoly having a significant power on people's life, intermediating social and economic relationships . (completely agree with Brandeis "curse of bigness")
692	Centralized and monopolized power, formidable implications of data, issues concerning advertising placements
693	DDG is almost always good enough
699	There are alternative options readily available.
702	Search engines have tremendous power to curate our experiences. I feel that there should be more transparency in terms of how the search results are generated. It seems that again, because of their size and power, that they aren't really answerable to individuals.
703	none
707	There are others, people are free to choose the one they like best
710	Market concentration
711	If Google offers the people just what they want, then its no concern they have most people using it.
712	There are others, but in general, google is a good alternative, instead of the amount of surveillance they had, because people in general are not concerned at all.
715	There cannot be adequate controls of Google's monopoly
717	For the last one? Why should I've concerned?
718	Monopoly and possible abuse of monopoly
720	There should be a variety of search engines.
723	As above.
725	They provide a free service that just works and they are always improving it. When someone creates a better engine, then people will use it.
726	Dominance has lead to possibly skewing what gets found but the services are great so it's a quid pro quo I guess
727	Firefox is just as good, even better in some cases. Google and Flash player... what more can I say?
730	Making money from its users
736	Google is not really the only search engine used by people. Yohaoo, DuckDuckGo, etc
740	They are robust enough with the best algorithm to get you what you almost immediately
746	There are pros and cons. It is the only search engine because it finds you exactly what you are after. Maybe it needs to filter personal details instead of too much information on you.
749	Same as above, with google dominating the market they have a great amount of power, motive and the opportunity to influence public opinion instead of encouraging an open dialogue.
750	There are competitors not meeting the need
751	They are where they are because of their marketing plans and business plans. They deserve to be where they are.
755	Because of its user base, Google knows everything about everybody!.
759	Google is also a monopolist and has access to too many data sources

764	Unlike social media, which could be completely decentralized technically (it only does not happen because big companies make so much profit from data mining), a global search engine *needs* to be centralized. So I am concerned that Google does so much profiling for ad targeting and search result ranking (bubbles!), but not so much that it is a big global entity. Search is one of the few cases that justify centralized operation to some degree.
766	asasasass
768	Little boxes on the hillside
769	Google engine is by far the best in terms of efficiency and number of results; there is sadly a tradeoff between what the user discloses by himself in his searches and what is the potential benefit of such a free service. It would be great if other search engines, even payed ones, would be able to reach even 80% of Google engine functionalities.
771	By being a monopoly Google has great power over what people see, how they form opinions, what is visible online and by manipulating user's data that effect their privacy.
772	Other products exist but helping people make informed decision is challenging ..
773	Again, people have the right to chose what they want, and they will probably chose what is easiest and relatable. The fact that Google is more of a monopoly speaks to it's design. If something better comes around people will use it.
776	Google is storing enormous amounts of data and tracing evry possible research done by evry single user
778	It a single company has full control on which information people can access, and acts as a gate between people and information, it can possibly manipulate people's opinion, hide some true information and spread false information.
779	This is one of the most concerning things for me relating to the internet - the primacy of Google search engine. Their search engine determines what becomes the norm, the status quo, across so many domains. It privileges pages from certain companies and certain types of pages. In effect, most of the search results are very useless - for example, if one wants to find a hotel website it is difficult on Google, because instead companies come up with their results, like trip advisor, booking.com etc. This just reconfirms their primacy over and over, and it is difficult to get beyond these kind of booking engines, or also the question-answer type sites and really find what one is looking for. And ironically i still use Google, I guess out of habit, laziness...
780	To much informations given to a single company.
782	Again, people do not realise how much Google knows people and what it can do with all the collected data.
784	see my answer about Facebook, it is almost the same
790	Google control the search results, favouring themselves and disadvantaging others.
791	Monopoly creates dependancy
792	For the same reasons as Facebook
796	I could say the same thing that I said for Facebook. Monopoly, information selection, etc.
797	big brother.
798	Yep
799	In some regions Google is not the only search engine that most people use. I, myself, use both Google and Yandex
803	I am not concerned about the most used platform.
801	I'm concerned because of the massive power that places in the company's hands. Whatever Google's intentions, it has become a major player in the construction of reality and the production of knowledge in the anglophone world.
806	Other search engines do not match the characteristics that Google has built into its algorithm, making it a natural first choice for many.
807	the same as FB in terms of how much information Google knows about users, especially that they connect this to info they get from Gmail and other applications. so it's very scary to link all these information together. it's like standing naked in front of people you never know, and can use this information they know about you against you
808	AS young people are now using Google to find information, they are losing the ability to use other methods. This gives Google a great deal of power over what information is most accessible. SO the question is how much you trust that company.
811	It is somewhat concerning, it gives it a a huge knowledge and as a consequence a great power
814	Because it controls the information flow (my biggest concerns do not relate to the commercial information, but to other kinds of information).
815	I try not to use Google as my search engine but you cannot get away from it completely, or at least I do not know how to.
819	Google is too powerful and is literally the internet. If they, and they have, decided that your e.g. YouTube channel was okay one day, but then not the next, you can be deprived of both

	income (closing monetisation) and influence (limiting your searchability, so you don't get picked up in searches). It becomes too easy for powerful forces either governmental or commercial or socially active institutions to persuade it to do as they are told, thus shutting down democratic plurality. Where are such voices now heard? This is why we need alternative ISPs, and internet companies that can offer alternative routes into the public sphere.
828	Too much personal data collected.
829	Like Facebook, they're an abusive market-dominant player.
832	Total abuse of users' data. I'm using (mostly) duckduckgo
835	Non mi piace che sia un monopolio, però funziona e non me ne preoccupo molto
837	Same. Market power. In this case, largely due to the quality of the product, but there is an economy of scale (of ad dollars in particular) which creates a difficult path for any competitors, though.
838	I worried about its algorithms because most users dont know how it works, and I am worried that it may keep users in a bubble by only bringing up results that it predicts is helpful for them. There is arisk of not being able to reach out to information that one is not previously informed. I also worry about users and organizations with lower levels of digital literacy to make themselves visible an accesible on the web.
841	Google is one of the new oligarchs in the digital age. They are amassing a large amount of data on user preferences, tastes, tendicies. It is very disconcerting.
842	It is a rather disturbing monopoly.
843	I have no issue with Google really, apart from that the ads are annoying, but you can just ignore them. Just because Google finds something when you do a search doesn't mean you have to click through and see it - you choose what you want to look at from the results. I've heard that Google self-promotes its own sites to the top when you do a search, but I don't always go for the top result, it depends what I'm looking for. I feel I have much more control than I do with something like Facebook, where you are putting stuff out there about yourself.
845	Again, it has become too powerful holding a lot of information about its users. I am not sure what control measures are in place with regards to goodle, how they are policed.
847	I think its the search engine which gives best results, but I do wonder what the filter bubble actually do with people. Do we only see what Google thinks we want to see?
849	Google makes developments in technology that I actively use and would like to see succeed further. I am not convinced that the competition would do a better job and I am not interested in slowing the rate of informational technology advancement in the name of high morals about a freer and less corporately controlled internet.
852	I hope google uses information correctly
854	You get spoiled because Google works so well, but I am mot fully aware of what is behind
857	same... I personnally use it as little as I can.
858	It's a tool. It's free. If you want privacy there's other options. No one is forced to use Google.
860	Google's domination is a kind of people manipulation by collecting personal data and search influence (through suggestions)
862	because Google can find out every details of users, public and private. it is matter matter of gathering the information..
863	Google retains a monopolistic power in advertising and is able to profit hugely from the client data without any meaningful regulation especially in US.
868	Cause of my permanent use of Google
869	De facto monopoly, filter bubble
870	Competition would be nice, but every single other player (even big ones, like Microsoft) demonstrated time and time again that they simply cannot fix their shit. I usually find the needed answer in the first half page of Google's results, sometimes the answer is in the excerpt! Bing? I'd be lucky to find the same answer in the second page for some strange queries. Errors in orthography? Google finds the result just fine. Bing? How about zero (0) results...
876	I don't mind if the majority of people use the same search engine as long as there is free flow of information and people have access to all of them without discrimination.
877	Most people don't appreciate just how much Google knows about their customers. The Snowdon leaks might have changed this and made people switch search engine or self-censor their searches/internet activity. The fact is almost everyone searches for things that they wouldn't share or want to share with any company/advertiser/friends/family. Look at the AOL search results release to see what this (annonymised? - Ha!) data tells about people.
878	people don't understand the risks involved with systemic profiling on a global level
880	Again the almost monopolistic situation worries me. As well as the power this company had. I tried to use alertnative search engine. But it's hard to give up the habit of using the options

	google provide.
883	Similar answer to the question before.
884	They monopolise the market and use this to promote their own services. However, their services tend to be quite good...
885	I already responded to this question
886	A single entity should not have the power to control what people find on the internet
887	Most people do not use tools preventing fingerprinting of past searches which means that google tracks their behaviors and can re-use the data for their own purposes.
888	I think having a single search engine could even improve the search results, because most of the people search for the same things.
891	Activities of netizens are controlled by one organisation, which is susceptible to misuse and abuse
893	Google is the best search engine in my view so I see why there are concerns about it being the most used, but I can also see why it is.
894	I think it's better to use different systems also for giving Google less chances to use information about the customers
898	Google may skew their results
899	google is a for-profit company that sells user's data, searches and so on. They collaborate making generalised 'profiles' of people that in some cases leads to further discrimination, depending on arbitrary data. They position elements according to their own key that is susceptible to economical influence. By having almost total power to decide what information is visible and which is not, they can shape public opinion, censor or facilitate, as what they consider beneficial for their own purposes.
901	I'm very concerned that to access most of the information we want on Internet we depend on a big blackbox that "does lots of things". We don't know if we are being censored, if they are spying on us, ... As a search service of "everything" that is digital they have great power on our lives
902	People won't see the evil from google tracking, on the contrary people love that google knows everything about them, people feel it like magic and the love it. I think it kills privacy but people values more the service than the privacy, sad but true!
910	Google decides what I have to see. Echo chamber. Filter buble.
911	They know interests of everybody, even diseases you where Not even talking about to a doctor.
912	As i know what to reveal to google and what not, that's fine by me.
913	While a non distributed system allows for censoring Google still has a far superiour algorithm to most alternatives and doesn't block usage via proxies etc.
914	The statement is not true. But many people do use google solely or for the majority of their queries. I have evidence that even the local police is googleing suspects names and case numbers from a police registered ip range which in itself is a privacy violation
915	They may have dominant market share but they got there based on the service they provide, not as the result of government policies or regulatory capture. And there are alternatives, which I use on occasion, depending on what I'm up to.
916	Well, google is not the only search engine on the market but is leading in all countries except China where baidu is used. About 80% of all web search are handled by google. This brings google not only into position of collecting a lot of user data to deliver better advertisement but also to control what most users will read. Google is also censoring results based on DMCA violations in all countries, not only in the USA.
918	I love Google. It's great! It knows everything about me which is concerning to an extent, but I am not bothered that I lot of people are using it.
920	To much data of the people in the world, power to "guide" informations the way they like, data could be abused
923	I believe that Google as a search engine is less threatening than FB, as there are other options. however, Google as a whole (or rather Alphabet on all its daughters companies) does serve as a monopoly - owning Waze &YouTube and operating services such as Gmail and Google Drive
924	As long as it is not the only search engine, no problem. People can choose
926	I do not like or trust monopolies.
928	It gives Google way to much power and makes us depended. These days some people consider not being (highly) indexed by Google as being deleted from the internet. I use the DuckDuckGo engine as well, but I have to admit that Google knows me a lot better than DuckDuckGo and thus gives me 'better' search results aligning with my interests. I find this useful and scary at the same time.
930	What are you gonna do? Telephones all used the same network.
932	potential limitation of access to information

934	Again we have only one source of information, what makes google the society common knowledge.
935	On one hand, Google is very useful; on the other, data is not safe with Google.
937	I try to vary my use between Google and Yahoo, but the algorithms in Google Scholar keep me coming back to it. It is too easy to make it your default choice.
938	Google's hegemony underlines how supine we all are. I use Google once or twice a month at most, and use a dozen other search engines more than I do Google.
939	Google's power distorts the advertising market, and undermines many media companies' business models.
940	Once again, it is a monopoly.
941	there are concerns about dominance and the surreptitious use of information for gain. But the internet is free and that is the price you pay.
943	Google seems too powerful - information is concentrated and this affects many around the world.
944	Same as Facebook comment. I despair of humans.
946	I don't like the fact that everything I do on google becomes de facto public - or rather, negotiable and tradable
949	Lack of diversity. The service works well, however. But is a private corporation with too much public information in their hands.
951	Monopoly of the answers
954	It is even better to have only one search engine, as it becomes better and better structured.
955	It is dangerous to culture and democracy when one Search Engine dominates. Also Google's marketing is unfair, as we saw from the fine imposed by the EU.
957	See Epstein, Robert, and Ronald E Robertson. "The Search Engine Manipulation Effect (SEME) and Its Possible Impact on the Outcomes of Elections." Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 112, no. 33 (2015): E4512–E4521.
958	Obviously using one database is limiting
960	As earlier, no choice = domination of (online) cultural practices and unbalanced force in shaping our developing society.
970	na
971	Not convinced it is objective.
976	They have all our data about work, leisure interest, friends, cities, etc,
978	-
981	Simply put, Google tracks its users and monetises the data it harvests with every search. That money is not shared with the content creators--i.e., the people who create the searches. There are search engines that are not as well know but that do offer secure searches; I switched to those several years ago.
982	The whole industry is based on trust so no concerns.
984	My justification is similar to part 1 of my previous answer: are the world's security agencies flexible enough to comprehend and adapt to changing social preferences?
985	Combined with governmental control of privacy it can be dangerous
986	The hegemonic status Google has achieved may lead to it becoming a public enterprise, through (inter)nationalization. The physical/technical infrastructure being built to accomodate search and retrieval on the internet was historically not possible to fathom within the public sphere. Now that it is established, the struggle for ownership must and will follow.
993	I think Google is more transparent - the ads are clearly labelled as sponsored, the promoted ads are also labelled. While there is a 'bubble' for relevant information, unfortunately it does work better than engines such as Duck Duck Go for relevancy.
994	The more people that use the service, the better it is. However, it also means that information is centralized – and can affect how we understand and apply information. So, the same concerns with Facebook apply here.
998	one needs to have a choice and that is not given when many mobile devices come with presets to google youtube etc .. or PCs with bing ....
1003	bad
1004	It means everyone gets the same answers, which can be [and are] manipulated by Google and are distorted by advertising. It also means Google accumulates a vast corpus of data and we have no idea how specifically it can track us.
1005	Google practices are no less abusive but at least, in quantity, they are less. If your economic model certainly does not distance itself in facebook spirit, it respects more rights of its users and the contempt towards them is not so obvious. In addition, its primary use although indisputable perhaps is less omnipresent than facebook
1006	Lack of choice, and monopoly leads to power misuse.
1009	Like I wrote about Facebook.
1010	Having access to data of its users is one thing, but I have the feeling that we (common

	citizens) have no clue about what is really happening with our data. I'm not really concerned that they can access it, I'm more concerned about the use of my data by Google (What do they do with my personal data?).
1012	Given its personalisation it is always interesting to use different search engines and to compare results. Also important when doing online shopping.
1013	It gives Google a lot of insights and power
1014	Concentration of power is dangerous. Concentration of sources of simboloc power is extremely dangerous.
1016	same reason as in previous question
1017	Google are data mad. But it is the most effective search engine
1018	For the same reasons as stated re: Facebook. I am concerned about the data and my creative that is being gathered, with and without my permission. I don't agree that this database platform exploitation of my privacy, content/creativity and contacts. If anything I demand a share of my profits.
1021	All information about desires end up at one place. You can easily make a profile of the actual life situation of a person out of its search requests; i.e. now a person searches after pregnancy signals, half a year later it is searching after furniture for baby room, in between after expensive tv models and how to create a zen garden, ... I have started to also use other search engines now
1024	More competition could lead to better services from the providers to keep customers happy.
1029	THERE SHOULD DEFINITELY BE MORE CHOICE.
1031	I hope people know how to discern a good search result from a promoted one.
1032	The same again, too much power over people (public) and their data. Using public to sell product for profit etc
1041	Google knows what we search, how we do it and that is concerning since it can learn our personal patterns and be more effective towards us when using or buying something.
1043	It's difficult to make another search engine. There is a need for a European Search Engine ...
1049	Same as for Facebook but even more so - it is operating as a monopoly so has enormous power and influence and is not effectively regulated.
1050	There are other search engines available, if Google has created a good product then it is understandable that it will be the most used.
1051	I really couldn't care less
1053	This provides Google with too much power over the archiving , use, exploitation and accessibility of information.
1056	This is a real problem, but we should live with it. If one day Google is going worse and worse, it could be a disaster. But what can we do? An other disaster may occur with Adobe...
1057	why shoud I?
1058	The huge monopoly it holds, makes a huge agregation of data possible - especially since the company provides many different services.
1059	Google has a lot of control over the information we are presented
1060	Google is becoming the deus ex machina of our everyday choices and it is going to run the future of communication technologies worldwide with no restrictions by policymakers
1061	Data collection --> for more intimate queries on internet people should use search engine that do not collect data (DuckDuckGo)
1062	monopoly
1066	Concentration is a problem— but it's pretty straightforward to set up an alternative search engine, including high-privacy ones such as DuckDuckGo
1068	It has the ability to use this to collect vast amounts of data.
1070	The private algorithm of that search engine keeps users from knowing how search results are ranked.
1072	DuckDuckGo still works just fine.... as long as there are viable alternatives
1073	Again, I feel I am against to any kind of monopoly
1074	Google monopolises large parts of the internet. This per se is not good.
1075	May be other search engines are not competitive.
1078	not concerned
1079	Same asnwer.
1082	Similar to the previous answer. I am using google even though I am aware of the issues that come from its monopoly
1083	Competition is good. If every person online uses a single search engine it may make it difficult for competitors to remain viable or enter the market at all.
1084	Google is far too big and has its tentacles in too many contexts. It probably knows more about me than I know about myself. Google and I have a very long relationship and I have

	experienced benefits from that relationship that so far have exceeded the drawbacks. I am concerned, but not enough to severe the cord...which I am not sure is possible
1086	No private company should have 90 % of any market. Google is totally untransparent about its usage of data. It should be split in several smaller companies and clearly report what data flows where and for what gain.
1089	they simply make money out of it. They use the data for marketing purposes. This is annoying as hell (the whole marketing bullshit)
1092	if google doesn´t find it, it´s not there for most people. a lot of people don´t have experience in a proper research on the internet, so they even don´t try to find more informatin or are not able to do so.
1093	Because their methods and preferences provide me what i find. If the do not want me to see/know something i won't know it
1095	Idem. Furthermore, the potential control of the global access to information (given that the algorithm is secret and tailors the results to each and everyone with no possibility to measure how) is really threatening.
1102	Porque la mayoría no tenemos conocimiento de otros motores de búsqueda y lo damos por establecido
1103	This only means Google will have vast amount of personal information. This is dangerous because once it is compromised, millions of people will become more vulnerable to cybercrimes
1108	Google can decide what you can find and it can hide unwanted sites
1109	same answer, being the dominant provider makes it difficult to regulate their behavior.
1111	No reason to believe Google is an irresponsible player
1112	Google is clearly best at search. I've used the internal settings to limit history collection. I've also used the VPN with Opera, ProtonVPN and occassionally, Tor/Tails to scramble a one-to-one correspondence with my IP address. What is more concerning to me, and less discussed, in these questions, is the relatively obscure techniques of "fingerprinting."
1113	big data for Google to control populations(s)
1115	Google Search works well and better than other search engines I've used
1116	data gathering by google
1119	Ok
1121	Formats the results according to your profile.
1123	Google collects all data on us, and has all search history. No one checks their terms and conditions when signing up, and few people actually asked for the report on 'search history'. I did, and it does show all my preferences, sites I visit, newspapers I read, etc. Based on this, one can see an exact picture of my age, personality, sexual orientation, when i am at home or outside, what i buy and what I eat. This is violation of privacy.
1124	Google is a monopoly that tends to take over all other services (like Facebook)
1126	if your are not on google, your dont even exist.
1127	tracking, distorted results
1128	I think Google is great
1130	there are plenty of other search engines to use if one finds their advertisements unacceptable- like duck duck go
1131	I believe that the algorithms are not likely to lead to strong biases in data consumption. Though, Search Engine Optimization and similar practices are generally worrying (those who hack the algorithm the best get most 'air time'), that's not a Google-specific problem.
1132	They collect too much data, but they're better about security than most of the others.
1133	Targeted ads and Google using data for pervasive reasons, like handing over data/info to police. However, there's also a positive side to big data surrounding search engines, which is predictability for potential 'bad things' (e.g., virus outbreaks and symptoms; elections; etc) and possibly 'good things' though those instances seem rarer.
1134	The power behind a private and unregulated search engine that is able to manipulate people's mind by altering the results of the queries is my main preoccupation in these case
1135	Which answer to justify?
1136	I think this is different to social media use as people use different services. In terms of the search engine, however, most people will stick to Google as other search enginges do not have the same capacity / the type of data they collect does not deliver the results users are looking for. The advertising and overall corporate issues do concern me - e.g. in terms of access and searchability certain sites develop over others by virtue of high traffic (and presumably a lot of other factors I am not even aware of).
1138	As before, monopolies are not good and I am concerned about Google's other activities.
1143	Is a kind of global power. Deleuze said to us about this: the information revolution is a capitalist revolution. What can I think about a company that wants to scan everything? Fuck off Google !!!! as in the chapter of the book "Crisis and insurrection" by "Invisible committee".

1144	Platform Monopoly is dangerous.
1146	Again, software/platform monocultures are risky
1147	Google search results can influence opinions and world views - most people don't know that they are not objective results and that they aren't the same for everyone
1148	There are alternatives.
1149	Again, domination of a global space by a single company in California is not healthy
1150	Google's algorithms privilege certain searches over others. I want to see a comparison with eg DuckDuckGo.
1153	Google essentially controls common knowledge and shapes people's understanding of important matters.
1155	to what?
1156	There are some problems with Google's personalisation and adaption to specific countries' legislation but these can be circumvented rather easily, e.g. using startpage or other sites the use of which is growing.
1157	same as previous
1158	Monopols are very dangerous
1159	Google can affect the scope of matters which are aviable for the the internet user. It's not only the question of filter bubble. It can form, mold users point of view, their vision of the word and their opinions.
1160	If it ain't on Google (or the first page on Google) it may as well not exist for most people - that's an unbelievable amount of informational power to wield.
1161	Same as Facebook: monopoly is or could be dangerous.
1162	same as last answer
1163	Monopoly poses a threat to privacy & democracy.
1165	Google is essentially and advertising company, and I am not sure people understand how their search data is used
1169	Oddly I tend to trust it as I think search relies deep down on accuracy of results. If they mess with that their business collapses and alternatives will appear, quickly, as search is fundamental (as Google more or less established).
1170	Again, having one source of information for most people about most things is a monopoly which is not good for freedom of choice or competition of ideas.
1173	I dislike Google's commerical business model but don't feel it affects me personally
1174	Google is collecting too much data of users and growing in power and influence. I am particularly bothered that most people in African countries do not know that so much data is being collected on them through their searches. The privacy debate needs to take root in these countries by involving more Africans in forums such as IGF so that they can voice their concerns and shape the future of the internet too.
1176	I am concerned about the power Google has
1180	I think search engine can not monopoly the market▯because search engine is usually treated as the initial approach to the Internet▯without any other choices▯people would be caught in possible inducing consumption and intentional guidance.
1185	In the same line that the previous question about FB, Google is a search engine build with commercial concerns, not information recovery concerns. The personalized results are very dangerous for the Net Neutrality and the possibility to read the other opinion that is different to mine. Also, google has a lot of trackers that aggregate data and they can use it with commercial purposes. That's why is very problematic that the people, including me, don't use "alternative" search engines such as Duck Duck Go.
1186	We have freedom to choose and to learn Duck duck Go
1187	It has the possibility to control and modify information that most of the people of the world search and then consume.
1191	I think it should be accountable as an enterprise. Also im concerned that is concentrating a lot of the market and is influencing the internet
1192	Not especially concerned about Google.
1194	monopoly
1196	There are already indications that Google started to filter out left-leaning websites from its searches. When there is a monopoly over the path to information, where that road is going to lead depends entirely on Google.
1197	Google is evil!
1198	Google give specific hierarchy to our research
1199	Google has vested interests. It will support its advertisers and partners. It has a certain way of categorizing and filtering the world's information based on the same silicon valley ideology of its competitors. It makes adjustments to the presentation of search results based on what it knows about a user by privileging certain information over other information. Again users

	believe they are seeing an 'objective' presentation (ie. what I see is what you see) but that's not the case. It nudges your search query towards certain keywords and phrases (predictive text) which limits our ability to formulate our own questions. It tries to give you its own 'answer' (via snippets) which is often false or biased information. It's no longer objectively presenting information, it's now attempting to tell its own story about the world.
1200	Google uses all their services to gather information about you. Your history, your likes, dislikes for customisation and ads. The more you use them, the more information they have of you. People tend to not even care about it and their privacies. Most would have a I-have-nothing-to-hide attitude, but if those information fall in the wrong hands, it will have serious consequences.
1202	It becomes to easy to (slightly) alter the reality people see through the bias introduced by the search algorithms, the paid-for placement of links, etc.
1204	Google does not disclose what information is harvested from the users account and its clients that buy or access the information.
1205	google monopolizes.
	i noticed that when looking for info on Cuba regarding Irma. There was nothing there in the first few pages. I actually had more luck through Facebook search
1206	Google's effective monopoly has, among other things, allowed it to assume a dominant position in various forms of advertising. While unsolicited advertising is a problem, sought advertising (e.g. classifieds) is often of positive value. The fact that Google dominates means that other social activities, mostly media, which historically have depended upon advertising, are facing a crisis and may not survive.
1208	All the knowledge/ analytics about search and clicks are aggregated in one place
1209	concentration / monopoly, same as last question...
1210	Monopolies/monopsonies are not good
1211	same as above
1214	Page and Brin themselves summed this up in their academic days by saying that if advertising is the main funder of search, then the search results are going to be skewed to what the advertisers want the user to see/do, not what the user wants. Google also represents a huge store of personal information access to which may be granted to anyone the Google controllers wish.
1216	Having a monopoly on what information can (easily) be found is almost like having a monopoly on information access in general, which is dangerous no matter who has that monopoly.
1217	The results on Google are biased and driven by commercial interests.
1219	Google has very much power over how we find and know things. Personally I am very troubled that I haven't been able to find an alternative that would provide me with the same search engine experience that I am used to with Google. It is scary to realise how Google has trained me to think of internet search in its own terms. When I tried to use Duckduckgo, I realised that I have also learned to view search results in a certain way: as Google always shows ads first, I always start viewing my results from the fourth on. In the alternative search engine I did the same, but it was unnecessary as there were no ads. I was very disappointed that Duckduckgo was not able to find me what I needed with the search logic I use. It could be also that it is not very good because of the where I live and my mother tongue (Finnish, a small language). It only makes it scarier to realise that a giant like Google is the only one who can afford to provide services for small countries and languages as well.
1220	It would be easy for google to sensor results or show only certain things
1221	Google can filter and censor searches or force them in a certain direction. Alternative search-engines have a hard time competing with Google. Google is already the single source of "truth" regarding search-engines.
1223	The fact that these webpages make their money from then monopoly-position, they are in, effectively makes it impossible to have a free, competing market for search engines, social networks and so on. This lack of competition scares me in a sense, that we're basically all addicted to these pages without any meaningful alternatives. That scenario is never good.
1225	It's not merely about search engine but google services all together. They combine information and are able to sell to third parties .Google is not a internet company, it is an advertisement company.
1226	https://news.ycombinator.com/item?id=902999
1232	Apparently there is financial benefit for them to prioritise some search results. This skews the process of trying to find something "out there" as if a neutral activity
1233	same answer provider for Facebook's question
1234	Google is a private company, a monopoly that can control our access to information.
1236	Google saves data what people are searching for and sells it to companies and other (e.g. state) organizations (risking human rights violations).

	The pagerank mechanism used structures the options, thereby structures opportunity structures and how people perceive the world, their beliefs about what is true, relevant and happened. A variety of perceptions and more diversity in terms of relevant information seems preferable for a healthy democracy.
1237	monopoly. too much power concentrated
1238	Google SEO via algorithms create limited information traffic. We are shown of certain information based on its ads target. So I use DuckDuckGo instead which we can see different results from the same key search.
1239	I guess, many people using one site or service is not as problematic if the company has very good standards and is an example of protecting data. But of course, if one company dominates the market, they may be more prone to abuse users' rights with little protest or consequences.
1241	Same as previous answer. Monopolies are never good
1242	- step forward to personal algorithms - Not perceiving anymore the world around me - missing of new perspectives
1243	It gives Google considerable opportunity to manipulate public opinion by means of ranking search results. Again, this means power in the hands of private company; this power may well be abused.
1244	Google is maybe more socially "neutral" than Facebook, but technically probably more sophisticated and has more infrastructural data on people, which makes it a powerful political agent with no democratic connections.
1245	Private business monopoly on personal information.
1248	Google lacks transparency and holds a great deal of data about individuals. As with other large industry members, I think many users lack awareness of the extent of the information they are sharing with these companies, e.g.: many people are unaware of the Google Maps Timeline that shows when and where users have been.
1250	Like Facebook, Google has a monopoly. Like Facebook (and other tech companies) the CEOs are white men who promote and perpetuate an industry that is structured through white supremacist imperialist patriarchy.
1251	In most occasions we share computers or labtops with others. In certain cases, what others searches, we may not interested in knowing it or don't have time for it. So, If anyone's websearch is observed and eliciting information based on the users online behaviour becoming wrong and users generally not aware of it.
1252	just using Google is a mistake - there are already other good ways that I and others can use
1253	Google is not only the biggest search engine but also the biggest marketing network which is giving it an unfair advantage. Through its result rankings, it can influence what people think to be facts/true (see controversy about search results for the holocaust which Google now claims to have rectified) and also which businesses receive more traffic and which ones less, influencing through its algorithms the business environment
1255	As with Facebook, Google occupies a monopoly position on search (and other online activities) and again, this positions too much power in the hands of an organisation with questionable practices.
1258	Too much control in the hands of a single company. When more than 90% of mobile search market share belongs to a single company I would say that is enough to feel concerned.
1259	May limit access to information
1260	I feel aware of the problems with Google as having the monopoly over search engines, and know friends who deliberately use alternative search engines. However, it is also very easy for that to become habitual to the extent that you partly 'forget' that Google is not an inherent or default option, but one that we willingly choose to use everyday. I suppose, a bit like how 'hoover' was originally a brand name but became one of the nouns for a vacuum cleaner.
1264	just as facebook: too much power in one hand
1265	SEE PREVIOUS ANSWER
1266	The amount of data they gather, the biases implied in their searches. This is not obvious nor explained clearly to users. We do not even know about other options
1268	It is not a neutral service but a for-profit corporation with its own agenda.
1273	Google has the power to show people the information they want them to see and hide others, collects extensive data, not clear about the practices of Google AdWords
1275	As above
1277	Monopolies are unhealthy. Too much power.
1280	Google is a private company which is trying to make money. Google has been fined 2.4 billion Euros by the EU for unfair marketing practices. Google is a highly dishonest organisation. I feel slightly more comfortable about Wikipedia, but even here there should be a state-funded alternative.
1281	It's just an answer, it doesn't need justification
1283	it's automatic

1284	We need alternatives.
1286	not transparent enough - people accept google and its search results as authoritative
1287	All of my same answers as with Facebook - one dominant player has too much power, concerns about what is doing with the information.
1288	Google can use its dominant position is ways that most people don't understand e.g. to push results up to the top page including favoring products and services provided by Alphabet corporations.
1289	Like I wrote about Facebook + it pretends to be an benefactor.
1291	As with all these free services, we are the product, not the consumer. Google's search service is excellent, and ties in well to their other services to produce a usefully seamless ecosystem, but we pay for that in the loss of privacy that comes with having a corporation know far too much about us in far too many ways.
1292	Atleast i have a place where i can go and find information
1293	-
1297	Search is "the whole internet" to most users. A page low on search may as well not exist. Too much power for one company.
1298	Centrality of data emission and too much power of one or few corporations.
1299	That's not even the main problem! People are not educated to digital technologies, so even worse there are those equating the internet with google! Not even the web or thinking it's the only search engine, they think it's the internet! BTW I'm concerned because of privacy, economic (monopolistic as well as not-paying taxes), direction of preferences, profililig etc issues.
1301	There are other search engines, but the other ones are inconvenient to use. To me, Google has the smartest design.
1302	Having just one company be a gatekeeper for information puts a lot of power in one place - and given the amount of infrastructure required to compete in this area (you can't start small and scale up in the same way as a social network can) it's harder to come up with suitable remedies if the power is abused (assuming you can even discover that the power has been abused).
1304	there is no other competition and no innovation of running different style of engines
1305	Its the most popular now but we have to see other ways, it's possible
1306	Concerned about concentration of power
1307	It's not great that it's a monopoly, but I don't fear Google as I do Facebook. I think they're more neutral than evil.
1309	They just do know to much about mankind already.
1310	Peole doesn't know that there is another alternatives to navigate online, like Duck Duck Go
1311	Too much power
1312	As with Facebook, such a virtual monopoly is a matter of concern
1313	The default search engine - before Google there was a choice, and each had its idiosyncrasies. A search engine should be a neutral tool, yet of course it becomes the gateway into a world of user data gathering. I have experimented with other SEs and still use Duckduckgo for anonymity, but when doing in-depth academic research unfortunately it doesn't work so well (yet). I therefore am minimizing my use of Google services, and have gone into the Settings to minimize the amount of historical search that Google keeps - everything from map search to music streaming etc. (I use Google Play Music as my cloud-based music solution, but am looking for alternatives).
1315	Initially I thought i would invest in Google when it was a start-up. I quickly realized that the profit motive would take over the stated initial values and did not invest. Their suite of products are built, again, on data users freely provide and are not compensated for. IMO, Alphabet is a monopoly that may need to be regulated in the public interest. Alphabet should consider every user as a shareholder who deserves some portion of their profit and a voice in the future of the company.
1316	With its business entanglements and trajectories, Google has an interest in particular social, political and legal outcomes. There is nothing to stop them from supporting a knowledge gap that limits access to viewpoints antithetical to their aggrandizement.
1317	When searching the internet became 'google it'. Built in bias. I also know that the service can still produce better results than some engines, which makes it harder to indicate a problem.
1318	Google has become evil, working with government, subverting democracy, etc.
1319	Extreme monopolies ultimately will be bad for citizens. Like autocratic monarchies one very bad CEO and lets face it Schmidt is already quite dire and we are all in trouble and democracy is at risk. Google has too much power.
1320	They monoplise everything and through the expanded package of services (e.g. email, calander, drive, google docs, ...) collect data on everything you do and monitor everything

	you do. Years ago I tried to use Yahoo instead, and later screwgle, but these are just not as good at searching. So it feels like there is no choice. (and 'not searching the internet' or 'not using the internet' is not a choice).
1322	Not only does Google restrict search results (meaning that people are far more likely to access sponsored links and selected information), but it collects personal data (tracking, data mining, etc.). In fact, it is not a search engine as such as it does not select the results of the search indiscriminately - it targets based on your previous choices/preferences and bombards your# with advertisements. I have a work Gmail account and am sometimes required to use Google search engine, Google Docs and YouTube at work - it frightens me to see how different my search results are from these I conduct at home through 'duckduckgo' - sometimes it is impossible for me to find the same website or article, because of the tailored results. I am worried that I have to use Gmail account for work and that my personal data is being collected and used by Google. My objections to this were met with a suggestion that I am paranoid and completely dismissed.
1325	Different to Facebook and Microsoft, Google has some degree of ethics and morality, and their quality is remarkable. The question is, if that will survive the pressure of greedy shareholders once the founders are gone.
1326	A search engine may and to some extent is inherently biased. Searching the same thing on several different search engines will often pull up a very different set of results. Reliance on just one search engine may lead you to see the internet as the organisation wishes you to see it, that is, the results may be manipulated (for the benefit of advertisers or subscribers - ie paying customers of the organisation). It is also easier to censor parts of the internet, when there is one giant one-stop everyone-uses-it search engine like this, as it is very difficult for any other organisation to hold them to account.
1327	Google provides a quality of results far superior to other engines. Unlike facebook, google doesn't have a captive search market; people can switch individually without losing out; facebook has the network effect of all of one's friends being on the site.
1328	Not every google/gmail friend checks privacy settings, personal information could slip through; google has a wealth of knowledge about us, but doesn't allow us to control every detail.
1329	The same case as in the question about Facebook
1330	Google as a gatekeeper is worrying.
1335	many people think google's search results are somehow neutral, but they're not. no one knows how the algorithm ranks pages, and most people never look past the first page of results. there's an ongoing battle between google and marketers (as well as groups like the alt-right) to game search results. if google is the arbiter of what ideas get surfaced and which get marginalized, that's a problem.
1337	same as the previous answer
1338	I have personally switched to an alternative that does not track users. I want results that are more objective, rather than subjective and leaning towards my own interests. I can't explain why I don't feel more concerned about Google--I used their service since early 2000 and they must know a whole lot about me, including information I would be uncomfortable with to share with friends or people I know.
1339	Google is really good and cheap
1340	google is a commercial corporation serving commercial puroses.
1344	Not enough competition to ensure authentic service provision.
1345	This company can privilege some companies and websites when searching. Besides, they may sell our data
1346	Google has too much market power in the market for search engines, and they dominate the advertising market too.
1349	Google are a fascist organisation masquerading as an empowering tool.
1359	Facebook can shape public opinion
1353	Google algorithms and tracking of info is of concern.
1355	google: not only search engine but has other services as well, Drive, Blogger, Sites, Youtube, Groups, Gmail, Google Apps for Education. Very dominating company...
1357	Google directs for its own ends, especially for video, while most people seem to hold to the assumption that Google produces the 'best' results for them. Beyond that, these are corporate behemoths, and corporate power has wider political and social consequences.
1361	This means that Google can decide what results to show depending on their viewpoint.
1362	Same as for Facebook
1363	The amount and comprehensiveness of data they can collect.
1365	I would say that my answer is similar to Facebook. Besides, I would say that Google services are particularly efficient and this reduces my concerns about other issues.
1366	It is not the number of users that's concerning per se, but the fact that Google and others collect enormous amount data on its users and we do not know what hie and when it used

1368	They have a chokehold on a service that provides answers, but the selection algorithm is both unknown to and uncontrollable by users. Again, such concentrated political power is dangerous.
1371	Most individuals are completely unaware of the extensive amount of data Google captures about individual users. Even if used in the aggregate, the data that G collects and stores allows for an unprecedented overreach of corporate control of consumer data, privacy invasion, and manipulation of user behavior to serve corporate profiteering.
1373	People should use alternative internet services to know about the world.
1374	In terms of Google, although it amplifies already popular sites (the PageRank algorithm), I'm less concerned because I believe the company really wants to help people find what they're looking for whereas Facebook just wants to imprison people in its vacuous platform where they spend entire hours on inanities
1375	Concentration of data in the hands of one organization. It may and is in fact already using for unethical purposes in favor of certain concerning politics.
1377	Not as concerned as FB, since if you don't have other Google stuff your search activity is unlikely to correlate to anything and personally identify you. It's not as closed a platform as FB, so I am less concerned, but still.
1378	Pretty much like Facebook, the worts thing is that most people don't know the rules for the results they are getting. They simply don't bother to ask themselves if the results they are getting in their searches are really the more important, or even the more adequate. For simple searches like a cuisine recipe thas ok to fall for the five first results. But whe you are searching for social matters, political issues or troubled questions to our social life that is VERy bad. You most likely will get a biased view and don't even know about it.
1380	Again a big private (tax avoiding company), would like it nationalised or 'inter-nationalised'
1382	The search facilities offered by Google represent the current apotheosis of syntactic processes. They could be replicated as a public utility.
1383	As we sign the term of usage, it means that we are aware of the consequences of sharing our data with Google. By default, all the Google users have accepted the way they are in negotiation with the service provider.
1385	I'm rather cocerned about monopolizing the internet news media, snd its persistence in creating a consumptive society
1389	Although it does lend a high degree of control (similar to my feelings about Facebook), I don't find it quite as concerning - it is responding to your search terms which does at least give the user slightly more scope, and my experience of other search engines is that they are more (blatantly at least) monetising you as a user.
1390	In terms of market centralisation like is the case with search engines questions need to be asked about the regulation of services. Some lessons can be learned from utilities in that regard. While they haven't come up with an idea solution, the framing of SE access as a right could help thinking about particular trajectories to follow (unbundling of services that are subject to a natural monopoly, like networks that enable functional SE's -- I am thinking content delivery networks etc. that can not easily be replicated).
1394	I do not like monocracy
1395	It has the same issues associated with it as Facebook. It ring fences huge parts of the net and is corrupted by algorithms that target advertising not information to users. It incorrectly suppresses some pages due to payment a from others and it is again a privatisation of a huge aspect of the net for the control and profit of very few.
1396	One part: Google is controlling what information we see first and foremost.
1398	Information is power, this is a power without any public control and the aim to make money. It is strongly concentrated and could do great harm when abused or in the wrong hands.
1400	As with Facebook, it is very invasive and a big tool of surveillance
1401	Google relies on advertising income
1406	There is a constant concern in terms of privacy and biased search results. I'd say the potential for polarization is what scares me the most at a societal level. However, I do acknowledge that I use it and haven't taken the necessary steps to learn more about or use alternative search engines.
1407	Concentrate many power in this corporation.
1410	Same as re. Facebook. Too centralized, not good...
1412	It just happens to be just that, Google. It can change its name, we can have more, or even none.
1415	Google's filters can be used to regulate what gets shown and also extract personal data from people.
1416	It is not helpful to have too much power in a single organisation, particularly a commercial company.

1418	Again the increasing dominance of the Google has over the internet market, makes its users vulnerable at the hands of Google. The agency may dodge facts, sacrosanct information details and redirect the users to an identified promotor or service provider or a spin agency meant to plant a story, a myth, a half-truth or worse a propaganda for the government.
1419	i think there should always be alternatives and options .
1421	I think it is dangerous that all my search results are filtered through one company, although I do not at this time have any reason to suspect malicious intent on Google's behalf. But the possibility of abuse still exist and I would like more choice/ability to control the filter bubble.
1423	It is a good search engine...but yes, the hits can be Googlebombed or engineered by some sites to give themselves a higher relevance ranking (including Google itself). Plus sponsored content coming top, meaning once again almighty dollar shapes the 'free' internet experience
1425	I am assuming, but I don't really know, that one could open one up to more intrusions (ads, hacks) if you only use one?
1426	I have fewer concerns with Google than with Facebook, although the illogicality of this attitude is clear to me.
1428	Ask, wow and other engines aren't used a lot. Google's results are skewed for Google and sites with ad-word.
1431	I use a number of search engines - but I am not sure what information they collect and use either
1433	Google actually controls all other search options. It can block anything that does not agree with the company's policy.
1436	Same as above. People deserve to have choice, and for Google, being the top (often only, in many cases) player in the game carries with it additional responsibilities around transparency and ethics that I would like to see more of from them.
1437	Its dominating people and there is no competition and this causes a monopoly on Google's part.
1442	they very huge compnaies and this power brings more power. this is monoply.
1443	Google is a monopoly and does not respect people. It manipulates people's emotions and information access and is responsible for boosting the hate in the world. It has not only economic implications but also political, cultural and of health consequences.
1448	Monopolies discourage innovation.
1450	Concentrates too much information into monopolistic organisation
1451	It appears to be a powerful monopoly. It's like only having one library with a psychopathic, controlling book burning librarian that creates detailed surveillance files on people searching for books and improperly stores, shares, and sells those files. The psychopathic librarian engages in the burial of books, he/she thinks inappropriate, in secret rooms . The psychopathic librarian engages in featuring books for money, books that may have inaccurate or misleading information including information that aligns with the librarians beliefs and goals.
1452	Monopolies are not good.
1454	It works, afaik, pity there is no competition. I've tried others, some are ok, but since google seems to "own" my android os I haven't much choice
1459	there are many other search engines, among which people can choose. besides there is no difference in terms of privacy concerns,between main-stream search engines.
1460	People can, at least in theory, easily switch to other search engines.
1468	Google has the power to control what sites show up or don't show up - especially on the first few pages. They've already applied censorship filtering with regard to so-called fake news sites, resulting in leftist and/or anti-establishment sites being effectively hidden.
1469	Google harvests your data. But see my answer for FB: I am a little concerned about what they might do with my data. I accept that as the service is free to me to use (no financial cost) then they will do something to generate income to provide this free service.
1471	It does more good than any harm.
1473	I fear "negation as failure" -- the assumption that any statement not presented by Google can be taken as false.
1474	Just as other big tech companies like Facebook, Apple, Microsoft and Amazon, Google monopolises our usage of internet. The most symbolic representation of this is the verb we use when expressing that we look something up on the internet. We say that "we googled it". The only hope are certain communities that switch to other browsers or for instance the German government and people who opposed Google's intention for installing street view maps in their country. In Germany, especially in Berlin, I have some sense of people being aware about privacy and data protection. In the UK, it seems like that majority just supports whatever will help business. Even BBC as public service made us all sign up and provide them with private information. No one in the mainstream media said a word against it.
1477	Google filters out results, uses censoring etc.
1483	the same: monopoly, very intransparent

1486	Big brother growing
1487	run by americans, results in a flow of funds from poor countries to a rich one
1488	Again, the same problems with a monoculture. We need diversity as the norm.
1505	Google controls the search algorithms and creates filter bubbles which in turn affect society in a variety of aspects - social, political, economic and so on I do use other search engines in addition to google
1512	It's true and it has converted almost in a monopoly... but they do it reasonably well :-(
1515	I personally use an alternative search engine with a strong privacy policy.
1520	What I find most concerning with google is a sheer magnitude of their ever growing collection of personal data on people and their behavior and that the public has absolutely no control of how the company will use it. Secondly, the means of manipulation available to a single institution or company that wields such a monopoly over what is considered relevant and what isn't, what will be shown and what censored etc.
1524	Being able to remember 'Web 1:0' meaning the early-2000s when the Internet was properly becoming part of every area life and the world as we know it, I remember Yahoo, Lycos, and Alta Vista and loads of other search engines, most of which weren't as good as Google, which by the late-2000s had basically replaced all of them, so much so that the new verb 'Googling' or 'To Google' was in common usage. Another way of seeing such 'monopoly' would be as an example of 'the commons' or communism 'being already here', but the wall of ISPs would need to fall in order to realise Hardt and Negri's "spontaneous and elementary form of communism," just as multiple search engines would doubtless be abundant besides any communized version of Google.
1538	It is the first one in my country that appears so many infos
1539	I don't think a number of search engines would help the fact that so many people do not understand how to critically evaluate the information presented to them via a search engine. My close friends and family would not be able to look at a URL and make a determination on trustworthiness, nor look a the construction of a website and understand if it was trustworthy. Very few people I know understand to look at several sources and do the sort of critical analysis of content taught in graduate school. Nor would everyone understand that different search engines use different criteria for organizing and presenting results, or how paid placements might be presented. So, I'm concerned, but not strictly about Google being the only one.
1540	Monopoly
1559	certain fear of monopoly. but on the other hand, google services are often better in quality (e.g. compared to startpage, which i also frequently use).
1571	Again, too much control on too many people's habits, interests etc. globally on the part of just one company.
1575	Power of Google to partly direct my search
1581	As the answer above with Facebook, they simply overcome others, their search engine algorithms are somewhat superior to others, giving better, faster and more relevant results if used properly. Since the majority of the population uses google search engine, this can be used to quicker and better improve search results as more feedback is given and many sorts of statistics can be anonymously collected to discover copious amounts of information about demographics that updates itself yearly without the need for surveys, which take time and money.
1583	monopolies are bad idiots like trump abuse them
1585	One company controlling the entirety of internet activity??? Search results?? User data????? The thoughts of billions of people????????????? Not good.
1588	Again my use of the internet is for shopping, research, news and information. Google is convenient and I cannot be bothered to spend my life faffing around with my computer's detailed working. That said, ideally the legal constraints that apply to the rest of society would find a way to control the internet but that seems very unlikely in my lifetime.
1590	I think Google helps in spreading knowledge and also help people with solutions if any problem occurs.
1597	Concerned, since Google has the power to show us certain information and hide other information. Google is seen as more legit and reliable than Facebook.
1603	Google can manipulate the information and we know that they provide answers to searches based on a profile that they have of the person searching.
1607	Same as above, Google is a monopoly, controls all your data; also generates accounts in your name (after Google bought YouTube, every Gmal user automatically had a Youtube account and so forth). Google even shows you your next travel information (when is your flight) when you google specific terms and so forth. The problem is, that Google is also so efficient, that changing to a platform such as Yahoo or Ecosia is for me (and I tried) less likely as their

	search results and results in general are currently not efficient enough.
1609	i have tried others, however, i am used to google and it just seems the easiest and most efficient
1614	It allows them to acess a lot of personal information.Your location,search results,emails via gmail. Which makes it easier for them to sell their product(their users) to other companies who would like to advertise themselves on google or youtube which is own by google. And even the shortest video on youtube started to have more then 5 adds in it which is insane amount of advestisment during short period of time.
1617	It's personal choice
1623	I am concerned how filtered out knowledge could lead to misinformation and help with the manipulation of large amounts of the population.
1624	Google can change their search results to further their political agenda and mute out ideas thoughts and arguments they don't agree with.
1626	Because I use adblock software, I don't mind using Google, I don't see the products they're offering me, and usually the convenience of how relevant my searches become out weighs most concerns.
1630	Google is fine if you know how to protect yourself - Google chrome on the other hand...
1639	Lack of competition is bad for consumers, since Google can collect any data from these people.
1641	I don't see this as a problem.
1643	The big data can be used to achieve anything at this technologically advanced world. We are mere consumers and i fail to fully trust it.
1647	.
1651	They hide -a lot of- internet content from people.
1654	They aggressively avoid paying tax.
1655	It provides the best service
1679	It means they monopolize the Internet.
1687	There is some overlap with my concerns regarding Facebook. Google also has a significant impact on other aspects of the media and content industries beyond the choice of search engines available to users. It dominates the advertising market across much of the globe, contributes little to the development of new content, whilst benefiting from search activity around content-based sites. The impact upon advertising has been uneven. Whilst newspaper revenues have declined in the face of competition, television revenues have continued to grow, even if its share has declined.
1691	There are alternatives such as DuckDuckGo but rarely as effective as Google
1714	Whats the problem?
1921	Same reason as above
1967	Google has become synonymous with "Internet search," which is disturbing for a number of reasons, the largest because of Google's use of search terms to provide targeted advertising. Google also is implicitly biased in its Western cultural orientation, and as a result much of the non-English web is still not as accessible as it should be within the Anglosphere.
1969	Too much information is stored in one place
2004	I haven't thought about the control of information, my experience has been that Google is highly functional and I am able to use it to get many sides/types of answer to questions. But I suppose if Google were censoring or otherwise manipulating information for its own profit we would all be kind of totally stuck.
2016	Google used to be better than other search engines, but now it's just trying to make itself into another platform, and even worse, not be a search engine but just give out supposed 'information' such as through Google Home or extracting data from the top result into the results page.
2044	Giving all power in one hand is not a good idea.
2050	I feel that most people use google through ignorance and do not realise that there are other search engines available. Again I feel concerned about monopoly and big business
2057	I do not use Google in my computer, but I do use it in my phone because I have an Android. I am particularly concerned with the level of personalised ads they associate with the users and the suggestion of news articles based on our previous researches, which can create a bias on users, since they will always hear about the same topic and from the same source. Google is creating a monopoly that was further extended with the almost universal use of Android as a operating system on mobile phones. Google and other social media platforms are not taking effective measures to prevent fake news, pornography, racism and discrimination in their platforms.
2069	If Google is going to be a primary provider they have a responsibility to provide unbiased content in their search results and limit the ability of advertisers to have faulty or incorrect ads to influence individuals.
2070	I don't trust Google, but unfortunately their products are objectively better than their

	competitors in most areas.
2078	Different search engines show different top results. Too many people just look at the firs few results and fail to always get the best answer to there search.
2080	Not really sure needs more elaboration and discussion regarding implications
2087	Propaganda, manipulate people with certain infomation. It would be easy if someone somewhere someday want to do those things beacause google has earned its credibility.
2090	Anything you wish can be found quckly, is easily used and accessed so that is a big advantage.
2103	It's simple and and everyone knows it. It would be a "big step" to leave the comfort of something that you have been using for so long and choose something else.
2114	Google is a fast and efficient search engine. It has never caused me any problems.
2118	It's very useful engine.
2122	Its the better one
2136	no good. it's very easy to use duckduckgo instead..
2140	Knowing what users are looking for can lead to a very precise profiling of each and any one of us by Google. This gives it immense power to control and manipulate us. Plus there is no transparency on their side on how they use all this data, what kind of profile they have on each user, etc. On the contrary, they are being very secretive about a lot of things concerning the data they collect.
2142	Private life on sale
2146	everything info is control by a certain provider, which has a certain way of working, while distributes personal data in certain companies and control mechanisms.
2149	Google are ok, but any one company dominating the scene is a bad thing.
2153	If it would reduce that amount of data it takes from every user, the algorithm seems to work pretty well for me. Nevertheless, I do know about the poor handling of many topics.
2175	Overbiassing in results.
2227	I feel Google are a lot more open about using customer data compared to companies like Facebook and it's clear to me that the majority is used for advertisement data, which I don't mind too much. I see it more as a convenience, showing people ads of products they may consider rather than ones they won't - it makes the purchasing process easier and more efficient for all sides surely. It's just making sure there is enough regulation to ensure they don't overstep this mark and users are always told in a clear and concise way which data is being used and why so there isn't a sense of asymmetric information present.
2235	such a monopoly giant of GOOGLE
2237	How comprehensive the functions offered by those existing media are is more significant than whether those media are monopolised in their industries.
2246	Again, I use everything that is internet related with care, so this does not bother me.
2253	I am focused more on the functions provided by the search engine.
2256	They use this data to provide the most relevant search results, and improve the quality of their product. No other search engine comes close
2261	monopoly, too much access to data, misuse risk
2264	The fact that most people use it means that it's harder for people to switch to another browser and thus gives a lot of power to Facebook and allows them to change privacy rules almost as much as they want
2267	In fact Google also gathers data on all users and will be able to sell it, but at the same time the fact that so many people use it make it the most efficient and powerful search engine available, which is a positive point for users.
2300	Control of peoples experience. Algorithms and bots that manipulate searches.
2304	Because the economic, social, cultural and political risks of concentration or monopolization. Too much power.

Field summary for QC13

Would you consider using alternative platforms instead of Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, or Google to avoid such monopoly effects as these seem to have at the moment?

Answer	Count	Percentage
I already use an alternative platform (A5)	162	16.20%
I would definitely, as I am very concerned about monopolies on the Internet. (A1)	359	35.90%
I would probably, but it would depend on my friends switching to these other platforms. (A2)	355	35.50%
I would probably not consider it, as I am used to Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, or Google. (A3)	80	8.00%
I would definitely not consider it, as I am not concerned about monopolies on the Internet. (A4)	44	4.40%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC15

How do you feel about the fact that many of the large corporate Internet organisations have been found evading taxes in several countries?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Not concerned (A1)	231	23.10%
Somewhat concerned (A2)	120	12.00%
Concerned (A3)	166	16.60%
Very concerned (A4)	442	44.20%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	41	4.10%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC16

How do you feel about the fact that not all citizens have Internet access or the necessary skills?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Not concerned (A1)	169	16.90%
Somewhat concerned (A2)	229	22.90%
Concerned (A3)	249	24.90%
Very concerned (A4)	338	33.80%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	15	1.50%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC17

How do you feel about the fact that an Internet user might have a much smaller number of followers than a celebrity or a company that can afford to employ managers for their social media accounts and build a large audience?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Not concerned (A1)	284	28.40%
Somewhat concerned (A2)	176	17.60%
Concerned (A3)	192	19.20%
Very concerned (A4)	250	25.00%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	98	9.80%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC18

How do you feel about the fact that more and more online newspapers charge subscription fees for access of their articles?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Not concerned (A1)	272	27.20%
Somewhat concerned (A2)	235	23.50%
Concerned (A3)	217	21.70%
Very concerned (A4)	234	23.40%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	42	4.20%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QC18B

Please justify your anwer:

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	755	78.81%
No answer	203	21.19%

ID	Response
36	Services have a cost.
44	The writer of an article must be paid. In my opinion, the acceptable sources of the money are the adv and the subscription fees. I am concerned of other money source for paying the work of article writers.
48	Because most of the Internet users will read news on free websites, which however would likely not offer any guarantee on the quality, truthfulness, and objectivity of such news.
49	printed newspapers are not free, so in principle also online newspapers could not be free. However some news, at least the main terms of a news, should be free.
51	Newspapers are born to be sold... I do not see any special difference between a paper or an on-line version. I do not have paid access to newspapers, so I do not know if in the paid version there is the same *HUGE* amount of *VERY ANNOYING* (auto-start videos over all) commercials that there is in the free version. I hope that the paid version is less invasive from this point of view, since I would find very dishonest to charge the user and drown it in advertisements.
52	if you dont want adds what other way to monetize journalism
54	It's a reasonable model, unlike the ad-based one, which is unsustainable and leads to extensive tracking. I'd gladly pay a small subscription fee to avoid tracking
61	I prefer physical newspaper
63	These are not services provided by flying angels... somebody has to pay the bill.
65	I do not want to pay for free news
68	Part of the information should be available, and some premium content should be available based on subscription fees. having all the content exclusively on a fee may decrease the diffusion
69	I'm a subscriber of a journal of this kind. I replaced the paper with a digital edition. I think that providing (good and selected) information must be charged some way.
70	I am for open access documents within public domain (e.g.: universities, research activities and outputs...) BUT it is important to support financially quality of news and editors
72	I understand that online newspapers might need money to guarantee a good information service to their users but paying a fee for reading a newspaper means that I will receive a high level of information without any advertisement.
78	They just shoot themselves in the foot. They loose the ad-revenue financed mass audiences to the seemingly "free" social media sites. On the other hand niche audiences (myself included) are very willing to pay for dedicated, in-depth content.
81	This is actually not a bad thing. If the only revenue is add based, then the papers have a high motivation to make a lot of "click-baits". If they are funded by the readers themselves they might invest more money into proper journalism, since I guess that people are more willing to pay for newspaper with proper journalism.
82	If they use these funds to get away from advertising and having to invade my privacy, this is excellent. If they don't, they're just cheaters. Also, there is the problem that less information might be available freely for those who cannot afford a subscription to the really good information, just to the junk.
84	They do good work. Good work should be paid for.
85	Stop forcing me to text!
86	it's better than advertising, and there's almost always a (better) non-pay alternative
87	The money has to come from somewhere, if ads have to be blocked because they are used for tracking you and are a possible carrier of infections. Still I think a voluntary donation amount would be the better course of action.
88	Noting is for free. Producing a newspaper is costly. I prefer to pay directly instead of selling my (usage) data.
89	Online newspapers provide a service. They deserve compensation. Usually the fees they charge are reasonable. Therefore I am not concerned that more and more online newspapers

	charge subscription fees for access of their articles. However, I am concerned that online newspapers usually add advertisement even when I bought a subscription. There should be a subscription plan with no ads.
90	this is just another copyright-on-the-internet problem. it won't work and just encourages piracy, which doesn't yet exist for newspaper articles.
92	they have to gain money in some way
93	I look at those that don't
97	In the ideal case, that way the get paid for what they should actually do and what's important: Doing good quality journalism. Being dependent on advertisement incomes can be a conflicting goal since advertisers can put pressure on the newspaper if the reporting is not in their interest.
98	Serious, and reliable, journalism has its value and must be supported, accordingly.
99	Innovation is something that have to be expressed also socially. It seems that many of the "new" technologies are not innovating at all at the social level. IF the newspaper is accessible from the internet but not for free this will limit my possibility to actively be part of the community and of my society in general.
104	Newspapers in print also cost money and always have. Even though it is important that some quality journalism is available to everyone, there is no way of balancing the cost without charges.
106	They have to earn their living
110	When not supported through general taxation (transfers) news companies are profit-maing companies. Since the selling of printed papers is going down (from incredibly low levels in Italy, already!) it would be fair to let *private* press agencies to charge their viewers. Different story for public news agencies. I chose to steady support The Guardian to help it meet the decreasing profits for it opted for an open access policy.
111	Good journalism is expensive. I am happy to pay (or allow cookies and/or ads) for a service I want to use
112	newspapers have to find financing; if they share articles for free via social networks they have to finance their work relying on clicks and shares and for this, I see the danger of newspapers simplifying the content to improve "clickability"
118	There has to be a balance between free access to information, and good journalism requiring money
119	I appreciate that newspapers use advertising and charges for access o make money, but this is an inevitable consequence of living in a capitalist society - the problem is how to move out of it and create something better
122	Absolutely not. The only way that on-line newspaper has to survive is ads, but if people pay a fee, maybe the newspapers could decide to reduce ads and to be a little more free in writing real important news.
124	The are forced to do so if they want to survive.
125	I would place myself in the neutral position. The reason is that online newspapers do need a stream of revenue. Not charging subscription fees is therefore not a long-term sustainable approach.
130	They must make a living, aren't they?
131	Free is better
137	Newspapers are in crisis and need to survive. They need to charge for their journalism.
138	I would like to have a free access to newspapers but I do understand it may be difficult to fund newspapers and pay staff members without charging something. I think that charging subscription may be positive from several aspects, a) it may contribute towards employing more journalists and this would then hopefully lead to b) increased quality of newspapers, which would be important because the standards are very low at the moment. Finally, perhaps it would not be bad to limit access of the general population to newspapers such as The Daily Mail,The Sun and other tabloids that spread fake news and propaganda, and that blatantly lie when they are pushing for a certain agenda.
141	I can imagine micro pay systems very well. Qualitative journalism must stay free and therefore it can't be left to marketing structures which generate what pays off best for them.
143	Newspapers have to earn money in order to provide professional journalism. Well investigated information should be appreciated by paying for it.
149	In the pre-internet world we had to buy newspapers, but the next day we could read them for free because they were discarded. I have no objection to online newspapers charging for the current day's content, but archived material should be available for free (it is supported by advertising revenue).
150	I'm more concerned about policies rather than choices made by private companies, such as newspapers.

151	We pay for the physical version, so I think it is also fair to pay for the digital one. Especially if this implies that 1) ensures a high quality of information and 2) newspapers do not need to get their money from gathering information on their users or from ads.
154	... they need money, that's ok.
	... it would be problematic if there would be no printed version anymore;
156	Fake news is a problem and a price for information should be a quality guarantor, but information used to be a right. I could understand some specific high quality service, like financial info, but it shouldn't be spread. Fake news should be stopped in some other ways.
161	People have always paid for newspapers. Why is there an expectation that services delivered online should be free. I think they can be, and the market might dictate that now, but ad free, private viewing sights might offer value that some might pay for.
163	I think it's justified of quality newspapers to charge fees for people to access their articles. I'd rather have high-quality articles than newspaper pages full of advertisements.
164	This means that high quality journalism e.g. reviewed by an editor, is available to less people.
170	its business
178	It should remain free
181	This tendency can increase the information divide between those who can afford to pay for information and those who cannot.
183	Paying for the quality reporting that will support online newspapers may be necessary in order to avoid potential bias associated with advertising support.
184	It is very inconvenient!
186	I enjoy reading articles across multiple media sites, but often I can't access articles without a subscription.
187	public knowledge is eroded and only elite can participate.
189	I am extremely concerned that not everyone in one country or in the world has the same quality of access to information and the Internet. I feel that everyone should be able to obtain an excellent level of information with a quality internet connection, if not at home (because they don't have equipment) then somewhere else like a school or a library. I am slightly less concerned with newspapers charging for online subscriptions because they charge for a print subscription.
194	I understand that newspapers need to make money to sustain themselves, their writers, etc. But as more and more reliable sources fall behind a paywall, many individuals will stop seeking this kind of information/ article, and instead go to less vetted reporting / blog posts/ opinion posts for their information.
195	If the online newspapers don't have ads and are dependent on subscription, one could understand. But they can not have ads and also expect readers to subscribe
196	access divide
198	Information is a social good and should be freely available
199	It is not reasonable to both complain about advertising and complain that there are fees for access to news. News should be free of both fees and advertising powers, but this can only happen if the news source is publicly funded. I am concerned about news sources being privately owned and funded, but if they are going to provide quality information, they need to have some kind of revenue.
201	The free distribution of news and information is more and more curtailed along class lines.
202	I am not concerned about this because the alternative mode of financialisation (realistically speaking) would be advertisement. If you pay for a news service it is therefore less likely that the articles you are reading have been influenced by this third party.
204	I would prefer a company ask for subscription fees up front, such as a newspaper, to view articles. This is much better than getting article free along with an enormous amount of advertisements.
207	Journalism plays a big role in a modern democracy. Of course, it's important for newspapers to establish a source of income. On the other side, these paywalls often prevent people from getting access to those articles. Nowadays paywalls are often complicated and create burdens for not so tech-savvy people.
208	I don't think it should be a matter of money if you can read journalistic articles.
209	Newspapers need incomes to survive, but the public needs information and not everyone can afford subscriptions.
211	people are relying more and more on dubious sources for news
216	They are a commercial organization, so They have to pay salaries.
217	Right to information - free, unlimited - is a human right.
218	With that, the newspapers are digging their own grave, from my POV. They have obviously no idea how this "internet thing" works... especially those in europe.
220	Charging fees in order to access news might create new economic and cultural divides to something that should basically be a public good (news). For groups with few economic resources, this might cause further peripheralization of those already at the margins.

222	It limit the access to information
223	News is public information
224	Media need money to employ journalists. I already pay to access to electronic media. Otherwise, when we'd have only free newspapers, we'll have race to the bottom and excessive advertising - which was concerning few questions above.
226	Online newspapers who build pay walls will not linked at anymore, so only a few paying (and identfied) people will find good or even outstanding artikels. Those newspapers will vanish in the long run.
228	More troubled by tracking and profiling
229	authors need payment too
231	Most data should be free ultimately
232	I think that part of the issue is that people are not prepared to pay for content they consume. In the last couple of years especially we have taken steps to pay for more digital content. e.g. software, online newspaper, streamed music. If we don't then more and more businesses will need to switch over to the ad-based model of funding which seems to me to set up a race to the bottom of exploiting users personal data. That said, there should be much more regarding the internet where the state needs to intervene. Either to regulate, break up monopolies, or provide infrastructure and digital services directly. We've tried to divest ourselves of FB for example, but the fact that we live overseas and all family and friends are on there makes it impossible. We never interact with it now, apart from to make essential family communication and announcements. Tried using Duck Duck Go, but too slow and search is ineffective.
233	It is odd that newspapers have started to charge for reading more than a certain number of articles. Not all of them do that. I only really use the ones that allow you to read stuff for free.
236	I think that the revenue model follow the same approach as paper press
238	As long as online newspapers are massively controlled by private interests and in the hands of investment funds and other such players one can hardly be surprised that they seek to "reward" their owners for being owners. So I'm "somewhat" concerned because it's no surprise, but of course I advocate a different form of ownership which would abolish subscription charges for users.
239	If you don't pay directly newspaper articles, it means that the company is offering you the service in change of your data
240	It is important that "newspapers" continue to exist and offer a variety of opinions to those that want them. Why should news be free? The advertising model does not work in the same way when space is unlimited on the internet so subscription or pay to view seems reasonable. Clearly the WSJ or the FT have dedicated financially supported users but the evidence of Mail Online shows a downtrend in content, while the Guardian is holding out the begging bowl to stay in business.
241	This is normal ! people are working back there and they should have decent pays and working conditions. We used to pay paper newspaper. I would rather pay for a good independent newspaper with well paid journalists, than read crap or "pseudo information" for free.
242	I'm actually paying for the adverts and not for the online newspaper
244	I think they should work and it's necessary for them in order to not be dependent on adverstising.
245	Journalism has to be paid for somehow and since I can't come up with a better way of funding it that doesn't put newspapers completely at the mercy of online advertisers then this seems the only way that journalism can continue to be funded.
251	death of newspaper as safe and honest form of news
255	they have a right to sell their content
256	Free access allows everyone to see the news - charring restricts to those who can pay.
259	People who write for a living should be payed for their work. Advertising revenue is not always enough to pay for good journalism, so I fully understand why news sites might have to charge a subscription. I'd rather pay a subscription for good quality journalism than have lots of intrusive adverts.
261	They clearly need to get money to cover their costs, but I also worry that any barriers to mainstream media open up the channels to less scrupulous online media (as in even less scrupulous the mainstream media!)
264	It's limiting access to people's news sources. The free ones always seem to be the awful racist ones.
266	Quality journalism costs
270	there must be a funding model.
272	This means that we are moving towards increasing numbers of people using Facebook as their sole source for news.
275	Newspapers have to make money somehow. While the subscription fee is not preferable, as it causes problems over access to reliable reporting, other methods of financial support also

	have drawbacks.
276	I'd prefere them to be fully open access, but i understand the necessity to have some kind of revenue.
279	Yes, I am concerned. I believe that, like academia, journalism should be a free and open exchange of information.
281	Yes especially as those will be rising as have academic journals depending on their brand naming- advertising and marketing strategies
287	I would rather pay an encourage the news sources I support. Most sources I use seldom allow free access on a limited basis. The Economist is the main exception. It is too expensive for my third world income, though I used to subscribe to the print version from when I was a student.
288	The fact that quality information is free became a given of the internet era. Decrease in quality can be hopefully contrasted with increase in in costs, although it all depends on profit allocation
289	Information should be free and public. Online newspapers already have advertisements on their websites, they shouldn't make people pay to read their articles.
292	Newspapers are for-profit businesses; therefore they require revenue streams. One might as well ask if an online bookstore should not charge for its goods. A greater concern here is the digital illiteracy that facilitates sites promoting hatred and publishing obviously (and dangerously) false information (e.g. Infowars; Brietbart) that have followers who are not able to distinguish sense from nonsense; truth from fiction. Online media normatively should be no different than print (or radio or television) media - and we should be concerned that the same level of user intelligence and ability to process, judge and use the broadcast information does not seem to exist. (Thank you to all the governments who have pared back spending on education!)
294	In a perfect world, information would be free, but newspapers offer a service by establishing, selecting, proofing and contextualizing this information (ideally). However, if not all people can afford this service, they probably use the "free" offer, which is likely to do nothing of the above stated and maybe even misleading.
296	Pay for a paper copy, pay for online content...
297	The subscription fees of newspapers are definitely a step backwards for free and equal access to information, especially because most of the newspapers' websites are so filled with ads that they could afford to exist without any subscription by the users.
299	Newspapers that charge subscription are most likely biased towards corporate capital and the ruling classes, therefore I am not really interested in reading their stuff.
304	I can't afford to pay their subscriptions, so I can't read the article and be informed.
305	I have noticed the freemium model is disappearing. But I click away when something is not free. There is plenty of information out there.

I am much more concerned that British Library has two buildings in the country where people can walk in. I would rather a campaign to put a library with full internet connection to university libraries within walking distance of everyone's house and 'study rooms' sufficient for everyone with greater numbers where housing density is highest (each kid having a study; each lone entrepreneur a cubicle). |
306	Well, there is good reason for that, quality journalism can only survive if journalists can make a living, but there are different ways of dealing with this problem and a paywall is not the best way in my view
307	Newspapers have to pay the bills meaning either subscriptions or advertising. My preferred option is to give users the option to either see content with advertising or pay a subscription and remove advertising
308	I rely on both traditional media such as the television and online newspapers and blogs to receive the latest current affairs.
309	Newspapers are a vital part of democracy.
314	I'm convinced this is one of the reasons why extremist websites and conspiracy-theory sites have become so much more persuasive in shaping public opinion - people cannot get access to much of the most rigorous and 'objective' journalism without paying, yet untruths about Muslims, immigrants etc are being peddled for free on sites that 'look' as if they are delivering news. Newspaper companies might have ensured their financial survival for a few more years through paywalls but the effect of paywalls for an informed democratic electorate (or rather the lack of one) has been much more detrimental.
315	I see the contradiction -i used to buy a daily neswpaper but haven't for years, and yet expect the same level and standard of news. Which I won't get, anymore than you can now fly with the level of service and comfort that was the case even if you pay a premium. Bad news drives out good.

	I support independent media with cash; paying for the Guardian which I use daily but which also annoys the F*ck out of me, not so much
317	With income levels so unequal it is an expense many of us cannot afford.
318	Another refinancing model will be needed.
319	Look these newspapers are REALLY expensive, and until we figure out a way to extract wealth from global elites and the institutions that hoard it, WE'RE GONNA HAVE TO EAT THE COST! I don't really blame journos or edittos for needing to get frickin' PAID.
323	This may deter "the many" from reading from a variety of sources -- free news does not guarantee quality (although the same could be said for paid news)
325	News organizations have long relied on advertising to fund their journalistic activities. However, internet advertising is invasive and sometimes dangerous to users (i.e. malware vector). News organizations continue to play an important role in society and need to remain economically viable. Paywalls are not ideal because they potentially disenfranchise those who cannot afford to pay, but they fulfill the economic needs of the organizations. If more news organizations were to eschew being part of ad networks and found other ways to remain viable (which may include paywalls), that would probably be better for news consumers.
326	Only people who can afford subscription can make use of online information while those who cannot pay have to tolerate free trash content
328	I think charging fee for online circulation is justified for those newspapers who only have an online presence and not print circulation or television broadcasting options.
330	On one hand this shrinks the availability of information. On the other hand maybe more people will be induced to spend money on the resources that truly represent their interests.
332	Online newspapers aren't where people get their news anymore (for better or worse).
333	I think it's okay to charge for access so these companies continue to exist. But I see how those who won't pay might be less informed. On the other hand, I don't think people actually read articles, mostly just headlines.
334	I think this is reasonable
336	Someone has to pay for good journalism. I'd rather pay for quality.
338	Paywalls have been in existence since almost the beginning of newspaper being online.
344	Unless we can find another model for supporting journalism, newspapers will need to find ways of supporting writers.
345	The overall quality of newspaper articles have fallen substantially, so I am not really concerned about their services. But we need open access to crucial information in some newspapers (Financial Times is a key case).
348	Again, too much control of information
349	I dot read news over the internet
	And I guess we should pay more considering of the workers who need income and to some extend it will be good for the economy and would be worth than paying the license fee to tv stations.
353	I think that in a some way that can be a good think. Producing information is a work. Journalists are workers. Why not to pay for they work?
354	In the world increasingly reduced to headlines, if it is a price for quality journalism I would be willing to pay for some of it. I do pay occasionally for printed press. Its not far away from that idea. Any serious media institution will likely will have costs if it will want to survive and not merely seek out crowd sourced content.
356	There are many gaps between human beings and this kind of rule and capitalist vision, affect human relationship
360	There are lot of things that disturb me about internet journalism. First, as surfing the net used to be free, people while always look for Something that costs nothing. This may push peoples towards fake news site. The fact that there is lesser and lesser printed version of newspapers is also disturbing for me. It is now possible to modify or remove articles without leaving any trace. We could call this the "Minitrue Syndrome".
364	You have to pay for printed paper as well. I prefere a quality content for a certain amount of compensation.
365	They have to get funding somehow. There are some newspapers that give "free samples" that are a good compromise.
366	Due to the fact that I am financially limited, online subscriptions limits the range of my choices. Although I am paying subscriber of New York Times from the very beginning, I don't remember exactly but it must be more than 10 years. But I would like to be able to read articles also from many other online media, but I have limited resources.
373	Content has to be paid for somehow.
375	As researching and writing good newspaper article takes time and money it is logical that media companies or/and journalist would want to earn money. On the other hand, the quality of especially mainstream media is questionable, therefore paying for sub par articles is dubious.

379	Online news needs a business model. Better subscription fees than advertising. I subscribe to several.
380	They need to be making a living, first of all. I pay for high-quality content.
381	The fees I am asked to pay are often substantial, to the point that there is a potential for limiting access to certain populations (i.e. those in poverty). Further, since such fees must be paid by some form of credit/debit card, access to certain populations is stifled.
382	Than for free is only yellow infotainment and ads.
383	Again, depends where one is located. Here in the US, anyone can head to their public library to obtain an article; moreover, most public libraries have full text newspaper databases where individuals can login to obtain material.
384	Organisations, including PSM players, need to monetise their content and find adequate sources of income. Plurality is dependent upon the availability of sustainable sources of income. At present, payments AND advertising play an important part.
387	While I understand that news organisations are struggling to adapt to an online world and are attempting to remain solvent, I have concerns that important, properly researched and attributed information will be withheld from internet users who are unable to afford the cost of subscriptions, leaving them reliant on social media for their news.
388	Yes and no. I don't want to have to pay, but subscription pricing is the traditional model and if it keeps the press alive, then maybe that's the best route.
390	As someone who has worked for print journalism online, I understand that they need to generate revenue.
394	A functioning Democracy needs free access to reliable, quality information.
395	They need to make revenues to keep alive
397	Content is king and creating good content is not free, especially high quality journalism that can be trusted. I regularly donate to the sites I found importnat and high of quality to keep them going on or keep them ad-free, but I know that is not the regular way of thinking, especially not in Eastern Europe where I live. On the other hand, yes, it is also dangerous that some quality stuff is only available for those who pay.
401	If they charge, I Just go and change my information source. I don't like it when it's compulsory. I contribute with subscriptions or donations to projects I believe in, like Wikipedia, The Guardian, elDiario.es, El Salto, Carne Cruda, etc.
402	I'm a communications scholar and I understand that the business models for print press are changing and are under pressure, so I understand why some might choose a paywall. That said, I personally prefer business models that keep information and content free/as cheap as possible and so I am not adverse to advertising on these websites.
405	Essentially because the papers I prefer have chosen not to put up paywalls (for now...)
406	seems not to be in the spirit fo the web - but then the most likely alternative is to be washed away with more ads etc.
407	They have to make their on-line operations economically sustainable.
410	Newspapers are disgracefully biased and are out of date.
411	We are in a very competitive market so i think most people will select to read free online newspapers , but i am afraid that the available free newspapers will start to distribute false information or one point of view and this will affect the freedom of press.
413	it narrows my options of readings on-line.
414	News should not be free, as the producers need to get paid. However blocking access to news (and therefore a retarding the development of a critical citizenry) means the cheapest sources have the potential to dominate the popular discourse. Paywalls limit access.
415	Wasn't aware it could be seen as a problem. But it is now that you make me think about it.
416	Just a feature of dinosaurs who haven't realised they are already extinct. Not a sustainable business model. Untargetted advertising is harmless. Alternatives will develop.
417	If the fees are connected with diminishing of advertising on newspapers websites, then it is OK. Otherwise it is not OK.
418	The barriers to access to a wide range of news/opinion sources including high quality journalism, based on ability to pay, The resulting distortion to the supply of news/opinions through users flocking to free sources that may lack the necessary journalistic credentials e.g. Breitbart The extension, consolidation and validation of often more extreme positions arising from interaction with such sources and with populist online news providers e.g. Mail Online .
419	Right news must have a value.
420	If its it necessay to pay printed edition it is correct to pay also online edition; work of people (e.g. journalists) have to be paid no matter in which 'platform' their work appears
421	Newspapers have mostly charged a cover price in the past so there's nothing new about this. Good journalism needs to be paid for somehow, and if ad revenue won't cover the costs, I am relaxed about paying a subscription.

425	Poorer people may have not the money to spend on online news subscriptions. If newspapers, who theoretically have more credibility than other kinds of media become unaccessible, than free "fake news" will proliferate easilier.
428	They gotta make money somehow. If subscription system work for them, that's good. Nobody's forced to pay to access all the latest news.
429	The early Web was predicated on the notion of freedom of information and therefore freedom for users. Paywalls are antithetic to this desire.
431	It may prevent people with less resources from getting access to quality news, but when done properly it may be a viable alternative to ads and exploiting users' data.
434	I trust more subscriptions than advertisement financing...
435	Initially tempted to check very 'concerned', but changed because good journalism has to be financed from somewhere, especially as online use may overtake use of printed media. So far this issue hasn't been addressed adequately, in my view.
436	I just hope that quality newspapers will continue to provide free-at-the-point-of-use, ad-funded if not publicly funded journalism accessible to all internet users.
438	I am concerned about this in terms of people not having access to "proper" news. but then the newspapers are struggling to survive. also the annoying advertisements disappear if you subscribe, which is a good thing.
440	Obviously prefer read everything I want without subscription, but at the same time I understand the need to safeguard and give economic value to the writer's professionalism
442	News should be free. When it is sold, it shows that even those connected to the news can also dictate what and how it is published.
443	I don't read online newspapers
445	I'm not concerned about online news charging for access because I can get free access from work. Public news providers (usually public broadcasters) also tend to provide more balanced and higher quality information for free anyway.
448	the charges are outrageous
449	It's concerning and disappointing, but difficult to see alternative business models.
454	Universal access to information is an important value Getting paid for your work (as a journalist) is an important value Find a balance
455	They need a revenue stream. Too many users are accustomed to getting something for free. Fees reduce advertising, in theory at least.
457	fee-for-service is less complicated than ad-driven service
460	Restricts flow of information
467	Fernanda Beigel and Hanan Sabea the book -Academic dependency and professionalization in the South. Prospects of the periphery (2014) - indicate that we must begin to reflect on the ways of circulation of knowledge at the regional level and dismantle the prestige built at the international level and accepted almost uncritically by scientists from the peripheral communities. This academic prestige is valuable in the main world universities and at local level (the Argentine case) with CONICET. The authors affirm that it is no longer possible to speak of "academic imperialism" because the methods of influence of the hegemonic centers of knowledge have been refined, keeping intact the impact in the establishment of research agendas and methodologies. They subtly point out that through the rankings of universities and the indexing systems of scientific journals have been established as "two great inventions of the cusp of the academic system" that call attention to the dichotomy generated between the Argentine researchers who participate in the international circuit and those who do not
471	information shouldn't be sold makes no sense
472	I would prefer to have free assess to all the articles. But I understand that the newspapers companies need to get revenues to pay the cost of producing those news pieces.
473	I know that good journalism takes time and money to have. But still i think this pay walls are not the right way to get money from the readers.
475	Newspapers are usually commercial businesses, they should be able to charge a fee for using their services if they feel that is the way they can finance their operations.
478	It is a pity that one has to pay for information, but... perhaps necessary...
480	It´s one way to enable running the operation.
482	This is a new way of exploitation.
483	Not everybody has financial capacity to subscribe to online newspapers and/or journals, as much as they want to read their articles. It's very unfair.
486	Their problem.
489	Newspapers need to make money to pay for professional journalists that brings quality journalism. I pay for access to the papers I want to read. For other papers the X number of articles / Y amount of time most papers offer is sufficient. For those who cannot afford subscriptions, many public broadcasting companies provide quality journalism for free (e.g.

	BBC).
492	News of what is happening around the world is important information and every individual should have the right to information. So limiting the information to only the people who can pay is violation of right to information.
494	Quality and verified information is becoming more niche and less accessible, this means that low quality, fake and unverified information becomes mainstream and the norm of how people are informed. This can lead to public vulnerability to exploitation from corporate gains to political propaganda.
495	Shouldn't news be accessible regardless of financial means? That's what I think form an ethical point of view. Money is power and information is power, so if there is a group of people denied both, doesn't that only further their disadvantage.
496	The provision of information necessary for the citizen to function should not be subject to a financial barrier. In order to gain the same level of income, as they enjoyed from advertising subsidy, the few surviving newspapers will be obliged to raise their prices to levels that deter poorer citizens. Public TV in Europe has been provided free at the point of use to all citizens (assuming they could afford a TV). The same should be the case for the more detailed information traditionally supplied by newspapers. Of course, public TV is subject to all sorts of problems, witness the current state of the BBC, but such problems are in principle resolvable.
506	I'm concerned that if quality news are not free more people will go to unreliable news websites. However I understand the need of quality newspapers/ news channels to get income from their work, particularly when I am saying I don't like advertisement on the news websites
507	I believe this is only a temporary behaviour as users predominantly switch to open data
510	Newspapers must also make a living but advertising should offset customer costs.
511	Indifferent
512	good journalism has its price
513	I read the news from the online newspapers and would not like to pay.
515	Somewhat concerned, It is nice to read it online I think if I had to pay for it I would not read it.
517	I really worry about this, I have donated to one Daily Broadsheet who are obviously struggling financially.
521	If you want journalism that serves you and not the owner of the mean (newspaper, website, etc) or the advertisers, then you probably have to pay for it.
523	Traditional media such as newspapers are much less biased than online providers such as facebook who filter news and are much more biased. Online services such as facebook are not interested in providing unbiased news, their sole interest is their own profit. It is a conflict of interest
524	It won't work as a mechanism to fund journalism, and excludes people who can't afford the subscriptions. Maybe a paywall will work for the NY Times or similar level, but not many titles can sustain it when people expect content for free. Therefore, I would say again that public funding is needed in order to deliver a public good - the public sphere necessary for a democratic society, which includes multiple sources of high quality journalism. See Robert W McChesney's book The Digital Disconnect for a policy proposal on this.
525	It's fair to charge for media which need to pay writers. And the content will leak out somehow and appear free if it's relevant to me.
529	Yes, and it reduces the capacity of those unable to pay to get information and creates a divide, no in that it reduces their reliance on advertisers and keeps them independent.
530	because they need resources to operate
531	I pay for my newspaper. It is under threat because too many people access it for free on line - they are in effect being subsidised by me. I think all newspapers should charge the same as the print version price to access the newspaper on-line - the journalists and workers need to be paid - why shold people think they can have this for free? They are prepared to pay to watch TV -= they shouod also be prepared to pay for newspapers.
533	I know that it costs money to collect information so I suppose they are justified in charging. If their product is of a high enough quality people will pay for it. Personally I prefer to buy a paper copy of a newspaper everyday - I spend too long looking at screens as it is!
534	News media needs to finance the news production, I understand that, and the advertising industry dependence is not working anymore, but pay-walls are a huge problem if they stop keeping the democracy feed with the common knowledge.
536	Everyone should have a right to information in order to inform their opinions or beliefs. Deciding who gets to know things by whether they can afford to pay for it seems wrong but that's how it has always worked.
542	Newspapers do costs in print and £5 a month for The Guardian is comparably cheap.
543	It would be healthier for the democracy and freedom of thought if there were no subscription fees for access of online newspaper articles. I realise, however, print sales have gone done

	and newspapers/magazines need to make money, though.
544	News should be free because it's information. We watch it for free on television (albeit the tv license fee) and can read it for free in newspapers like the metro / evening standard. So why is there a need to charge a fee for an online newspaper? I understand as a business it needs to make money but why can't this be through advertising like everything else? It doesnt make sense to charge for something we can get for free elsewhere.
545	The fact that 'real' news generation is increasingly 'hidden' behind paywalls and subscription fees means that it is even easier for the fake news generators to spread the lies, fabrications and mischief into the 'free' news sphere.
548	Keeping quality journalism alive through continued support remains one of the cornerstones of a proper democracy.
550	Journalistic production is a costly venture which must be supported to prevent hijack by advertisers
557	I currently do not pay for any online newspapers but if I could afford to I would consider it - but only if it was cheaper than buying an actual newspaper. It would concern me more if this was the only way of getting access to any news or articles.
559	It somehow erodes the original idea that the internet was build so researchers can share their data. Newspaper charging for information when at the same time they earn money do to ads and collecting our data is a bit counter-intuitive. Phrased differently: you get my data (cookies from surfing the net) and hence produce targeting ads, I get your news.
562	I understand that newspapers need to generate income in order pay journalists. However, it's important that people have access to a wide range of views, and not just one website that is funded to present a biased point of view.
568	i hardly read newspapers online or hard copy
566	I expect to pay a cost to purchase fiction from my bookstore?
567	It is normal, from commercial perspective, we paid for each paper issue bought every day from the kiosk. On the other hand, it is a signal that the situation is not changed, just moved from the paper media to the virtual space. And there perhaps should be any kind of change in future, I do not know really what may happen, but the changes are happening with a greater speed than we expected and maybe because of this we are very pressed, because this communication opens more channels to exchange new information and to get new knowledge.
569	I believe Internet made an implicit promise of free content.
570	They need to earn money for good journalism.
571	A free press is important; however, there's the problem of the payment of full-time journalists. Would a newspaper publish a critical article about a major advertiser? This is one reason why I do not loke advertisements. On the other hand: hiding information behind "paywalls" makes that informnation isaccessible for people who aren't able to pay the price. one might argue that the "paywall" on the internet is only the equivalent of the price for a printed newspaper, but thta's onla half the truth, since publishing online is by far less expensive.
577	Knowledge is power, limiting it to select few means further limiting the power of the less powerful
578	Newspaper articles often carry important arguments which should be available to the public for free.
587	There are good newspapers in Ermany which act differently, e.g. The Tageszeitung. In addition, good journalism must paid, offline or online. Only then we may be informed in an independent way.
589	While I understand that newspapers have costs to cover and that the same goes for quality journalism, I think that information should be free. Ideally, there should be other ways found to cover these costs.
592	They have to make their money somehow, but I can imagine people will always end up at the lowest common denominator, sites that are free or rely on advertising, such as thr Daily Mail Online. They can then spread more maliciousness through click bait, and generate a nice sum through advertising. Their oligarch rulers can then carry on peddaling the lies, misinformation and hatred, safe in their offshore tax havens, all the while knowing they won't be challenged as they prop up todays failing tory government.
593	The erosion of the mainstream media business model is a severe problem for companies but also for the health of democracies. As such, mitigation actions should involve not only media outlets (and their legitimate actions to gather much needed revenue) but also national governments and supra-national actors, like the European Union (namely by taxing large internet conglomerates which profit from media contents and allocating those funds to media producing outlets).
596	I would hope that they are using subscriptions to pay their writers, and support proper newspapers.
597	Whilst I appreciate the need for new business models, I generally believe that the limitation of

	access to quality journalism is of detriment to the populous.
598	I don't mind to pay a fair fee for good journalism and trustworthy information. Journalists should be able to make a living from their work. This having been said,I only hope they are properly payed.
600	If you pay for the hard copy then you should pay for the online version too.
602	As I am a media researcher so I feel that the data should be used by the user free of cost. Moreover, internet usage fee, if has already been paid then why doe it necessary to pay more. Also, I m concerned with the fact that the companies gain multitude benefits by offering their website, on-cost and off-cost. And so on and so forth
604	They need to pay their staff and bills to exist.
605	News should be free
609	if they charge, sod them. there is social media
611	Marketization of the share of ideas is a real disaster!
612	Print copies are purchased so online content justifiably so.
613	They charge for a physical copy of the paper
614	the poor do not get equality of access to information
615	This limits access to different viewpouints
616	News and information are public goods, which should be accessible to all on an equal footing to accommodate informed citizenship and participation in democratic institutions.
617	I prefer to pay for quality journalism as I do for a paper edition of a media rather than I get presented some ads online that try to collect as much data from as they can.
620	you do not have to use 'paywall'services if you choose not to. I do not get my news from just one source
629	I am concerned because it goes against the concept of open access; I'm not concerned because I have to pay for a standard hardcopy version, so why not something for an e-version?
634	Newspapers are businesses, they have to have some income. If media were public or part of the State, I would think that they should be free, but that is not the case.
636	better not to read them
638	If we want free press/media, free press needs funding (in our capitalist societies). Ads, micro-payments, public fundings, crowdfunding.. any of these must be, otherwise journalists cannot do their job - and we still need them to.
639	If they charge I will not use them. There are other sources.
640	They have to make revenue somehow, less people are buying print editions so this is a way of making a profit.
644	It means that news from reputable (although, not always and obviously, different papers / news channels have different political leanings) will only become for people who can afford it leaving other open to using channels such as Twitter and Facebook for news which of course is where the majority of fake news is circulated and shared. As print editions are slowly and unfortunately becoming more and more obsolete, I feel that it's important that people can still access properly monitored news. I do appreciate though that they need to make money so it can't always be free but I'm not going to explore business cases today!
645	Good journalism is a core component of a democratic society, and (as Trump demonstrates) the component most easily attacked by those who would replace it with totalitarianism. Good journalism is a societal good, but needs to be read to be effective! To rely on Facebook or Twitter for your news is to give power to organisations with no professional standards or desire for the public good. News agendas from such online sources are driven by the self-serving economics of 'clicks', 'likes' and 'views', not by any desire for journalistic 'truth' or 'the public good'.
649	I'm not sure 'concerned' is the right word. I do fall into the trap of wanting content for free, without intrusive advertisements, while valuing quality journalism and thorough reporting. I acknowledge that these desires are mutually exclusive! And I recognise that alternative models are needed if quality journalism is to survive.
650	these things should be free to read online
651	Happy to pay for subscription.
653	I appreciate the ones that try to avoid this, but in the end, o read a newspaper you buy a newspaper. Sometimes to read online, you have to pay too otherwise advertising income is the only other way.
654	I'm in favour of subsidies to ensure high quality new provision online is delivered.
664	I worry about the access to information, but I also consider that the current models might not be suited to sustain the production of quality journalism. Also, if paid access is coupled with ad- and tracking-free browsing, I believe it might be justifiable in some cases.
665	Gotta pay the bills somehow... The Shirky/Lessig/Benkler/Brand utopian nonsense that information wants to be free is mere short-hand for media barons don't want to pay for labour.

666	I am happy to pay for subscruiption to the newspaper I read, if it means keeping it in circulation
668	I don't read newspapers and prefer to receive information from online media or feeds of my social networks.
669	Newspapers that normally don't require a subscription fee are taking advantage of the convenience of accessing them online.
670	I don't read those newspapers
678	You get what you pay for, or you are the product (sometimes both...). Journalists need to be paid for their work, even if, under the cirscumstances, capitalists exploit them.
680	Objective, fact-based journalism could become the preserve of the wealthy while the less wealthy consume fake news that's been selected for them by paying companies / political parties. That's a terrifying prospect.
688	a business model decision.
692	To the extent that the news is in the public interest, subscription fees are harmful in how they limit access to those willing/able to pay.
693	The existence of "real" reporters is a good thing, it's hard to see how that'll continue to be funded in the absence of paper copies.
699	Newspapers in general are a vital and important component of society: they need to do what they have to do to survive.
702	By the higher-quality news sources relying on subscriptions to fund their journalists, expenses, etc. it means that anyone NOT willing to pay ends up relying on potentially inferior sources of information.
703	no answer justification
707	How are they going to produce quality journalism if they don't generate revenue?
711	Reading news in prints comes at a cost so does putting in online. So the news may be constant, the medium to deliver the service of providing the news may differ but doesn't eliminate the fact that providing news is a service that may attract a cost though less than having it in prints.
712	News need to be free for all, because the communication is important
717	How do you feel about the fact that most printed newspapers have to be paid?
718	Barrier to access.
720	News should be free.
723	It makes sense, as publishing is no longer as popular, people hardly read any newspapers or magazines in hard copies anymore, and they do have to generate income, however i do not really read either (maybe headlines at most), so it doesn't really bother me.
725	Newspapers always cost money when in paper format, good reporters do not work for free, they need to be paid.
726	The business needs to survive and it's already imodvtkhg on journalism quality so I think it's fine but I don't pay I use other sources that are free
727	Save trees.
730	Information should be free, they already make indirect money due to ads and visits
736	You have to pay for paper newspaper also..
740	Intellectual property should be paid for.
746	I am happy with the free newspapers, as long as I can read some news that fine.
749	While concerned at the death of print media and their failure to adapt their business models, I see it is a changing of the guard encouraging citizen journalists and sites like Wikileaks. However, less people sharing information means a less diverse dialogue, this is an overall negative. 90% of US media is owned by six related companies.
750	Yes I'm pro open source and free access and distribution of info, but if some want to charge I have no problems with it... its an open market
751	I would imagine it is cheaper to pump out articles online than it is to pump out actual papers. It should be FREE!!
759	News organisations should also get paid for their work but there is a need to public services, also in terms of information provision
764	Better charge for services than exploit user data. Of course, services that do track AND charge are no option for me. However, I strongly support interesting online journalism that charges for service, but does not track and annoy with ads.
766	asdasdad
768	many people don´t get access to real journalism anymore, only to their own filter bubble
769	I try to avoid reading the news, as most are bad anyway. By introducing fees to read them, it's a sure step to help me stopping completely from reading the news :)
770	They need to pay salaries etc
771	They need to make a profit and charging for subscription is better than depending on advertising.

772	Some people have access while others are unable to afford to access the information
773	I personally feel newspaper articles should be available to everyone.
776	It is becoming more and more difficult to access information from certain sources
778	It would be nice to have access to good quality free information (otherwise people might prefer free, but unreliable, information sources and this would be very dangerous).
779	I didn't realize they did this, but this is concerning for me as then it means people will find their news from other sources, sources that aren't credible. Even so many of the major news outlets these days are becoming increasingly sensationalized in the way they present media.
780	It' business
784	Journalists and photojournalists should be paid properly for their work. If paywalls raise awareness that journalism is not something "everyone can do" but requires professional training and skills, it is good to have paywalls and to pay staff and freelancers - and not letting them fall into precarious working conditions.
790	We pay for 'free' internet by having our data harvested and advertising sold back to us. It's not a good model, and I pay to avoid that for some things.
792	I value free riding; I'm concerned about the impact of the changes in media ecology to the institution of to independent journalism and to non for profit press; I'm concerned about the lack of awareness among media users of the effects of marketisation including molopolies in information, content and cognitive/processing capacity acquisition, packaging and distribution
796	If it allows them to live without relying on ads, this is great. But more importantly, it must allow them to be independent, and to live only with that. And more important, people should be able to buy it ! If nobody can afford a subscription, this is pointless.
797	they will soon be obsolete. well they are now actually.
798	Yes
799	subscription fees for access of their articles are mostly high
803	The information must, according to me, be available for free
801	Honestly, I support news outlets in any attempt they make to keep afloat.
806	Newspapers need to support their revenue through means that are not always ad-subsidised. Payment for content is one of the more reliable ways to generate content through high-quality journalism, especially in the age of ad blockers.
807	Paper newspapers are not gaining as much profit to keep the newspapers going. People are shifting to the online more. So, yes, it is not very good for users but it's a necessity if we still want to have news agencies that can pay salaries to their employees in ways other than public donations or funds.
808	Newspapers are business and therefore need to be financially viable - they are not a public service. We should be more concerned about the content being provided by the public services.
811	Knowledge should be accessible easily and for the better freely
814	Free access is fundamental to me as far as I need newspapers for my research
815	I think the media is entitled to have a paid for option. I don't have to use it there is plenty of free content out there. I do pay one subscription but that is work related.
819	I can understand a newspaper if online having to have both free and premium models (freemium). Everything can't be free, as people's time needs to be paid for, so I understand if they want to charge. Other online news channels e.g. on YouTube do the same e.g. via Patrion etc. There are lots of sources out there, so online newspapers need to offer something of value e.g. investigations etc. that require funding, hence charging for access. I can see already online that what people are more interested in, is the truth, and seem willing to make payments to such channels in order to get access to those channels. So, it is possible to provide a good service and charge for it, esp. if mainstream media seem very biased or one-sided in their programmes.
828	Access to news and information is important but this costs money so there has to be a revenue model that supports it.
829	Paywalls are a reasonable way of paying for publication. Prior to the Internet, nobody EXPECTED content to be free, and production, as opposed to distribution, is not significantly cheaper now.
832	On the one hand, information needs to be free and therefore, no subscription should be in place. On the other hand, traditionally people would pay to buy a newspaper, hence, there has been a model that worked. I generally do not use subscription-based online information sources. I believe it is to the content provider's benefit to leave access open. More people will go there and therefore, the content provider will have higher rates of income from adverts. It's been a similar discussion with music sharing over P2P, or bands that made their music available online for free - more people went to their concerts.
836	I pay for good content

837	Eh, news is not as available, but subscriptions are probably necessary for the viability of the news providers - and may also enable reduced or less-intrusive ads.
838	The battle for the business model for online news is not resolved yet. There are different models, trial and failure. If all news are premium than there is a risk of creating a privilegged class/public who has access to information and who can influence the public debate.
841	Newpapers should avoid putting content behind paywalls.
842	Information should be free and for all.
843	I don't read newspapers in print or online, unless I occasionally pick up the Evening Standard or Metro when passing through a station. You can always find free news online - try the BBC, Channel 4, etc. Or listen to the radio - I get almost all my news from Radio 4 and that's free.
845	We already pay in many ways to use online services. If newspapers want to publish online, this service should be free.
847	It does mean that news is in the risk of becoming private. However, this is not news as it was the same way with printed copies.
849	We don't have money to pay for it.
852	it's a service so it is normal to pay for a service (we pay for newspapers)
854	You cannot expect to find reliable news for free
857	I think information should be as much as possible freely accessible
858	Who cares? They need to make money somehow. You BUY a newspaper, so what wrong with BUYING an e-newspaper?
860	it should be pertinent fee without ads
862	they need to protect themselves from the "unfair" competitors such the OTT that abuse of their monopolistic position
863	In general the artistic , cultural, news content (professional and not) should be protected by serious international laws (and enforcement) against predatory policies by big internet companies.
869	It's a service provided by private corporations.
870	Well, they do have to make money somehow. Serious commitment to news reporting cannot reasonably be offered completely free of charge. Invasive ads is NOT the way to make money though...
873	As far as I'm concerned, it is more democratic for the media to be available for all and not a commodity to be purchased by a few. The democratization of knowledge is the acquisition and spread of knowledge amongst the common people, not just privileged elites.
876	By charging subscriptions they limit the access to information that users have
877	You could write a book about how the Internet is changing news and journalism - I believe it's damaging civil society and the citizen's ability to think critically and argue against bad government. A healthy press is a vital check on power. The switch to printed newspapers to online and their associated funding problems damages us all and sets the scene for worsening political class and culture.
880	I don't necessarily have problem with paying to access a service. I'd rather pay a reasonnable fee that have advertissement.
883	It all ends up being focused on paying but there is no discussion on raising minimal wages or having a maximum wage. I agree that the work of journalists and newspapers, etc, has to be paid. But also we have to be able to pay it. Otherwise you end up choosing on what you can spend money on and the cheapest is always the best.
885	If I am not mistaken this is the 3rd occurrence of this question
886	Risks creating a situation where only those who can afford to pay has access to information
887	The newspaper's business is in trouble since we are reading news online. I think that it is fair that they news sites (the ones that have also printed version) want to charge for the digital services.
888	Even before you had to buy the newspaper when it was on paper. It is also important to remember that the revenue of the news paper is the advertising. This is true also before the Internet existed. The problem is that now with online advertising Google ads makes a lot of money, but there is not a big margin for the newspapers. Who also have a benefit are the people advertising products, they can do campaigns of marketing at a much lower price compared to the past.
893	Newspapers have to charge subscriptions to survive in an age where reading in print is significantly reduced.
894	As journals ever sell informations is right that they can find new ways to sell them
898	There are other sources
899	At one hand I believe that writing for a newspapers is work and not a charity, so I consider it just that the authors or editors are being payed. At the other hand, there are different alternative ways of receiving funds. And the main concern is that the money does not have

	the same value for everyone, and so charging for the access for information may lead to inequalities and would bring further difficulties to people having already very little privileges.
901	They did not understand what digital era + Internet is about. They try to protect that liquid digital media as analog media. They are the authors of the attacks to Internet and digital models. They don't accept the new situation, for example they try to block users of sharing content with DRM, which is awful. New digital era has new business models.
902	Information is power, and certainly has a price it will all depends on the willing of the people to buy and the type of info, for example, medical and scientific discoveries should be open.
910	At the end of the month everybody needs to pay bills. Quality journalism must be paid.
911	If they lose readers, it ist OK for me. It does not matter. They missed the point finding new sales structures for monetarizing their Work. They want money for quoting Twitter or copying other newssources. Stupid idea. If they produce News in a good quality, I will give them Money, e.g. via crowdfunding/micropayment platforms or buying their products.
912	If they continue to do so, they will vanish. I rather refer to several different sources than to "the" one , single news(paper) site...
913	While I agree quality journalism needs to be compensated a lot of agencys also hide the key facts of articles or ticker posts. This way people without the financial or technical abilitys are hindered to participate on public discussions needed for a healthy democracy.
914	The prices the publishers dream of are to high and often not justified. A lot of content on the web is free so the hurdle to pay for some subset is rather high. However I would gladly pay a flat fee for all media if that would eliminate ads
915	Most on-line news organizations that charge for their services are hurting themselves as there are plenty of alternate sources of information that allow me to search out anything I'm interested in. Those very few organizations that provide something I'm interested in, I am willing to pay.
918	I would like to access these subscriptions free of charge. Having said that, I might be willing to pay for the right price.
920	Informations should be free, but journalists need to eat too
923	Unfortunately, online newspapers have no other options as most people today receive their news information through social media platforms. If not assisted (Via regulations, state intervention or citizenry initiations and so on) the whole journalism industry might collapse
924	Any content must be paid in a way or another. Subscription is the only way to avoid too many ads
925	Why?
926	I believe in taking information from different sources to compare.
928	I think it is good to have information available for everyone, paying for these articles might throw up a barrier to read them. On the other hand, nothing comes for free. People that spend their lives to create these articles, should be able to make a living. The hosting of these websites (on systems that consume energy, need maintance etc.) isn't free either.
930	Prefer news and current affairs to circulate freely.
932	WTF
934	Well, to have good quality journalism we need to fund the group of people that make that news. I think it's fair to pay for that but at the same time, I think that information needs to be spread to everybody, not only to who has money.
935	As the old business model for journalism is crumbling, I have no concerns for a user pay model for journalism. Someone or something has to fund journalism.
937	Journalism is NOT cost free. To afford to have good journalism, I am willing to pay for it. I do not believe that thinking news is free leads us to reliable news media. It leads us to opinion and fake news flourishing. However, to keep those forces at bay, we need to accept that some people believe everything should be free. Clearly we need a new model for news that will support news gathering and reliable journalistic operations. The model where Google and FaceBook get the revenue, not the news organization, is no sustainable.
938	I view online subscriptions to online versions of newspapers as every bit as not-concerning as subscriptions to hardcopy versions of the same newspapers.
939	Newspapers have to make a profit somehow or they will cease to exist. Reasonable subscription fees are OK.
940	I understand there is a cost in media production, but, they also have advertising and they are still charging.
941	My subscription includes delivery of a newspaper and 'free' access to the website, which I only use for research. The newspaper delivery is discounted so I consider my subscription as beneficial though I resent paying extra for mobile access.
943	How are media organisations going to survive with no income streams? Your question seems naive.
944	If traditional media corporations want to make themselves irrelevant by paywalling their content then it doesn't bother me. Far more concerning to have a broad readership of their

	partisan commentaries.
946	In two minds here - I understand that if newspapers are to survive they need non-ad revenue and I'm willing to pay in the abstract - but in practice I don't. I realise the effect of people doing as I do will effectively kill non-advertising supported media on the internet and by extension IRL
949	While I like free access to information, I understand that journalism needs a business model to survive.
951	Reasonably source of profit
954	I support the journalists' right to be paid for their work.
955	For democracy to work, knowledge and information must be freely available or at least very easy and very cheap to obtain.
957	Whether a newspaper charges or not does not adversely affect society or the individual. Newspapers are not the sole source of information, nor necessarily high quality sources of information. If all newspapers charged, this would simply create a gap in the info-ecosystem in which others would arise to give the same information away for free.
958	That's their commercial choice. The old newspapers pretty much 'killed the internet' here anyway. A quick review of Google Analytics shows that.
960	As above answers, giant providers or users with an unfair advantage in promoting their own publications and opinions twist popular opinion
963	they obviously need money to survive!
967	It goes against the principle of the internet
969	They deserve to be paid for their work.
970	na
971	It becomes inaffordable to get a balanced viewpoint.
976	Quality Information should be make profesionally and that must be payed.
981	I am by vocation and avocation a journalist. Of course, I'm concerned about paywalls for newspapers. But I am far more concerned about the disrupted financial model for newspapers that is killing off scores of titles in my country every year. If paying for a subscription--as I did with a daily print edition before it was sliced to three days a week--can help keep journalists reporting on stories that must be told, I'm more than willing to do that.
984	I think I should pay for access to quality journalism, but not with my data. The internet has been not so much disrupting but rampaging through journalism, demolishing one of the most important ingredients of democracy.
985	Advertisement and sponsored control should be avoided. Subscription fee is necessary
986	This has become a normal strategy for newspapers, which is quite telling of their inability to make use of the web infrastructure. I see a tendency to plus-arrangements, where prenumeration for the printed edition give access to the full web edition. In Norway we also have a (Spid-)logon developing, which makes access to articles easier across papers. However, the closing of opiniated/news sources for most people is of course a challenge - as it always has been, ever since the printed press and before.
994	Newspapers and the media in general are vital to shaping the public opinion, ensuring transparency and accountability within a democratic society, and promoting an informed citizenry. When segments of the population cannot access it, it exacerbates the digital divides, but also tarnishes democracy in practice.
998	on one side it is understandable .. on the other it is getting very complicated and confusing when for each detail access is needed. it also contradicts the original idea of the internet that was once thought of as a free medium .. Certainly though one should also make a distinction between the internet and www. It is not an easy question to answer as I am also very concerned about the google attitude .. 'keep signed in with one account for all' - that is basically total control.
1003	bad praxis
1004	It depends where the cutoff is - both in terms of how much of the article you can see, and how many pages you can see free of charge in [say] a week or a month. The best sites are those that allow you 5 or 10 pages a week. Others, such as the Murdoch press, I just cut out of my reading altogether.
1005	Newspapers are a business, must have profit or close. The economic model must evolve, before we paid for a copy, if now paid for access to the news does not seem worrisome. Salaries are payable. Now, the walls of payment to access scientific research or academic articles that have been financed with public money (fellowships, salaries, etc.) if I find it very worrisome
1006	Charging subscription/access fee is good alternative to business model based on advertising.
1009	It´s a fair way to make quality news.
1010	The Internet is open and for all. I can understand that you might have to pay a small amount for information access (you also pay for a physical newspaper), but how can you than be sure that the quality of the news is correct (if you go through a physical newspaper in a shop, you

	know if it is worth buying or not, you cannot do this online).
1012	Well I used to pay for the newspaper so it makes some sense to pay an online subscription to keep quality newspapers in business. Many of them allow a few stories for free. I am more concerned about the emerging relationships between news media and social media platforms and the role social media platforms will play in what news we see.
1013	Because of the accessibility of ('quality) news especially when there is also free news available
1014	Newspapers need resources to survive. If there is no public funding, alternatives must be found.
1016	I think a newspaper is a private company, service provider so it's entitled to charge for it services/products. Depending on the relevance/quality of information a small pay to access is acceptable. But then I would not accept advertising. If I don't pay, I accept advertising as a form of payment.
1017	It's come to the point where good journalism needs to be funded by the people.
1018	access to quality news should encouraged and not behind a pay wall...
1021	In history you always had to buy a newspaper if you wanted to read it. Than these newspapers published their articles on the internet for free. Now it is not paying of. Less and less people are buying printed newspaper and read the articles online instead. But the newspaper companies have to earn money to hold their level of quality - it still costs to produce the articles. Therefore, I do not think it is a big deal that they now change from free to fee. On the other hand, shitty newspapers with free articles can influence people ("alternative facts") that do not want to pay for good and high-quality stuff.
1024	I understand that professional journalism comes at a cost and newspapers are struggling, but users get so used to free online news that, if the good articles are only for subscribers, they will retort to other online news sources, which are less credible, ranging from lower quality to outlets which are freely accessible but paid for by advertising and which support the sort of Fast-Food-Journalism which brought us Trumpism.
1029	INFORMATION / NEWS SHOULD BE FREE FOR ALL.
1031	Once newspaper charge a fee to consume news, it becomes a real danger that people will consume free news where the authenticity of the information may be unverified/fake.
1032	Those without access and/or money have less information and thus less political empowerment
1041	I am a little be concerned because someone has to pay and they might get the price very high or even control all the information from the web.
1043	Control of press means no freedom of ideas ...
1048	Privacy of data is paramount but advertising is how free services - twitter, Facebook etc can exist. Advertising may be irritating but can be easily ignored, user has the ability to use social media or not.
1049	Newspapers and media that are privately owned have to make a profit to survive, historically they did that through sales of the physical object and through sales of advertising - these have both been completely undermined through the advent of the internet. If they are unable to generate an income then they will fail which is enormously problematic for the democratic process.
1050	Print newspapers have historically had a charge, and if the journalism is good then we should pay for it. However, this should negate the need to have large amounts of advertising - if a news service decides to promote a lot of adverts then the service should be free.
1051	If you want to read it and they want you to pay you have a choice - pay up or don;t read it. I currently do the Guardian cryptic crossword and read Guardian football coverage. If they started charging I would simply go elsewhere
1053	I believe that we should find ways to sustain good journalism. I don't think that this can be achieved through the mechanisms of the market but, as an interim measure and until we find a better system, I don't object to good quality newspapers raising money through subscriptions if the alternative is for them to fold...
1056	Open Access is desirable for obvious reasons: access to knowledge, etc. But several thousands of predatory publishers and journals offer Open Access: caution! This form is the last occasion for me to specify the following: I never use Facebook and Twitter and I do not want to use them, nor alternate services. So pls analyze my replies in regard with that.
1057	its their business
1058	It results in more and more information being difficult to obtain in a situation where filter-bubbles are already dominating how people consume news. This will only increase through paywalls and subscriptions. People will stick to only Facebook groups for their media and

	news intake...
1059	News stories from credible sources should be widely accessible
1060	I think that at the current stage it is necessary to give a value to good information. Newspapers need to be recognized for their good work avoiding the click-mania that nourishes their funds. Paying for good journalism is in my opinion better than not paying (at least apparently) for bad journalism.
1061	With good quality newspaper introducing a fee to access their articles, most people won't pay it and will be left to only have access to bad quality journalism/fake news and won't get any critical analysis of the events
1066	Newspapers need revenue to pay their staff— and $DEITY knows they've trimmed their investigative, writing and editing resources way more than is healthy. A subscription model is a reasonable way to do that for private entities. Public service broadcasters, on the other hand, should always provide open content.
1070	Information should be free!
1072	Primary news gathering still takes time and money
1073	This will limit accesing the information and media in general terms
1074	I think it's fair to pay for quality journalism.
1075	Traditional newspapers are shared free. Why should online news agency charge outrageously?
1077	"Offline" Newspapers also cost money...
1078	if they charge they lose me
1079	Information on the Internet has to be free.
1082	there are people working to write (possibly) good articles.. it is the right thing to pay for them
1083	People want things for free. If the majority of large news/media companies create a pay-wall it will drive people to find their news from less reputable sources which could be very dangerous.
1084	People need to access a wide range of news so that they can make informed decisions. Many people cannot afford to pay for subscriptions to online news from credible news organizations. There still are some news providers that ask for donations versus subscriptions (The Guardian), but I worry that they will be following the trend towards subscriptions.
1086	Paywalls for news might be ok but there needs to be some publicly funded basic news services (such as BBC) and companies should not feel compelled to overload users with annoying JavaScript ust to squeeze some extra digit for their EBITDA/ROI
1089	They do it as the others sources of money run out. I do not agree on paying for shit articles in shit websites. Clickbaiting could be a problem. With quality i would consider paying for it.
1092	i still prefer to read the print-versions of the newspapers, so i´m not that much concerned with that. i don´t like to read online. especially if it is more than just "the latest news". a good analysis needs time and space. don´t want and can´t read longer texts online.
1093	It is understandable, but i already pay for internet service. Anyways it could be crowd founded . My internet fee could contain subscription coins what i can spend on magazines i want.
1095	It's just back to the status quo of paying your daily newspaper. Then, if we were to question that, of course journalists should be able to freely benefit from the mutualisation of the social resources, outside of market relations.
1102	Considero que este hecho incide en la falta de calidad en la producción de la cultura escrita que requiere validación en publicaciones arbitradas
1103	Reading the news has become a costly habit.
1105	Journalism cost money
1108	In most cases fees are calculated in accordance with some algorithm
1109	as one who pays a subscription fee for access to the NY Times, I do so because I value the service; the fact that others don't have access to a quality resource is troubling.
1112	It's very true that Google and Facebook (along with Craigslist) have siphoned most of the advertising dollars that were part of late 20th Century media (newspapers, network television and radio). On the other hand, subscribing to each of the news web sites that I read (The New York Times, The Washington Post, The Atlantic, The Guardian) is beyond my relatively modest means.
1113	I am willing to pay to receive good quality news online and offline.
1115	Having worked in print media for a number of years, I know first hand that these publications need the money
1116	same thing with print media
1119	-
1121	It's normal. I am happy to pay for real interesting content.
1123	I am concerned mostly about The Guardian, the only newspaper I still trust. If they can't generate enough revenues or enough donations, they might ask for subscription fee. But the

	UK still has BBC, thankfully., which hopefully, will always stay free
1124	I pay to read the print press (I buy "Le Monde" everyday), and wouldn't want to pay for online reading (except in exceptional cases). Not much pleasure in reading articles online. I don't like the fact that more than two years old scholarly articles are proposed at outlandish rates (even some of my own articles to which I have no free access). University articles should be published online with free access in the interests of intellectual debate (most scholars do not have access to paper publications).
1126	if a newspapers charge for the news I would stop reading the news. i think i would use the tv or facebook. both are in my phone.
1127	because people don't pay, therefore they limit their exposure to "free" news
1128	I don't mind paying for content, especially if it means fewer ads. It would be nice if sites offered a minimum number of free reads before charging you, however.
1129	journalist need to have a salary, it is better to pay journalism through subscription rather than ads. Or at least a combination of subscription fee and ads is important
1130	again, I understand the impetus to charge for information that costs money to produce and I subscribe to some sites for content, but I cannot sign up for all sites that I might browse too, and sometimes that is limiting. My biggest concern here is the outrageous prices academic publishers charge for access to information/articles.
1131	Although I don't like paying money for what I can get for free, the economic model of a free press just can't manage without subscription revenue. I am willing to pay for good journalism, but that usually means the opposite of what free news has (e.g. clickbait, celebrity focus, listicles, buzzfeed).
1132	They've got to pay staff somehow.
1133	I believe in open access, but I also understand that open access doesn't always mean 'free' and that content creators have to make a living somehow. Paper news (magazines, newspapers) aren't free, so why should it be free on the internet? (fair ACCESS to content and more equitable creation and dissemination of knowledge.)
1134	Access to information should be open, but as happen with printed papers you must pay to read. For some online publications, there are ways to access the content without paying.
1135	What/how to justify?
1136	It seems inevitable that (quality) online content will require a charge eventually. These are often not very high prices, but allow a publication to keep producing new content, while also reimbursing their staff (or so I hope). That said, it's not something I can see myself being able to afford.
1138	New papers should have made micro charges for their service from the 1990 and should now also do so.
1143	it is important to keep the press - traditional and alternative - and your freedom. the financial question can be important for these aspects. Companies like VICE do not charge, but receive large amounts of money from capitalist investors that can reduce their stock.
1144	Good journalism requires resources.
1145	To which question?
1146	While the higher-quality journalism gets locked behind paywalls (and is therefore unavailable to those worst-off socioeconomically), the "free" (propaganda or "fake news") options seem to be proliferating. That said, if one knows where to look, there are quite good news sites available even as many traditional news outlets put up paywalls.
1147	Good journalism is costly so I am willing to pay for it and, in exchange, don't have to see much advertising
1148	I am old-fashioned and read paper.
1149	Too many accounts in too many places gets hard to track. I would stick with old-school DIALOG or LexisNexis as at least it aggregates that even if it is expensive.
1150	It annoys me, but on the other hand we all used to buy newspapers. It just needs to be made easier to pay for these things online. No-one wants good journalism to perish,
1153	In order to continue to perform investigative journalism that holds the powerful to account, news organizations have to earn money somehow.
1154	I must pay for the paper version of a newspaper, why should I not pay for online newspapers? It's the journalistic work that costs money not the paper.
1155	concerned about who has access to newspapers, but on the other hand they need to have viable business models
1156	It's their business, print papers cost money, online papers can cost money, too.
1158	I plead for a variety of journalistic offers, so a fee can be useful.
1159	It's question of the lack of knowledge access and the lack of the possibility of verification of the facts.
1160	The rise of the internet has mean that we expect to get things like news for free. It's not free to produce quality news and people need to be educated about that. Nothing is free. If you get your news for 'free' it's because you are paying in other ways - primarily through loss of

	privacy. One positive about the internet is that despite its corporatization, I think that individual users are still able to develop a profile and presence that rivals companies and celebrities, so I don't think that's yet a concern. That said, I do think this is likely to become a concern as large monopolies increasingly begin to control what we see (via search engines and news feeds).
1161	Digital access to information should be free.
1162	concerned as you get into theirtrap. and not since, there's hope from free platforms n those outside the net
1165	In democratic societies, news is a public good. Print newspapers can be left behind or loaned out, whereas online subscriptions totally block access.
1169	I think the commercial model (an industrial model) for journalism is now broken. I think journalism as an industrial institution is, in the main, doing a very poor job of working out what something like journalism might now be, yet it is clear we need a fourth estate. I live in a country with an independent state media which sort of fills the gap, but it is clear we need a fourth estate or similar. (My views on this got much stronger post Trump.)
1170	News is expensive to obtain, it must be paid for somehow. If people would rather subscribe to get it rather than/as well as to see advertising, that is fine.
1173	I don't expect journalists to work for free, and would prefer that their work not be paid for by advertisers. But paywalls make people less likely to read news and this is a problem
1174	Digital media are going through a crisis of financial models and definitely need to diversify their sources of funds to make sure they are independent and produce quality journalism.
1176	People should pay for a service they receive
1179	Going online means it is less accessible to a certain part of the population.
1180	Readers need to pay for the most valuable productions they are going to read.
1185	This is a tricky question, because the online newspaper have to pay a salary to its employees. So, one say that this information should be open because the more informed the better, but we can discuss about it for a long hours. I think this isn't a very problematic issue nowadays. Maybe the journalistic media should think about alternative ways to make profit out of their work in online platforms.
1186	It is their prerogative.
1187	I am not sure about the way of make benefits, but not every people can pay for information and being informed is a universal right
1191	I think that newspapers are becoming global with the internet, but to pay are restricting the information again to just a geography. That can be bad for newspapers, as less people would read them, and also most importantly for people access to information, especially in poor countries. But i understand some of them are under pressure by the internet.
1192	Which answer?
1194	costs
1196	To charge subscription fees is a way to keep the quality journalism alive.
1197	I just don't read the ones that charge a fee.
1198	The good information is becoming costly
1199	Newspapers have always charged for their print versions, as they are have mostly been commercial operations. I don't have a problem with them charging for access to their stories, so long as it's reflected in the quality of the journalism. But I am living in a country where these news sources are competing with non-commercial, independent sources of news and information (such as Australian Broadcasting Corporation - similar to BBC) which enables all citizens to freely access content. This is not straightforward for other countries where public media may be perceived as government propaganda.
1200	If it's a good and reliable information, then i'd be willing to pay for it, if it means supporting those that provide it.
1202	There will always be free ways of getting information. The main problem with paywalls is that many people are too lazy to look for alternatives and as a result become less informed or rely on online gossip for their news.
1204	News follow the logic of online platforms and applications which is commodification. Not contended with online and targeted advertising, news corporations now want to sell news that is part of the commons, from where all those information come from. In fact news production is premised on the free exchange of information and democratic discourse. Would it come to a point that news sourcing will be mediated by money and whole news production would become one huge commercial venture?
1205	your survey is confusing. ok, so newspapers have to make money, and i understand that they have online subscription
1206	So long as there remain free-to-use high quality services (BBC, Guardian etc.) this is not a problem. The differentiating feature of gated sites is (mostly) that of a particular slant on news rather than the actual content. The only substantive exception to this are specialist journals like the FT, where I do have some concerns. If political pressure (on the BBC) or

	economic pressure (on the Guardian) forced them out of the free-to-use, high quality news arena then I would have concerns.
1208	The restricted access to digital news is an issue not just because the cost cuts some people out, and the digital licensing model means the same people are also shut out of shared access via libraries, schools, cafes and donations by previous purchaser.
1209	I'm not very concerned, because so far, I have found alternative sources of information, and these tend to be more liberal than the mainstream ones, which charge for access, so it turns out ok.
1210	On line news sites simply replace the print media and these are for-profit organisations
1211	Although I don't want to pay for online news, I understand their need to sustain their business and not be totally dependent on online advertising controlled by other companies
1214	Quality sources of information need to be funded. Subscription is one of those mechanisms, and it's better than advertising in many cases.
1216	Good journalism costs money. If the quality is right, I am willing to pay for it. (And such a model is certainly better than financing by advertising.)
1217	.
1218	companies have to profitable somehow.
1219	It is a tricky question. Newspapers are struggling at least here because their revenues have diminished and they need to find new ways to cover the costs of their work. Just very recently the newspaper of the newspaper industry in Finland celebrated in Facebook the research results that only very small amount of people use ad-blocks in mobile phones. Answering my question why this is good news, they told that they need revenues from ads. So if the choice is between aggressive online advertising to fund journalism or subscription fees, I think the latter is better. But what I am worried about is the lack of interest to find alternatives. Subscription fees possibly block my chance to read news from multiple outlets. A system of micropayments might be a much better alternative. The question is difficult for me because I don't think media houses have to give news for free as nice as that would but a model in which that would be possible should be developed.
1221	This could lead to an Internet where you have to pay for everything. The idea of free usage, free communication and free sharing becomes corrupted.
1223	I understand, that newspapers have to make money, because quality journalism is important. With limited, if not falling revenue through the online advertisement industry, thanks to mostly ad-block I assume, It's only reasonable, for these companies, to find other ways to survive. Papers charging fees is better than papers dissolving.
1225	Good and independent journalism has a price - it is better to pay yourself rather than let someone else pay (advertiser).
1226	They need to make money somehow. Different people will prefer different ways of supporting them.
1227	...
1232	They obviously have to also earn some money. But I'm afraid that the free fake news sites will just proliferate - the sites where people don't have to pay and where news might not be of good standing.
1233	It's only a business model
1234	It is akin to controlling information. Not all people will be able to afford to pay for articles, especially considering the global spread of Internet, thereby limiting the emancipator y potential of information access.
1236	Quality journalism need financial coverage. I rather pay for journalism instead of being spammed with ads.
1237	quality news production is expensive
1238	Free culture should be liberated by not adding any economic restrictions from the public kmowledge advancement like pay firewalls. But to survive the dying offline press, they gotta create business model on the internet platforms. But this should be balanced out and not becoming like Google or FB which mainly selling ads. The ads selling point can affect the quality of journalism. Maybe a model of public broadcasting can apply to new media press.
1239	Print newspapers are not free, why should content online be free? Certainly, there has to be public services that satisfy people's needs in terms of information access and consumption.
1241	Newspapers have to make a profit in order to survive, and content has never been free to produce. To me, the biggest mistake newspapers did in the early Internet days was to start giving away content for free. Media outlets do not have the same enormous user base as Facebook and Google, and thus can't deliver the same kind of targeted content as these two can, so paywalls make sense.
1242	- if there are people to pay for - there are e.g. offers that avoid ads by paying for the services
1243	Online newspapers do not write themselves; it seems only fair that one should pay for the work that is put into them, much the same way as traditional newspapers charge a

	subscription fee.
1244	Newspapers should be paid by their readers for their product irrespectible of if they publish on paper or on the net.
1245	It would be good if information for the social or political good was available to all.
1248	I worry that the Daily Mail or other un-nuanced newspapers will be the only remaining online news sources without paywalls, leading to greater readership and fewer people will consider the multiple facets of current affairs
1250	We've become used to getting things for 'free' because of the ways that big corporations make money from data and advertising. I think that it's fine that newspapers ask for money. There needs to be a change in culture so that this is seen as okay.
1251	The person accesses information already pay for internet access. subscription fee further restricts the access.
1252	News against pay restrict the freedom of information and weaken the watchguard function of journalism
1253	Newspapers need to generate income. If they are not charging subscription fees, they need to generate income through allowing advertising on their websites or collaborating with an intermediary such as Facebook. However, freedom to information is a basic right and shouldn't depend on one's ability to pay a fee
1255	Charging online fees shows a lack of understanding of the digital economy by newspapers, and a desire to stick to old operating models. My main issue is that this practice means the access to balanced views and news is waning in society, at a time where a plurality of views is more important than ever to combat digital propaganda or 'fake news'.
1258	The monopolistic companies (Google, Facebook) provide free services at the expense of privacy loss and targeted advertising. They are able to provide free services while monopolizing online ad investments worldwide. The more people use them, the more interesting they become to advertisers. Now, the habits of using free services were mostly created by these companies based on, formerly, democratic principles of openness and sharing. Paradoxically, the existence of free/monopolistic services creates habits among internet users for not paying online news content. These habits need to change as people have to realize that quality content costs money, professional journalism takes time and costs money. Some form of non-profit journalism where people would pay some money for content while the organizations would invest all of that in quality content is the way to go, in my opinion... The legacy media are also screwed and are trying to patch-up their revenues by introducing subscriptions...
1259	I like that I can read the Guardian for free
1260	To keep information behind paywalls seems to run counter to the possibilities of the internet and the values of open access.
1264	open access to news and information
1265	???
1266	It makes sense,journalism is not free and quality not advertising has to prevail. The concern is how it will survive when readers are going to go for those seemingly 'free' options. They need to make it convenient to access
1273	It's a shame that people cannot freely access news from a variety of sources, but as print media declines I appreciate there has to be an alternative source of income.
1275	Because I believe that the first mission of mass-media should be access to information for everyone
1277	Anything that limits the freedom of expression is bad for democracy.
1280	We easily have the capability, so the news should be freely available to all. The state should make all the newspapers freely available online.
1281	It's just the way I see things
1283	would be okay if cheap enough
1284	It depends on how much they charge.
1286	Understand that newspaper are charging because tradition income from adverstising has fallen - however this means that fact-checked information is more scarce online. People have learned to be reliant on FREE information.
1287	As an alternative to an advertising-based model, I think I prefer that we would pay subscription fees for some services. It would mean there's no requirement for them to surveil us. Also, it seems that advertising isn't enough to fund quality journalism/publications.
1288	Although print newspapers cost money the cost is generally quite low. An online subscription seems expensive. Many people no longer read a serious newspaper.
1289	I think it´s fair to pay for good, edited news. I have also subscribed news papers, so I can also pay for online news produced by the same companies.
1291	I recognise that the production of news is a business and that these businesses exist to make money for their owners and shareholders.

	However, as more news websites disappear behind paywalls, it becomes harder to get a broad understanding from a number of different viewpoints about the world day-to-day and about specific events happening in it. I think it also helps enable the promulgation of "fake news" by non-reputable sites, since they generally remain open access, and with reputable reports hidden away it becomes harder to challenge those reports with ones from better sources.
1292	We have a right to access to an infornation. But in the other hand, what about the employees of the magazine?
1293	-
1297	Their articles are mostly crap anyway.
1298	It makes sense if they were already charging for physical products and are just switching platforms.
1299	The 'quality' they profess in change for subscription is not realistic, after all they do news and there is no quality in that.
1301	I am paying for the print edition, as well.
1302	Newspapers and the like have costs to cover. Internet content exists in an awkward intersection between a scarcity economy (food, rent, pay packets, mortgages) and an abundance economy (information is _almost_ free to copy and distribute). This is a circle that has not been squared and while I don't have an answer myself it may be that charging is how we solve the economic impedance mismatch between the two domains. (I don't think it is, but they have to try something to keep the lights on).
1304	because I do not read online papers
1305	This media are going to occupate the net, it´s their job, obviously the monopoly is a capitalist expression and they want to get it for they own advantage
1306	I prefer print media and believe that with all their faults nonetheless print media organisations are more transparent
1307	People won't pay, and then won't get news first hand. But also most of this "news" is bullshit, so whatever.
1309	At least this is in the open. I can decide if I want, and offline Newspaper costs too although it is full of advertising too. Still: if only newspapers charge and others (earning their money with obscure data driven advertisement), people with less money have to turn to what seems to be without price tag (although it is, but just hidden).
1310	The information, the news, should be free to know. You don't have to pay for reading an online newspaper
1311	I can access them anyway with google news (e.g. ft.com)
1312	Access to news is important, but it's a little misguided to think this can be provided as a public good without cost, if we want good quality news coverage
1313	Have you seen how most people get their news? FaceBook! The run-up to the US election clearly demonstrated the need for quality journalism, and newspapers without paywalls end up producing clickbait and being ad-revenue driven and so editorially compromised. My wife and I feel so strongly about this that I paid for a subscription to the New York Times, and my wife for the Washington Post. I would hate to think what we would do without decent journalism, which is certainly struggling right now and needs all the support it can get. I would never trust a newspaper without a paywall.
1315	There is a fine line here - if newspapers are not paper news, what needs to be their stance in digital form. I subscribe and pay for the New York Times and other sources for their journalistic content, not for the "news." What is the news in an idealistic sense is neutral journalistic reporting, which I think needs to exist in the public interest as a public good....difficult issue.
1316	Anyone can spout off in a blog. Investigative journalism costs money. That's what subscriptions have always paid for and that has not changed.
1317	A subscription for a newspaper is understandable given the lower rates of newspaper reading.
1318	I am often blocked by a paywall from reading articles friends share or research papers.
1319	The internet is being 'bought' so is digital space for 'news' piece by piece. I sympathise with the Guardian requesting financial help. But oligarchs and corporate interests are already buying up the media, distorting news coverage and misrepresenting both facts and context. That's not new but the power to do it in the shadows is unprecedented.
1320	Which answer am I supposed to justify? the immediately preceeding one or the series of questions leading up to this? I don't mind about newspapers having subscription access beacuse traditionally you had to buy a newspaper. Anyway, those subscriptions are relatively easy enough to evade when something important comes along. But I'm mostly not concerned about this because most large corporate news agencies are bullshit and the less people read them the better.

1322	Now that we are (unfortunately!) witnessing the slow death of print media, many people's access to news depends on whether they can afford (and are prepared to pay extra) for quality journalism. This is undemocratic and in a long run will lead to populist ignorance, reinforcing the media power of some multinational corporations and seriously restricting the voice of individuals. We can see this happening already - it is much easier for corporations to communicate and many individuals and social groups (even those privileged enough to have skills and access to the internet) are not being heard/recognised. This is troubling and marks the advent of new totalitarianism.
1325	Depends on the amount of fees. Online publications must cover their expenses and their people deserve decent salaries. That is not the same as becoming absurdly rich charging more and more as Microsoft does. Paying something affordable, I am happy to recognize their efforts; being extorted because you depend on that software to live, i.e. SSPS, Adobe, MS Office, should be ilegal!
1326	News is becoming available only for those with the means to pay for it. Gone are the days of news available for all with relatively cheap paper based publications, which are easily shared around groups of people. Now access to news articles - which are predominantly becoming more and more limited to being online only - requires the means to pay to access them, and this puts such information out of reach of those with less resources & less abilities to access the internet.
1327	Newspapers will need to balance openness with fees; their credibility and influence is based at least partially on open access to articles. Though I would prefer some other support method for public information, in a capitalist economy the newspapers must pay wages from some source, so fees or advertisements are the main methods for this currently.
1328	Internet depends freedom of communication and exchange. Too many commerical contents would change the nature of it.
1329	News should be available also for those who can't afford to pay for them
1330	Reliable and accessible information is a cornerstone of democracy
1335	the revenue model for journalism is broken. I appreciate that good reporting costs money, so I understand newspapers charging a subscription fee (and if that means I don't have to wade through dozens of ads to get to an article, all the better). I like the Guardian's membership approach.
1337	Paraphrasing Dune, 'the information must flow'.
1338	I have worked in a Customer Service of a newspaper service who charges readers for articles. The quality of journalism suffers when (often exhausted) people just want something to read to kill time, but resort to free alternatives where multiple viewpoints are not endorsed, reading only tabloids and "news" with shock value. While the journalism of paid services might be better, according to my experience the newspaper publishers are conservative in their production. They are hesitant to shift the weight from print to digital services, and their digital service development are very lacking--which in turn makes readers frustrated with services and unwilling to switch to them, preferring the expensive paper format.
1339	You get what you pay for
1340	alternative direct payment
1345	They need money to survive and offer objective and non-biased news,
1346	I understand newspapers are in a crisis, as they have lost once-reliable forms of income. But some of their paywall practices have become too extreme. Good journalism is necessary for a functioning democracy, and the newspaper crisis has also caused some papers (especially smaller papers) to do too much click-bait, etc.
1359	They need to pay for content
1353	information on internet should be free
1355	Newspapers rely on subscriptions. What is an alternative? Even more ads?
1362	Free access to information is a basic necessity of democracy - it is of course understandable that journalists need to make a living too, but providing basic funding for various news outlets who'd then be obliged to provide their articles to the public would in my opinion be a preferable course of action.
1363	News and articles are their products and they have every right to charge. It is just like buying newspapers and magazines in the old time.
1365	While newspapers haven't (still) sorted out the way to secure their viability online, I guess that paywall is a way to do it, until they find a better way. Although, I am not sure how many people are willing to pay a fee for access to their content when there is so much information available for free. Of course, there is the issue of 'quality', but I feel that it doesn't matter for many users.
1366	Articles were always charged for, but bo adjustments of prices per regions and socio-economic situation of a country being taken into account makes some outlets unaffordable anf therefore only available to some, and thus high quality articles become just another chip in the inequality game.

1368	As websites put up paywalls, some users simply won't use them and they become less relevant. The power of the internet is that is scales to encompass everyone on earth. If sites don't want to reach everyone that's to their disadvantage. As long as net neutrality can be maintained there will always be open alternatives.
1371	The majority of newspapers charge for print editions. The pay model is gradually moving to the digital space. It's not a new concept, but the transfer of an old business model.
1373	Information should be libre.
1374	Newspaper have to pay their journalists and other employees so it's normal that they should charge people. However their economic model has been eroded by the web giants you mentioned, so they may not survive which will be a tragedy for quality information that is not under the aegis of private corporations
1377	I am a bit concerned since it makes credible information less available than free fake news, but on the other hand I understand that they have difficulty to monetise without the 'hardware' paper newspaper selling much. If I was a jounalist in a newspaper I wouldn't want to get paid less if I did online work than printed, so I understand the need to monetise.
1378	I think a model of mantain the journalism as an industry is yet to be found, so , while we look for it, paywals are not the worst.
1380	I would prefer that platforms pay a subsidy to news orgs.
1382	Payment seems inevitable, to recoup the costs of human intellectual and semantic labour in content creation.
1383	I think it is rational to ask for subscription in the age of content production as a professional field.
1385	This is creating a social divide, msrginalizing emerging potential creators and programmers and duping us all to follow the herd
1388	They need to raise funds for the development of their content and it is the audience choice whether to pay and consume or not,
1389	Well, it does mean that it is not very easy to critically read the media (by looking at multiple sources), but, on the other hand it is content that they are producing. It is unreasonable to insist that it is free!
1390	I'd say that it's fine when proper content produced by professionals is only available for a subscription fee. As long as they are forthcoming about how they use subscriber data etc.
1394	Journalist need to be payed as well - if we do not want so many ads, than they have to be paid by the readers
1395	Large newspapers have to py for journalism. They have to do so by advertising. That's been the business model for ever. I get it but the way they use advertising as well as subscription annoys me since it seems like double dipping, especially when they are 'pushing' ads into your read. I am also concerned that instead of employing quality journalism they resort to wire services anc lick bait instead and the depth and honesty of their work is compromised as is the breadth of their analysis and coverage of a diverse range of issues and events. They have often substituted narrow, opinionated journalism for free and investigative journalism. On the other hand smaller media platforms that do more in the way of these things and do not have the advertising revenue I consider supporting. And do in some cases.
1398	I do think that journalist should have a fair payment for their work. But do not like the idear, that money decides how many information you get. Especially in science and education and democratic processes.
1400	We need news information to make decisions, create or support opinions. Paid news service do not help with this.
1401	Information should not be relegated to people with financial means
1406	I have always defended that access to information should be free, since differences in such access have the potential to create important gaps that are rather structural. On the other hand, I agree to paying reasonable fees if that guarantees quality of information.
1407	I simply don't have money to pay all these articles.
1410	I can understand why they're charging - most newspapers are scrambling to come up with viable business models. Still, it's bad for free information, which was one of the best promises of the internet...
1411	as the circulation of print media declines, news agencies need to find other ways to generate income. if we wish to maintain a diversity of news providers then we should expect to pay for their services.
1412	Selling news through subscription is like selling water. Information and water should be free for all. When everything has to be sold, the world will be either totally enslaved or they will lose interest in the news or find alternative sources that are more affordable.
1415	It's at least marginally better than relying on advertisements and clickbait articles.
1416	Access to information is important, but newpapers have always historically charged for access. If newspapers are freely available online they must recoup their costs through other means such as advertising and selling on data which can have a more insidious effect,

	particularly as these practices are rarely transparent. Admittedly, the fact that newspapers charge for online access doesn't prevent them from advertising or selling data, but I would rather see a reduction of these practices which I think comes with an acceptance that readers have to pay for content.
1418	Newspapers mirror our world, online newspaper offer a glimpse of our less noticed world, the issues which at times are important and fall into the gatekeeping trap are often voiced through online newspapers, blogs, and forums. If such spaces are made a matter of privilege access the world would lapse into ignorance and silence.
1419	Newspaper should be available to internet users since they are purchasing internet through mobile net or wifi . if for everything to access they have to pay then there will be less number of users .
1421	If they charge a price for the printed hardcopy, then I think it is only fair that they charge for access to quality content.
1423	Newspapers exist in a capitalistic environment, they need money to pay wages and costs. While personally I tend to only use free-to-view news (e.g. Guardian, plus produser amataur sites), I am concerned on the long term impact on journalism as the 4th Estate
1425	Restricting access means there is less diversity in terms of news coverage - which deprives citizens of different viewspoints, opinions, insights. Although it may make limited business sense, it is undermining access to information, profit overrides social service.
1426	Journalism, especially good journalism, has to be paid for. For this reason I am in favor of paywalls.
1428	Most large scale media is just dictation and propaganda. If they want to charge for their wares then their reporting had better be good.
1431	THe concentration of power by media companies is very concerning.
1433	Ideas should be free, that is what the internet is all about, that is why it was created in the first place.
1436	News media are suffering in an internet powered by ads, where users are not accustomed to paying for anything. Paywalls and subscription fee services are interesting models for many media organizations, but ultimately will prove detrimental to their growth and recognition.
1437	While i understand that we cannot get information for free, then a decision should be reached by internet service providers, to factor the cost of extracting articles into the monthly subscriptions we make.
1442	I do not have enough money to pay for subscription.
1443	The access of information would be guaranteed to everyone. In order to sustain itself, a newspaper does not need that each reader pays for it; only a part of them.
1448	There has to be a fair way to provide income to newspapers and free access to essential information via communication systems developed by governments, which means that people's taxes paid for them. Any society needs a truly free flow of information.
1450	Businesses charge for their products - people should, however, have alternate choices
1452	Newspapers need to make money and I would prefer that they are not entirely dependent on advertising.
1454	I prefer the system where I get a summary and can buy one off access to items. I see no reason to subscribe when I only want one or two items.
1459	knowlegde/ data on the net is very dispersed. one subscription will never be enough. though there are always some bypassing ways.
1460	If this allows them to stop selling data about my browsing habits to advertisers, I'm fine with it.
1467	It would be better to have access to a broad field of news sources for free rather than to pay for one's (politically) favorite news organization and then be unable to see what others write. However, I think subscriptions/donations are a good way to run a news organization as to make it less dependent on commercial interests (investors, advertisement).
1468	In some cases I'm willing to pay for the content in which case this is fine. If they want to charge, and you don't want to pay, then that opens up space for non-profit or donation-based independent journalism and content.
1469	If online newspapers are to exist they need to generate income and I recognise that charging susbscription fees is one way of making money. Perhaps its more honest than stealthily harvesting my private data. Perhaps I'd use a susbscription service for news and pay money if they agreed not to harvest my data.
1471	Not yet in my country. Pakistan.
1473	The free press is an important institution, and I hope that it can be sustained. Charging online fees indicates that too few people are buying print subscriptions. That's the concern, and again, the burden of supporting a free press is on the public.
1474	It concerns me when the New York Times and Financial Times put pay-wall up or charge for reading their articles online. But if struggling local newspaper or media outlet provides me with a good quality journalism, articles on unreported issues and gives me more in-depth coverage than I would subscribe and pay for the content.

1483	it limits the available ammount of information online
1486	As commercial organizations they have to generate income. However a free access to "basic" level information would be useful to support citizens awareness.
1487	Plenty of free choices remain
1488	If they indeed deliver value, then they should be paid for it.
1500	Newspapers need to survive, too. So, charging for online versions is inevitable and the charges are lower than buying the printed version. Sad as I may be as a bookworm and lover of paper in any form, I do not see any alternative in the current day and age.
1505	Unfortunately, due to digital monopolies, without paywalls newspapers will not survive. of course lack of media channels affects society and democracy and rise the risks of fake news dispersion
1512	It's important to have free access to information, but it's also important to find a business model for newspapers in order to journalist can be independent
1515	Fortunately, many other do not -- that's where I get my news. Sites that charge subscriptions have lost my business.
1520	Access to information, news and culutral life are necessary prerequesites for a democratic society.
1524	Somewhat concerned because although it is well-known that print media is dying a death, making online access 'paid content' is replicating what exists in print: a small number of billionaire owners and conglomerates severely limiting what is available and can be read or seen.
1538	But feel that somehow they should earn something extra fee about the serives they had to offer. Sometimes it seems that the fees is enough high others not.
1539	I do understand that newspapers have to figure out some way to stay financially viable, and payment for and use of physical newspapers diminishes. I don't want them to be supported solely through advertising (and ideally, at all through advertising) but I'm not sure I know of a good solution or even another one. Since newspapers, physical ones, are still available for free in libraries, there's at least some way around this for those that cannot afford it. But I don't think this is a good situation for a democracy or keeping an broad swath of the public educated to a 21st century standard.
1540	It is a service that costs and thus, it should be paid. Its right
1559	while i see the cost-argument of newspapers to provide online services and information, the problem is that not everybody buys a newspaper. my concern is that paywalls drop the amount of people reading the news and thus lead to a reduction of the level of education. and so far i have not heard of a newspaper being at high economic risk because of their online presentation. not least as i assume that a high amount of earnings come from advertisements, not from individual customers (online as well as offline). i think that online should remain free of charges.
1563	Again, a skewed question. Where is 'pleased' because it gives them a chance to build the business model they do desperately need?
1571	We already pay for various sorts of content - quality research and independent journalism may come with a fee.
1575	All publishers should develop concepts to offer at least part of their publications online open access
1581	There is a good and bad side to things: 1. It is OK to charge if you offer an ad-free and quality content with good website layout (intuitive and non invasive with pop-ups. 2. Many services will charge and still have ad based revenue which defies the point to subscribing if all you are getting is access to content which was freely available before. 3. Subscription does not promise increase in quality or an ad-free experience. 4. News should be unbiased and have high standards of reporting anything in an appropriate manner, without subtly leaning readers towards certain opinions, telling them what to do, how to feel. Information should be presented as facts and people should extract from that and use their heads to think and not just as an umbrella attached to the body so that rain doesn't pour down their necks.
1583	the internet is not secure , payments are not secure , people are dumb enough to believe everythnig they see online.
1585	Sunday newspapers used to cost no more than a single pound in the past and now online publication platforms want to charge a lot more than that equivelant of a month for online features. Also the internet used to be the one place you could go to for free answers, charge

	us now and half the people on the planet will get misinformed by free misleading sites. It's not very hard to see where all of this is going. I guess it's great and practical for those that can afford it but the rest of us? Doomed. It's just not fair. It's also very very dangerous for the state of the world. No one seems to be asking the right questions just like this questionnaire is doing and they definitely don't seem to give the right answers. Goverment control will only aggravate the problem and I'd rather have a coorporation than a goverment handling my data.
1587	It costs them money to produce the articles
1588	See my response above. If free online news has to take corporate advertising to survive then thetas preferable to charging as far as I am concerned.
1591	LET ME READ NEWS FOR FREE
1597	I strongly believe that ist would be right to charge people for their newspapers and news sites - it would lead to an increase of quality journalism and improve the massive problem of insincere and incorrect news distribution. I think everyone who can afford it should pay a small fee (just like the TV licence works as well). Everyone on benefits or with a wage that does not allow to pay for a 'news license' get it for free. Only seems fair on all sides and protects today's good journalism from dying. They need to be paid for their contribution to society just as other jobs do too.
1603	Newspapers are a business and they trade in written material so I think it is understandable and acceptable for them to charge for access - they have always charged. However, it does mean that because there are large amounts of free news online that many people don't pay and instead read free material that is at times of questionable quality. There is no good business model yet for newspapers and magazines to be able to provide free written material and pay decent money to experienced, supervised staff, without advertising.
1607	If (online) newspapers want to survive, one of the only choices they have left, next to advertising as a way of revenue, is the paid subscription model. This is not much anymore a matter of concern rather of time and therefore to me already something to await and that is acceptable.
1609	you gotta do what you gotta do. i would rather pay and support something i enjoy directly than them just gaining money indirectly through annoying ads.
1614	Despite the fact that online news papers are easier accesible they still need to make profit just like they did before they were printed
1617	Should not pay for news, when paper copy is cheaper
1623	News is information, I shouldn't have to pay to find out what is going on in the world. I choose not to read any newspapers and get my information elsewhere as I feel like it is already filtered and manipulated and I don't want to pay money to read someone's corporate opinion.
1624	Not my problem if people start losing interest in internet news providers. Most spout endless lies anyway.
1626	I've found that most online newspapers charge a subscription fee in place of advertisements on their websites, in addition to making up costs from a lack of physical sales. However, I think using a subscription wall does stop many people from reading as much as they used to, and it discourages engagement because we're used to everything being free.
1630	There's newspapers for a reason, don't fly too close to the sun.
1639	Quality news outlets cost money, unfortunately. How can they claim legitimacy if people cannot read their articles?
1641	It drags me away from them.
1643	News is not just an entity, it is human right. We shouldn't be charged for consuming it at all.
1647	Its good to have paper in your hand
1651	I see no difference in buying an hardcopy of a newspaper or downloading a drm free digital version. Different story if the softcopy has drm that will not allow me to freely share-print-copy it.
1654	It's annoying when I follow a link to an article and discover it's hidden behind a paywall.
1679	Online newspapers have to find good revenue models when publishing online and subscription fees might be a solution however, at the same time users might not be tempted to pay to read an article if the same news can be accessed for free elsewhere.
1687	My position is hard to represent using these options. In the absence of significant income from digital advertising, subscription or membership may be the only viable option for funding high quality, professional journalism and/or content production. Whilst one might envisage different forms of funding (public funding, compulsory licenses being just two) there seems little prospect of such models being adopted in the near future, and their adoption would be dependent on being part of a wider programme of social and political change.
1691	Well researched and curated content has value.
1714	Increases divides
1921	I want to keep a certain level of public service and trustworthy newspaper, and I understand

	that it is not for free. However, sometimes it is highly inconvenient not being able to access - after a few days/weeks, all the stuff should be free.
1967	An informed populace is essential for the functioning of a democratic society, and as such news of the region, nation, and world should not be limited to those with the ability to pay. The production and distribution of news, in whatever physical or digital medium, should be run as a public service, paid for by taxpayer money, rather than as a for-profit enterprise.
2004	Paywalls limit news access for people in poverty, though the profits might help the newspaper to have better standards (e.g. less ad-spamming and clickbait, more journalism and paying its workers). It seems to me like the latest incarnation of the old profit-based engine, though - poor people have never been able to afford the Economist or whatever.
2016	Why should we pay for it? Content has less actual value these days, nothing is printed, and it usually used to be possible to read newspapers without paying (they just got thrown out). Subscription should be optional (if people want to support the publication or story) rather than mandatory. If too much is paywalled, fake news sites will become even more influential.
2044	A difficult issue. They must survive. They should not be dependent on selling adverts. For the user, it would be helpful to get an overview of several newspapers.
2050	People are used to paying for newspapers, and so paying for quality online content is a natural step. I think that the balance between paying and advertisements needs to be addressed
2057	Even though I understand the financial reasons behind such a move, by restricting access to their websites, they are cutting off vast amounts of population, which will otherwise rely on sources that are not as accurate.
2068	The majority of newspapers charging for access are what I would consider more serious sites that still do investigative journalism, and have at least some concern about facts and honestly. Many of the free sites, are more concerned with clicks than accuracy leading to a plethora of fake information.
2069	I would rather pay a monthly fee for high-quality content than having the website littered with distracting ads.
2070	I'm not paying for it.
2078	Most of these services already create income through ads. The traditional charge for newspapers was to pay for the act of printing, it doesn't cost nearly as much to post online, making additional sources of income unnecessary.
2080	Journalism is an expensive endeavor and good support is necessary for in-depth reporting of complex issues we face
2087	I don't really know how much a journalist can earn by an article on the internet but if a fee is needed to get his/her salary I am not really considered. I don't think it's about the freedom of speech it's about doing it for a living. It's like paying for a book (and at the very end the author who wrote it).
2089	One of the benefits of internet is free access to unlimited information. By charging subscription this benefit is no longer guaranteed and users don't have the chance to compare information in order to develop their own opinion. Also, newspapers take advantage of the fact that citizens would like to be informed about important issues.
2090	Is physiological because it's like getting a newspaper delivered at home daily. But, it must be checked so as to be a fair fee not excessive amounts of money.
2094	I think it is very reasonable to have a price for such services
2103	A small fee for access to the whole newspaper is ok. Big fees for access to each article will decrease viewership. I wouldn't want to pay a lot just to read one or two articles.
2114	I find it reasonable. I suppose the writers need to make a living out of their articles
2118	It's a natural result.
2124	They should ensure adequate revenues so as to survive.
2136	in general, I follow newspapers who do not charge subscription fees. On the other hand, less than 10 years ago, we'd have to buy a newspaper on a daily basis. Normal subscription fees are monthly what they used to be daily, so I give them a pass there.
2140	Paid access to news content is restrictive for many people, but all these reporters that produce the content should be paid for what they do. I would prefer to pay, than to have them profiling me and serving me ads.
2142	You can't access the content. Knowledge must be accessible. New enclosures arise.
2146	This means that knowledge is not free and it can not be shared to everyone. So, we are talking about enclosures, that drive to elimination of public information and distortion of reality.
2149	So far the news sites I want to read are free
2153	When newspapers were only printed no newspaper could live without a price that readers would be to acquire it. If to avoid the amount of ads a price has to be paid, I don't consider it as negative as massive tracking, surveillance and ads. Nevertheless, the downside is that the

	access to those medium that can confront fake news are behind the paywall.
2163	I feel that access to quality information should be free, especially given not all people have the means to pay for such subscription fees
2175	Bloomberg recently increased amount of ads dramatically and additionally started restricting content. I think that doing both made me almost fully switch to ft, for which I'm paying anyway.
2227	As much as I feel it's important for news to be shared, the switch to online has damaged newspapers a lot. Online ads are a lot cheaper than traditional paper ads and revenues have fallen as a result, so I can understand why they'd want to charge consumers. After all, this is a service provided to consumers and it seems a bit greedy to expect that with nothing in exchange. This will be an okay system as long as the free news providers that make money alternatively (TV channels such as CNN or public broadcasters like the BBC) are still available to the general public as both CNN and the BBC are mostly high quality publications with informative news pieces that can provide a wide view, as well as combating more unreliable and agenda-driven news sources like the Daily Mail, Fox News, Breitbart and the Canary. And even with the attempts to undermine these institutions from leaders such as President Trump, they seem to be just as popular with a large number still trusting them, so I don't see places like the BBC faltering anytime soon.
2235	the knowledge should be share but not be sale on the internet
2237	I prefer a free online subscription.
2246	What used to be great about the internet was the abundance of free access to information. Now more and more websites are charging for access to their newspapers etc which I am not prepared to pay as a student.
2253	I prefer a free subscription.
2256	Its just irritating. I'm not going to pay, and don't expect that they will have success in the long run with that model.
2261	poor, no more access
2264	It's normal that people who invest time and ressources get a reward for what they do, hopefully it will encourage them to do a better job than free online newspaper.
2267	It seems logical to reward those writing the articles, so paying a fee to access the content is normal to me.
2300	Apparently we are moving to a model where you have to support with payments credible media. Free media means most of the time that whealthy people who control them get benefits with political means from our free access to their manipulated news.
2304	Because they have to produce credible news. They have to sign the information and paid to the journalists, and specialists, and people that manage their platforms.

Field summary for QD1

Do you think there is potential for such local community networks to overcome your concerns about the Internet identified in this survey?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Definitely (A1)	194	19.40%
Likely (A2)	322	32.20%
Not very likely (A3)	351	35.10%
Definitely not (A4)	45	4.50%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	88	8.80%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QD2

Would you consider using such a community network instead of, or in addition to, your current Internet provision?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Definitely (A1)	317	31.70%
Likely (A2)	375	37.50%
Not likely (A3)	126	12.60%
Definitely not (A4)	25	2.50%
I am already part of a community network (A6)	25	2.50%
Do not know/ No opinion (A5)	132	13.20%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QD2B

Please elaborate on your answer

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	863	99.42%
No answer	5	0.58%

ID	Response
36	No comment
37	I do not think that things will change so much by using and participating in local communities
38	Community networks can be a solution of the problem. However, governments, Telecom operator and content providers may be hostile to community networks. Least but not last, another big concern is the fact that the current model of the Internet triggers very negative aspects, such as : i) the uncontrolled spreading of fake information, ii) the significantly high number of "haters" and "trolls", iii) the possibility to use the network for criminal purposes (e.g., drug commerce, terrorism ideas, weapons selling, child pornography).
40	Trust no one ;-)
44	I do not think that a community network can offer reliable internet provision for free.
45	One can't be sure until one tries. Security and privacy issues arise after a period of continious usage, so what might seem innocent at the beginning can manifest undesirable side-effects later on.
48	Might be interesting, but it depends on the required effort in terms of time (and money).
49	this alternative could be attractive. However the formulation is too simply stated: e.g. how and who will manage this community. In Italy there is the example of the community managed by the M5S political party which completely lacks of user control and is not transparently managed by very few people that do not rerspond to anyone.
50	I think that non-technical users ma not use this thing
51	Should I be honest? I am very perplexed by this idea... Maybe I do not understand it fully. I mean, Internet is not just Twitter and Facebook. I use it for e-mail, for remote storage, for buying train tickets and so on... What are you proposing? Some kind of "local Internet"? Would this local Internet be able to access the rest of Internet? If yes, you will need to connect to the rest of the network. How are you going to do this? How do you plan to do this with volunteers? Managing a network is not a joke, you need professionals, your average "smart user" who can create a video with a smart phone is not sufficient.

By the way, please note that I am a strong supporter of Open Source, I also contributed to few projects and I have some projects of mine. Therefore, I am not against community, volunteer-driven effort; only this idea is still unclear to me.

As long as I do not have more detail, my answer is "Definitively not" |
52	Freifunk is a geniuos idea, but not spready widely.
54	Community networks are a great opportunity to build an open internet, but it's going to be hard for them to gain traction
61	There is scarce possibility of my personal involvement
62	I would consider community networks only if providing cheaper access costs to the Internet than current ISPs.
63	It will not work, the business model is wrong. It will never produce revenues and we know how investors are concerned about their money.
65	I do not see the advantages
66	In adddition to global network
67	If I would be able to follow it (time, expenses) and maintain it alive, I think that could be a very good investment for the society. But... how large would it be? Would there be many locally community networks?
68	The personal involvement in maintaining the network is a strong limitation
69	I've concerned about the implementation of such a community network. I cannot express a relevant opinion without testing it before. The idea is appealing but, in my view, very difficult to realize.
70	I am not sure that such networks could be sustainable + Interoperability has to be guaranteed
72	It depends on the availability of technical assistance, if required. It might work well, but there

	should be the guarantee that the service works.
78	While living there ca. 10 years ago, I did participate in the OpenWireless project: http://sg.openwireless.ch/
81	If it needs a substantial amount of work from the users I think such a model might fail.
82	We are trying to set up decentralized and federated services, as they will provide more local control and therefore, be more justified and have more incentives to "behave". Using well-configured Open Source Software, this can be done effectively. The big issue is making people aware, as they have to do something, even if it is just very little. And inertia is probably the strongest social force.
84	I believe - and also see all around the world - that people have an urge to help eachother. So commmunity networks will help with this.
85	Stop forcing me to text!
86	less money to big companies
87	I am part of the Freifunk community in Germany.
88	I would consider to participate in civic projects/community networks like Freifunk if available in my area.
89	I am open to it. I would give it a fair try.
90	it won't solve the platform problem, almost all people would still use the "normal" internet. however, i personally like networks like Freifunk in germany, and would contribute to such a network in my city or country, even if it's only fully used by very few people.
92	if the drawbacks are not exaggerated it may be an interesting solution
93	Depends on performance
96	I would first try it in a complimentary way -- if my needs and expectations will be met, it will be an encouragement to switch totally.
97	The idea seems like a plethora of segregated local networks – which is not an alternative to the world-spanning internet we know. If this not the case and the goal would be to only provide access to the known internet via an alternative, non-commercial way, then I don't see what this would have to do with Google, Facebook or Twitter... there already are free, open and privacy-respecting alternatives (DuckDuckGo, Diaspora, GNU Social etc.) everyone could use today, but still almost nobody does. A "local Wi-Fi network that is free or low cost to join and is provided by your community on a non-profit basis" wouldn't change that a bit I guess.
99	I like the DIY networking paradigm not only for as a deterrent for monopolies but also as an enabler of new more effective and useful services
102	כעבכאעמתנילצחילת
104	It depends on whether the same goals can be reached. If a commuity network is only used by a small number of people, it may be an option for private groups but not to reach out to the public. Also, we will still use other networks to get the information we need as long as the alternative network is not (one of) the major provider of information.
110	Already in favour of open-access policy (for scientific dissemination, teaching, software, etc.), I would definitely give it a try if a new solution comes about which is more transparent and shared (and help giving it momentum), if it proves equally efficient and not too hard to use (investment in learning, or for keep-it-going)
111	Risks of filter bubbles increase in local areas
115	I would definitiely consider using it if it offers better protection of privacy and would be free of ads
118	A local network that extends (rather than replaces) the internet, that is more open, transparent, and does not engage in surveillance of its users, would be very attractive
119	I live in Primrose Hill and we just got an invitation to joing a 'neighbourhood' netwoirk - we looked at it but it seems to be just another commercial scam with a little 'community' veneer
122	Not likely because someone, who has expertise in programming and the internet stuff, could use the data as the big company. Likely because It could be a space of confrontation and growth, unfortunately, a virtual space.
124	I simply see the possibility and I would love to see how it could work.
125	If there is a way for the community to share the cost of the Internet, I will certainly sign up for the service.
126	As long as it has good functionality, I would participate. I already tested an alternative search engine called GoGoDuck (or something like that), which was fine and did not store my data, but later I went back to Google anyway, out of conformity or laziness I assume.
130	I would prefer a community free of commercial interests
131	B
134	-
137	Sure, but not sure what these questions entail so I cannot elaborate on my answer.

138	They would be subject to control from the Government just like everyone else and they would probably not provide a better service.
140	-
141	It's internet, not localnet.
143	It depends on how reliable and how professional the alternative provider would be.
144	.
147	it depends on the quality of services offered.
148	Depends in the cost and availability
149	The proposal is not very clear. I do not see any advantages to local in contrast to existing internet.
150	I would be willing to pay and sustain with reasonable effort (including time) because I think that a solution to current issues based only on the "hope" that access and services could be provided for free would be: (1) not realistic (2) not sustainable (3, most important) not promoting any social change and awareness.
151	I don't know if it counts, but I registered to Ello.co, I think I did it a couple of years ago. I thought that this might be an alternative to Facebook, but so far I only have two friends so I am still using Facebook.
152	Some community network can also have flaws, concerning privacy as well as crashes or speed reduction. Although i'd probably have to get some position in the administration council to make sure that things are done properly.
154	a serious service able to compete needs to be established; the masses use what they get or what's popular;
155	The idea is interesting but my adoption rate will depend on perceived usefulness of such SNS
156	I said it would be likely because I like the idea, but it should be a tendency of all the people I care and i need to communicate with the most. Then, honestly I don't know how I could contribute to the maintenance of a Wi-fi network, I don't have the skills. It sounds like a Linux model.. where there is a community, but it's a community of experts.
158	Because I will feel in that way not trapped
159	It would be great if we can develop our local networks as described above. However, my concern is any of the network infrastructure is fragile and vulnerable to attacks or surveillance. Rule of law proved to be not that effective in our global technocratic capitalism. In my view, our contemporary age is similar to the times of Cold War weapons race, where one is trying to apprehend the Other under its techno-eyes and other is always trying to avoid such predicament. In my view, the best way to fight back such technocratism is through the technology itself, rather than appealing to the rule of law or legal principles which became too easy to be tampered by political and economic powers. Perhaps, every weapon is perfect in its every way except one: its user. I think, the "user" and its extension, technology must be constantly perfected in every its possible way, and, at the same time, paying serious attentions to "philosophy" of mistakes and accidents that we always make in our efforts for such perfections.
161	In some ways I am already using an alternative network through my choices of technologies and services, for example Tor. There are already community networks available. I am most familiar with Community Broadband Networks, https://muninetworks.org/
163	I'm interested in alternatives, though it's hard to talk all your friends and acquaintances into using it too. There has to be a critical mass of users and influential people to set a good example.
164	If the network was secure there is a chance it could be a good thing - in practice fee people usually have spare time or spare money to invest in something like this - how would those in charge of a system like this be monitored to ensure the system is safe? What are the legal implications?
170	thats what we need. Fuck capitalism
171	Yes.
175	I would be interested in such a service
176	I'm already involved in setting up a LoRaWAN-network
180	Community network will likely be too limited to an area. I use commercial platforms mostly to keep in touch with people all over the world.
181	I will consider using such a network depending on the ease with which I can access it and use it.
182	I think the bes option is not to be in any on-line platform. That my case.
183	This sounds like a great idea, but would take quite a bit of investment in both money and time from the community. There are a lot of other things in our community that I think would be a higher priority though.
184	That depends on many factors! How fast it is, how 'low' is price etc.
186	It sounds like a wonderful idea!
187	community that focus on human matters, not only to serve celebrity, power structure, religious

	groups and commercial interest which is the case with the existing systems.
188	I think something like the described might work for small niche interest audiences. However, with the financial power and interconnectedness of business' interests of the internet as we come to know it, I guess it won't be doable to reach a scale for the mass user. For example, I thought about installing Ubuntu several times, and even did so on an old device. Things are just not as convenient as I'm used to it, it would require me to have the OS as a kind of additional hobby. If this is the case for myself, I don't see how it should work for those 60-70% of the population who are even less tech-savvy than I am. In my opinion, it needs a harsh, like harsh, policies for the existing internet companies. And potentially, individual countries that are as powerful as the one that I'm living in (Germany) should start to take the fight, even if it means disadvantages for users.
189	I would love to use a community or city provided network. This has been tried in some cities in the US, but the quality is often not as good and there are too many users, but not enough bandwidth. I think this model could really succeed if local and federal governments were more interested in investing in it. I would even consider subsidizing my cost or someone else's because great access to the internet for everyone and without so much commercial interest involved would make society better.
193	I've no time, but it could be great to create a social/local/owned by the municipality (a sort of public utility) platform that unify the function of Air b&b, Uber, Amazon and so on
195	Internet is about global connectivity. Small areas of independent ISPs must be available in many places to have an impact. That needs strong regularly support. If a non commercial alternative is there, one would definitely prefer it.
196	no
197	I think a community network which incorporated privacy by design would be very attractive to me, and I would be willing to pay a little extra in order to use one.
198	Platforms that are community assets, disengaged from its current for-profit status, would be a good thing
199	This would have to be a generalized solution, since the dominant players in the social media markets are global monopolies. Having a small local alternative service would be nice with which to communicate with my neighbours, but it would be less convenient if I had to use existing social media monopolies to communicate with everyone else.
201	I am ready to participate now.
202	I think that these community networks would have to have a very strong defence mechanism set up against the global network if they are to operate autonomouusly. Is it even possible?
205	I don't think this idea would work in most towns, but my town is filled with young professionals who would probably be willing to put forth their own efforts towards such a goal.
206	Users should be able to control the networks
207	Community networks offer a great benefit and/or alternative to traditional ISPs. Inside a (small) community network, there are no big companies that are collecting private data and surveillance gets harder. When a community network gets connected to the Internet, it becomes usable for daily usage but loses some of it's advantages.
208	I already use de-centralized services and platforms and open WiFi alternatives.
209	I live in a rural part of the US that has poor internet service because advertisers and big companies have no interest in such populations. It's hard to see how my region could mount internet service without considerable state and federal funding and support.
211	depends on involvement requirements
213	The whole idea is about openness and Open Source has been my hallmark from day one. I am completely for this one. ThumbsUp
214	In a localized context such efforts could succeed. However, as a challenge to the entrenched power of the largest internet corporations they might also have little effect. Unfortunately, the centralization of control and the increased commercialization of the internet is actually a response to the more communitarian options that preceded the corporate Web 2.0. The transition to a so-called "participatory" internet has actually already appropriated the common elements of this technology. The creation of community networks is a potential site of resistance but likely needs to be supplemented with a direct attack on the capitalist control over networking technologies as a whole.
215	internet tends towards monopolization
216	Xx
217	Vienna: Funkfeuer , was part of it! Still, major issue with the relevant knowledge and involvement of those who don't care much.
218	In short: i already do. Freifunk, to be precise.
219	regain control!
222	I think it would be interesting to have alternatives, to have the power to choose what kind of

	internet and providers we'd like and not only to use those that have take over the market
223	An open wifi network accessible by all would hide personal information in the noise.
224	It would be interesting. But there is risk that if such network is cutting people off e.g. Facebook (which they use for contact with remote friends) or is to complex to set up - only geeks will use it.
225	I would use the network with the best service quality
226	Internet companies can easily use filters or restrict access to the network. Community networks built by local communities might use several providers to circumvent such censorship. Unfortunaltely, this option depends on the broad availability of technical skills which is mostly available at univertity cities only.
228	Petter privacy, lower costs, less WiFi ap, more educated users
229	no
230	It is important for people who can not affort to pay for an internet connection, and it also provides us a choice for what kind of internet that we want to have.
231	Always try new options - volunteers are deserving
232	Sounds good, but there are lots of problems with trying to make it happen. I've tried using the FB alternatives - Diaspora? They don't work because no-one else is there. One thing that the likes of FB and Google do well is the simplicity of design. Even Diaspora I found slightly challenging. It's a different way of thinking and trying to interact with something so familiar. So many people are not 'digitally fluent' enough to switch so easily. I think pressurising central government to fund and set up alternatives would have to take place at some level.
233	I live in Alberta, Canada. There are some towns in Alberta that have created their own community internet networks that have better speed and service than the regular providers. If my town were to be able to do the same, I'd be more than happy to sign up.
236	Interested in sustainable alternative
237	I would definitely consider it but its success would depend on whether it would be as efficient as commercial networks.
238	Well, I'm not sure where your definition of community stops : I mean 1. is this just my neighborhood, my whole town, or a larger area? 2. why take this "community-based" approach rather than a national or supra-national perspective? And it sounds good, but you don't clearly specify who owns this alternative Internet network...
239	This solution is very interesting, however it should have been done at least a decade ago, before the rise of the current oligopolies.
240	Issues of reliability of service, maintenance and security of saved data - would make me less confident.
241	I am not sure I understand the scenario so I can hardly assess its potential.
242	Politically I really like this idea
244	It would like to try, but affects on commercial Networks are very developped.
245	This is exactly the type of initiative needed to rest back some of the control over our data, privacy and online infrastructure from these companies. It would be be directly empowering to those participating and indirectly empowering to the local community once sufficient numbers of people became involved. It would also be a positive development for democratic control and it would open up all sorts of opportunities for enhancing democratic involvement in the operation of critical infrastructure.
247	If a local network could offer the same/lower cost with more security provisions and control
250	Cannot elaborate
251	no community in my area
254	x
256	The rationale above appeals to me and I think it could work.
259	I'd use it in addition depending on price and ease of use. I assume I'd be able to use it in a wider area than my home provision, so it would be useful when I'm out and about and need to use internet.
261	this is especially an issue for me as I I've on a small island and there are clear practical advantages (as well as privacy lens) for dealing with local traffic at a local level.
264	I don't feel like a community network would allow any greater privacy
266	A local internet would be good in terms of tho owns the pipe and who the service operators are, but that doesn't address concerns about the dominance of google and facebook etc.
267	It may be helpful
268	My answer would be 'not very likely' but still 'possible' if it was good enough.
269	I perceive community networks as something difficult to administer and configure on my devices: moreover I am not sure they will provide more guarantees in terms of security than proprietary ones.
270	This needs to be market driven rather than state driven as the latter tends to fail. Not that there should not be incentives.
272	It sounds like an interesting proposition, although I would still have concerns about how such

	services might develop fragmentation into silo-type information networks, especially if based on like-minded communities/communities of practice.
276	I probably would, but I definitely need someone I trust to vouche for this service and to help me overcome my laziness in terms of internet-based services
279	Although I am skeptical of its possibilities, I would be interested in using such a community network. However, it would be challenging to change what I have been used to for so many years, even if the change were to be beneficial to me.
280	Great potential to shape the community such a network reflects
281	I'm looking forward to that and would love to be part of it
283	A community network might work in the direction that is getting lost by the usage of internet today: rebuild local and not only communities.
287	I use on, the National Capital Freenet in Ottawa. I have been using it since at least 1991.
288	Fishing for compliments mh?
289	If a community network could really work, it would be amazing for users and providers. A platform made for a specific community could be very useful.
292	In the early 90s I was associated with the Freenet movement in Alberta, Canada. Community networks have been around for a long time, but lack adequate promotion to create broad-based awareness. Additionally, regulatory bodies need to increase their support for these movements - make it easier for them to start up and operate.
294	Seems to be a good idea and worse trying since it better fits the requirements of a public good, which internet infradtructure is to me
297	I would definitely use a community network, it would be a kind of returning to the early Internet era, more free and participative.
299	I would use a community network to experiment how it is like. Since the problem I see with the Internet today is that people are spending too much time online, I don't thing there will be an improvement if people switch to a community network.
303	not too much difference
305	Considered in this semi-rural area because internet is so bad. But the truth is people don't even use mobiles. They walk out their door and talk to someone. You are looking at self-healing networks of sorts. And your idea is funny in a way. Most unis can't maintain WiFi connections on their campuses. But a campaign to have free internet as long as it was lined to free libraries might be interesting - a modern post office.
306	I don't think this can work in terms of being a true substitute, but I would consider it if it would work
307	I would explore it but i think it would be unlikely to win sufficient buy in to succeed
308	I believe in the power of people and being self-sufficient, not always relying on companies to provide.
309	Sounds like a great idea could be a viable alternative to Monopoly.
310	There is a real need for an alternative internet
313	Would like to participate in a meaningful alternative internet
314	If it was there I might use it, *especially* if the connection was more reliable than the only commercial ISP in my region (I live in a city where for historical infrastructural reasons there is only one non-mobile ISP).
315	i would I guess - haven't thought it through
316	There were such networks in the early days of the internet. They would be more subject to democratic control.
318	It would be most attractive and worth to support it.
319	MESH NETS ARE THE FUTURE. SEIZE THE MEANS OF COMMUNICATION, AND USE THEM TO BURY OUR OPRESSORS. DECENTRALIZE POWER AND INFRASTRUCTURE.
320	can't
321	I am part of a Mesh Network looking to grow the range of physical links in our city.
323	Currently there is only an illusion of choice with the mainstream internet -- no harm exploring an alternative, and shift the power dynamics
325	Community or municipal networks would be offered as public utilities. They may or may not perform at the same level as commercial offerings (many factors here), but would be tasked with providing a public service and would therefore be subject to greater oversight. The power and influence of ISP monopolies (and duopolies, etc.) would be positively diluted. This is no guarantee that transparency or customer service experience would improve, but profit would not be the main incentive structure driving how the service operated. In my U.S. state, there are examples of excellent partnerships between publicly owned infrastructures and small business resellers of the service. However, with government involvement comes the

	potential for abuse by law enforcement interests. So while I prefer the option of community/municipal broadband, I have some concerns and reservations.
326	How to keep worlf outside and avoid becoming the new worlf
328	It depends on the traffic
330	It would depend on the exact conditions of participation and the transparency of the organization.
331	It would depend on the definition and structure of 'community' in this instance as to whether it would be a definitive alternative
332	Alternative networks are good for communication and sharing among individuals, but have challenges with some tasks like general information seeking that can be leveraged only with the large userbase, searching tools and storage solutions.
333	Sounds great to me.
334	If a community network is user-friendly, I will try
336	I'm very social and prefer to know / have a network of people near me geographically.
337	in addition - ease of use
338	Anything the requires volunteer time is suspect and will likely not work.
339	I would have more interests in this community network if it can lower the risk of information leaking and has an reasonable price.
342	It reduces the power of the big Internet companies.
343	I want to browse the world - as widely as possible. I know everybody is looking at a different internet, but I don't want my view to become narrow.
344	The key would be accessibility, ease of use, and speed.
345	I believe the success of community networks depend on how profound is our shift to community networks. I believe more in a system of community networks rather than local community networks per se. This transformation requires socialist, communal, changes in other economic sectors, state areas and labor regimes.
347	I would definitely be worth some effort
348	If it was there and stable
352	Why? Just because "community" is in the title? Does that make it better? Is "community" not a "buzzword" just like any other?
353	If I have more time to learn about, I definitly would.
354	We need to think not only of infastructures but also of structures of our desires. Why these megaplatforms are so seductive?
356	I have bad experiences changing providers but if we have a community option I will take it
360	I would definitly using, but I'm not sure that it is possible. I think that companies like Facebook, Google or Amazon will try very hard to gain control over it. I guess it would be a non-stop combat to keep this network free.
363	Well I would be glad to participate in building up a new platform againstt the monopolistic ones. But of course it has to be offering certain attractive features in building up the local community relationship.
364	I would opt for a noncommercial internet services.
365	It would not solve the problem of communication with geographically distant friends. It would potentially created new walled-gardens. It would potentially prevent users from learning anything from people outside their geographic area.
366	local networks have limited content and are limited to local community. Internet is interesting precisely because it is global, universal and it offers unimaginable great number of choices, possibilities, variety of choices, global contacts and communication etc.
372	t
375	I think that is not an alternative. An alternative would be to transform existing services into public utilities controlled by independent bodies and in which ordinary citizens could participate.
377	Monopolies such as XFINITY provides terrible services at high charges. I'd like to see competing companies to change the situation.
378	I believe in the internet as a form of communication capable of making people collaborate to live in a better society. This project depends on freedom and the right to access.
379	You're confusing the layers. Local networks provide connectivity, not content.
380	I only need the Internet for e-mail, does not require a strong wi-fi connection or my friends to follow me.
381	I would participate as an additional venue for information sharing, but since I have significant community contacts on more traditional media (and often with people having neither the expertise or financial standing to participate on a network such as you describe) I would not eschew the existing media.
382	Maybe
383	In the US, there have been community models (e.g., The Well, USENET maybe). This

	decentralization may indeed be the answer to some of the issues we are now facing, such as Net neutrality and the Digital Divide.
384	I have doubts about the scalability of such local offerings, or their ability to support areas of content production with high levels production values. Such services might be a useful addition but the preferences for closed and open networks vary across time and activity type. A non-profit large scale social media platform might be a useful alternative to Facebook and could be provided in a less intrusive and exploitative fashion. Existing social media platforms should be brought under closer regulatory oversight.
387	Ultimately it would come down to the usability of the system.
388	Sounds interesting. I'd have to know more about it. I'd want to consider what the local community organization is doing with my data and who owns it (is it politicians I don't trust? What if they keep it for 20 years and 20 years from now there's a politician I don't trust? But I have these concerns with the current system too). Practically speaking I would also want to know how much effort/time/money I need to give to maintain this, and also what the quality of the connection is like. It's a pretty cool idea though. I'd definitely want to know more about it, and I'm inclined to view it favorably.
390	why not?
391	It would not be worth the effort.
393	Usage would depend on the potential benefits, capability or utility of such a network.
394	Participating in solutions is important to me. And it helps if I can do that locally.
395	If it offers the same services/conditions, I'd happily join.
396	no reason
397	Some of the problems can be overcome, and I would love to see local communities being strengthened in this way and I would be more than happy to take part in processes like these.
401	I believe in distributed local economy initiatives. I would even care less about high connectivity if it is a community provider.
405	Whilst I am worried about the structural inequalities that pervade the existing internet, I think expecting an intense degree of community involvement in running a network like this is probably unrealistic; I suspect that most people in practice lack the wherewithal to get involved with running something like this on top of their everyday concerns. There's a good article here that uses Lippmann's The Phantom Public to discuss something similar in terms not of running a network but of data self-management, but I think the same concerns apply: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/2053951715608876
406	In addition -= as community services in my experience have more intermittent issues and - if you work from home a good bit can be problematic Alos my wife is from Germany and as we live in Ireland contacting OMA and OPA with our kids is high on the priority list - don't want Oma or Opa freezing on us.
407	In a globalized world, it is crucial to have international connectivity which local providers may not be able to offer.
409	/
410	Such a network would need to match BT in service standard
412	There is an initiative in spain called guifi.net which is working so well
413	Would need to have more info to firmly decide.
414	This is a compelling idea, but I need to know more.
415	I would if it provided access to those sites and networks that matter to me.
416	Great idea. Never going to happen - lack of public knowledge/support, resistance/political pressure by corporations; lack of sufficient social cohesion, except possibly in communities united by wider oppression (eg: slum communities).
418	the difficulty would arise in the definition of 'community'. People are now used to interacting with a range of different communities/non communities through the internet . I think this might struggle to take off in the light of the entrenched power and practice in the current system. Might work as an 'add on' but not a replacement.
419	I don't know technological problems in building a community like that.
420	n.a.
421	It would have to be able to meet a certain service level quality. I am a little dubious about this kind of network to deliver this, which is why my answer is not Definitely but Likely.
422	it would depend on who else was using it
425	I am concerned that these communities where you communicate only with the users that are part of it will become "too close". It can be used for example by criminal organisations, and may not be accessible by security forces.
430	more freedom
428	A network isn't necessarily more responsible just because it's local/small.
429	These networks are notoriously slow, fragile and unreliable. If I had access to a network that was none of these things, I would certainly use it.
431	A distributed platform based on open standards would eliminate the problem of having to use

	multiple platforms to get access to different people, and will reduce the network effects that give certain unaccountable commercial platforms too much power. Open standards will also encourage innovation and a sense of community.
434	Internet provision should be like like electricity or water
435	I could imagine using it in addition to more widespread networks, for specific purposes - e.g. some research communities (rather as mailing lists are used now, though they're a bit clumsy), or community solidarity work. I already try to use Facebook in this way, but it's proving difficult. As some of my other answers show, I feel a lot would depend on how many other people I needed to communicate with would join me on these networks. There would probably need to be some transition arrangement
437	N/A
438	it might work, but then, people will still be hooked up with those monopolies. to be able to make an impact such a local network would need a substantial user base, which might be difficult to achieve. but, let's hope that those days will come!
439	I would if it is well-designed and is secure.
440	I think I could try to change my habits and it would be a very interesting process to observe
442	That opportunity allows me to use internet anywhere I find myself. It breaks location barrier.
444	would like to try the option
445	Local community networks are important but face numerous barriers in terms of transport interconnections and the ability of incumbent telecom service providers to maintain dominance via marketing (and to a lesser degree barriers to entry with regard to transport interconnections and use of infrastructure even if access is regulated). Another important element is the growing demand and usage of mobile wireless, which, on the whole tends in most countries to be allocated by auction and thus controlled by dominant carriers. Local networks are certainly important in resisting the dominance of incumbent carriers; however, they also need an effective regulatory regime to flourish.
449	Great idea- the problem I see is the trends to censorship and control would remain, as these are partly driven by public opinion, and perhaps even be worse because narrowed with less mitigating influences, i.e. local autocrats/moralisers would likely impose the think of the children/save us from terrorists agenda.. potentially with worse outcomes for dissenters because local. Still, I support the idea, but these issues need to be resolved.
454	There is often a discrepancy between one's value and one's actions, but the idea of community networks sure is very nice...
457	Diaspora.
459	Yes, I would.
460	Additionally
463	It sounds a good idea, but it's hard to imagine how it will works.
464	I would use it as an addition to the existing network.
466	They are usually better run and cheaper
467	In Argentina, in the province of San Luis the digital agenda has been developed and WIFI has been provided to the population free of charge. According to different periods the quality of connectivity has varied and although more and more government procedures can be done through the Internet connection, much remains to be done to empower through citizen participation and to generate progressive transformations in the communities .
471	am likely to consider it IF it is in addition to my current social networks because local networks will exclude my other contacts that are not within my local network
472	I like to try new things, so I guess I would try it if possible.
	But my network in the social media has people from all over the world, people that I have met during my life in different places. Therefore, a local community network won't fulfill my desire of keeping in touch with people from other places around the globe. However, yes, I think it would bring local communities closer.
473	I like that idea, but i am not very willing to spend much time or effort in it.
475	I live in the countryside where I have only one fixed line internet service provider - and this one operates the last mile through telephone copper wires = I have no high-speed fixed-line internet available. Currently I can get faster and cheaper internet connection using mobile 4G network, which has its own limitations (slower speed when it rains, possiblility of congestion etc.) An ideal situation would be a local or regional co-operative which would build and run a high-speed fibre network: I would be willing invest in that.
476	i would like to know how it works
478	I would like to try
480	I would hardly be amongst the first ones. But if it works well, gains experience and gains members, why not.
482	I would prefer a community network in order to avoid the ever-growing flood of commercial ads
483	It would be great if it's an addition to current Internet provider. Plus, personal involvement

	would have people feel more invested in the work/cause.
486	I would use it, but would there be enough users?
487	why not?
489	I can't really envision such a network. Do you mean that we would have a local "citynet", which would not be connected to the regular internet? What would be the purpose of this? Or do you mean that e.g. a city would become the ISP for its citizens? I don't really see what I would need it for. In my country Internet access is reasonably inexpensive (all the mobile data you want to use for X euros / month, where the price goes with the speed of the connection) and there are an increasing number of Wi-Fi hotspots in libraries, shopping malls and cafes. In my experience the usability of small ventures is very bad. The only exception to this that I can think of is the journalling site Dreamwidth, but you access it through the regular internet rather than a "local whatever", and the communities there are typically virtual and global rather than local in the physical sense. Many cities in my country already have on-line initiatives that gather opinions on e.g. the needs of a particular part of the city, and this feedback can be used to prioritise the city's endeavours in the area, but again, this works already and so does not need fixing.
492	It sounds promising and probably easy to adapt
494	It would make access to Internet more democratic, autonomous and the ownership of it would be more spread out.
495	it would depend on a number of things (the other people involved, the size of the community, if I was able to remain a "traditional" internet user in the meantime...), but I would definitely consider the option. I might even be interested in taking a big role in the community aspect of the venture.
496	There would be detailed questions of governance to be resolved before one could wholeheartedly adopt such a strategy, but in principle it is a good idea. The internet is a central part of contemporary life and should be a public utility.
498	-
500	It seems highly unlikely that a locally organized non-profit could provide comparable services to huge firms that spend billions of dollars on engineering
501	:)
503	nothing
505	No elaboration.
506	Although I like the idea of an alternative network developed by the community, I have reservations about the level of participation and the fairness. I fear that the interests of some groups of users (e.g. older or those with less technological skills) won't be as represented. Also if people who use the network have to work to maintain it, is their privacy kept ? Somehow privacy and "strong community ties" sound contradictory.
507	perhaps I would trust more local NGOs
508	The internet as it is now has some great qualities. It is the concentration of too much power in the hands of a few companies that is of much concern to me.
510	I am content with the existing service and sometimes find novel technology confusing and difficult to adapt to.
511	I'm not too hot on all this, but it sounds like an ethical, viable alternative
512	probably depending on international scope and founders and funding
513	If its Community network there will probably be more control.
515	Give it a try to see how it works out, maybe it might be alright.
517	I'm interested in community networks, especially those that were set up in remote village communities because the big Internet giants couldn't or wouldn't help them. There is technology out there that reaches a free internet!
521	I would use such a community network only in addition to the current Internet provision.
522	I already use similar networks operated by the German Freifunk Initiative
523	How could a locally operated internet provider avoid or prevent the problem of citizens being monitored and used as digital share croppers? Individuals would still be interacting with sites that track and sue their data. This is naive.
524	I'd love to support any viable alternative to commercial networks that was workable and easily useable for a moderately skilled user such as myself.
525	To be honest I would need to understand more about how it works. It sounds good.
527	I am not interested in community led projects anymore, used to be, but not any more. The politics are exhausting
529	Sounds great, but again, its success relies on there being enough of my contact on there
530	such facility would be used as a backup or an alaternative
531	I like the idea of participation and breaking the poewr of the large providers who are not EU based

534	If that alternative exists, we must support it, as a new form of community creation, moreover, as a new form of communal relationship.
536	Doesn't seem as secure
541	It would be more secure
542	I always try out everything. Media is my job.
543	Having an alternative Internet network provided my your community on a non-profit basis would make me feel more secure and having opportunity to design and control where, when and how the data about myself is used. Another important aspect for me is that there would be no commercial gains for elitist corporations/monopolies.
544	Depended if the community network offered the same provision as my current internet and on cost.
546	n/A
548	The current way our internet services are designed carries some major flaws, corporatization being one of them. Unsurprising as it may be in our present times, as it basically follows the same impulses seen in other parts of societies across the globe. It remains to be seen if an alternative system of networks and accompanying platforms run by the civic community has any viability to compete with the corporate molasses, but change has to start somewhere.
549	i dont have time to make it happen
551	I would consider using such a community network.
556	I don't know enough about this to definitely confirm that I would choose this alternative, but I am open to changes so would definitely consider it.
559	As I would be part of the network I can influence it and hence I actually got a chance to do something, rather than relying on politicians who declare: the internet is new for us (Angela Merkel)
561	I would consider, because i would like to enhance my ICT skills by participating in these
562	I understand the concept of local communities building networks, especially where dominant telcos are not interested in providing service. As I live in a large city, it is unlikely that a small enterprise could compete with the infrastructure operated by dominant telcos.

I cannot relate this to the idea that community run infrastructure would encourage its customers to opt out of global social networks. Nor would I see this as desireable. The internet to a large extent has broken down barriers, and broadened horizons. For example, someone from an isolated minority, will find kindred spirits on-line, possibly on another continent. I don't want to encourage people to live in inward-looking walled gardens. |
568	Groups on Whats app give an indication of how successful such a venture might be. If my community decides to give such an opportunity and we also have the freedom to build our platforms, then we will build platforms directly related to our activities a s members of the community as well as build relatively safe platforms especially for our younger members.
566	Federation and decentralisation of the internet as it exists whilst reclaiming personal data needs to be the next evolution of global communications, not creating small clones of the internet which will fall prey to the same issues on an even less-regulated scale.
567	yes, such community networks are useful but they could not be instead of, just in addition to YouTube or Twitter, the latter are the Bigs, global social platforms. However, imagine that many small community platforms form a global social platform on the basis of their own networked connectivity, they may change the behaviour of the Big Platforms in the direction to improve their moral and value policies, maybe, I do not know how, but this is a dialectic process, based on the principle of the balance between network (~ed, ~ ing) power and network (~ed, ~ing) counterpower; civil vs state, etc.
570	I don't know as I was obliged to fill in ....
571	I'm already member of "Freifunk Rheinland e.V.", a non-profit association that has the goal to connect people directly via Wifi, enabling the users to share their internet connection and – most importantly – enable them to communicate via their own routers WITHOUT the help of a commercial internet provider. The latter aspect is often neglected in public discussions, but is indeed one of the key features of the "picopeering agreement", the document describing the idea of wireless community networks.
All "classes" of people benefit from such an idea: those who CAN afford a commercial internet connection can communicate with peers without the help of their internet service provider – those who CANNOT afford a commercial connection such as refugees gain the ability to communicate at all.
575	why not? I would at least try to see if it is able to offer the same level of enjoyability.
576	Sorry, i don't write in English
577	If there is a start up ISP then I am willing to pay more for more integrity/quality of service/access
578	I would consider using it but I am not sure that I have any time to help get it up and running.
583	Not enough people are concerned about their privacy and they prefer current solutions and

	don't want to risk any problems. Maybe in the future people will be more careful.
587	I of course would be happy if such an approach would exist. But this would be only one step - we also must control Google, Facebook and al the other dragons of the net.
588	Depends on the structure of the community.
589	I don't know much about community networks, but this sounds like a great alternative self-organised option.
592	Wee
593	An idea that might develop in the correct regulatory environment but which would be very difficult to implement in countries where regulators have traditionally been captured by large communications operators. Also very difficult to implement in the context of a European Union which perceives profit as the sole thrust for economic and social development (DG for Competition being the spearhead of this restricted yet authoritarian view).
596	I like the idea of there being a community based network.
597	Nice ideal but wouldn't happen in this day and age.
598	I would definitely consider using it. But my decision would also depend on the price charged and quality. I would probably begin using it in addition to my present provider and after a while switch to it, if it worked well.
600	Yes I would support a community initiative as I hate big monopolies that are making people rich - but...would it be able to provide the current high speed fibre optic broadband that I currently use.
602	The dominant and current sites have monopoly to attract the users too
604	It would depend on what it can do.
606	i would consider it but i imagine that a shared wifi service would be low speed and have security issues of its own. Norwich for example has city wide free internet access but it isn't great.
609	it's not very clear "the scenario of an alternative Internet network, e.g. a local Wi-Fi network that is free or low cost to join and is provided by your community on a non-profit basis". ~What do you mean by Alternative internet network? The way of accessing the internet? The internet is the place, there is no other internet. If the way of access is being asked yes, it should be non profit, publicly subsidised as it is becoming closely linked to individual rights/human rights, expression, etc. without having access to the internet, the individuals would be deprived of having and exercising such rights.
611	I would prefer to try to experience alternative one
612	it is unlikely to be low cost and offer the speed from my existing ISP, which is part of a wider communications package. I would loose other uses such as landline and cable TV services.
613	I don't really have the time to participate in such a scheme
614	Too much effort. We live in a busy world, I sometimes don't have enough time for food and sleep because of work and travel. the internet is used for its ease, speed, accessibility to information - I don't want to do more work. Too local. I want global
616	I participate in the sarantaporo.gr community network in Elassona, Greece.
617	Access to the net is not the problem...
618	It seems inconvinent, like using linux on a computer
620	depends on so many factors, speed, access, security, availability,
624	xx
627	X
628	yes as long as connection is reliable and as fast as my current one
629	I'd support a local initiative of this sort. However, I don't believe it could provide the open access to information that I'd be looking for (and which keeps me going with the existing Internet)
634	In Mexico, where I live, that is difficult.
636	depends on the nature of the community networks, because most community networks will/would be controlled by those fakers who work for state organizations or some private interests. Think of the community radios and televisions: they are mostly racist, nationalist or religious provocators who pretents to be in the service of community or society.
638	there are such things in certain places: funkfeuer, freifunk etc., maintained by (semi-)experts - but this is only the very first access and says nothing about the 'places' mostly visited/services mostly used by people online. before all people want to get involved in infrastructural measures, we need to change a lot more about society, i guess..
639	If there were benefits, I would consider using it for what it did well. At present I access a local community blog on Facebook.
640	I don't really understand the concept of it. You would have to pay a small fee and provide voluntary work for it to run? I cannot imagine some people in my local area completing their voluntary work and so I cannot imagine it working.
644	I am willing to look at more cooperative ways of accessing the internet and I am interested in

	breaking away from being forced into using large cooperations for such things. I think it would be harder in smaller, rural communities with perhaps an older generation or young families. I wouldn't want it to fall into the hands of Local Authorities because they can't event get our bins collected so them maintaining the local internet would be a nightmare.
645	I would likely use such a community network.
647	ulhu uig;lih
649	There may be privacy or stability issues to overcome, but I like the sound of a community-led internet provision.
650	not sure it would work
653	Maybe in addition to what I use already on an infrastructural level but this is a globalised world. Beyond infrastructure this doesn't really make sense. This section is combining too many issues and doesn't to separate infrastructure from online platforms. Facebook emerged as a community network which grew and grew until it become the huge company it now is. It used to be a community platform, but because this is a globalised world, it spread out from there. Also, I have to say that all the questions in this survey so far have lumped together Facebook, google, twitter and youtube as if they are the same thing and you can give one answer for all of them together. Now this section lumps together infrastructure alongside all these platforms as well. This survey is appallingly designed. Some of the questions don't make sense on a grammatical level let alone in terms of the content you are asking about. This survey needs redesigning and serious thought needs to go into distinguishing the different elements of what you are asking. For example, I use Ecosia instead of google for basic searches, but google apps for my mobile because I have an android so it is unavoidable there. Facebook and twitter are necessary for me because the whole point is the global network and I live between countries. But I prefer to Skype certain people because it's free. At the same time I also still use a landline in Greece. Or pop over to see people. Or text or email. This survey needs to better distinguish between services that can work on a community level and those which are by their nature global. And separate questions according to the function of the platform otherwise they make no sense. And it is totally missing one of the main problems people are concerned about at the moment, which is the design of the algorithms which shape our relationships with the technology and our relationships with each other. The targeted commercial and political use of data mining is mentioned which is good, but the whole notion of a community 'network' is flawed. My community is dispersed across several countries and cities within those countries. I live between Athens in Greece, Manchester and Newcastle. How do I define local community? This survey has irritated me,
654	I don't have time to go between the two at present, I'm afraid.
659	I would use it in addition to the regular internet, as I would probably not bem able to use this community network for all the porpouses I need.
664	I have never seen such an initiative from up close (so I am not sure about its exact demands, limitations and possibilities), but I find the idea very compelling. I would likely be interested in taking part in one, as internet communications play a very important role in my life, and am enthusiastic about having it managed via a community (rather than a corporation).
665	wireless mesh ftw
666	I already have this kind of communcity via What's App
668	In Russia, we have an experience of local community network launching. But people used it for playing Counter-Strike and downloading Hollywood movies.
669	I would use it given that there is sufficient supervision to ensure my privacy or data isn't being used the same way it would with a company-dominant network.
670	I am already involved in the CN movement
678	The real obstacle is that I don't have time to find out about alternatives, or become an activist in that area, I need my access right now, and very little time is left to change my work settings (thought I could do it at some point this summer, but work keeps piling up, I just did a series of political and union campaigns, and look how late I am in responding to the -- preciously marked "new" for weeks -- email calling me to fill the form... And the survey makes me feel guilty of not manning that other breach...
680	It sounds interesting and worth exploring.
681	N/A
688	access is one layer and there are laws on data retention, anonimization and usage; there are also procompetitive rules on the access layer. application is another layer, where there are no such laws, no procompetitive rules, no portability/interconnection/interoperability; too little competition, too much concentration
689	I'm already member of a community network
692	The network would have to cut or match major ISP costs as well.
693	Such networks (and I've built 'em) tend not to be sustainable
699	You obviously need to differentiate between ISP and platform services. I can't see much

	advantage in changing my ISP, but would be interested in alternative platform services - however, they would not have to be local. I have joined a couple of local community networks and, to be honest, they were pretty crap: no critical mass, little value added - I concluded if I was going to put my energies into anything local, it would be saving our local newspaper which is a more important community institution.
702	I can't imagine it having enough support in South Africa for it to function as an adequate replacement.
703	no answer
707	Local networks, means their management is more accessible.
708	Dont expect they would provide level of service.
710	Closed network.
715	Devolution of infrastructure and control is more likely to meet communities communication needs more effectively
717	I'm the first one that won't trust a community network with myself as user
718	I feel it provides a safety net against monopoly
720	Community Networks could eradicate monopolies and democratise the internet.
723	That sounds great, I prefer anything that would help strengthen communities.
725	I am a wireless network engineer, so I have the skills to help. I have already discussed with my city council the need for this type of alternative.
726	It depends on the network and structure of the organization but I'd be open to participate and contribute as an additional network to mainstream service
727	Fibre is fast and reliable.
730	QoS and breakdowns
736	Community networks can also be misused. But they can still be good - especially in emergency situations.
740	to save from using other paid networks
746	If such exists
749	I am a resident of Niue Island, where we already have a citizen Internet with free access for all. We are used by the University of Canterbury to test things.
750	A community network in addition to the Internet is a great option because the network will allow local people to create and distribute relevant content to one another. Having the Internet will provide additional information, while the community network will have localized content that's relevant to the people and at no cost, informing the audience while creating a market for the content generators.
751	It seems like your are being data-mined everytime youre on the internet. It would be nice to not leave a trace for other entities to study you and start profiling people based on their searches.
755	I am not sure if that will happen, But I am interested about using that kind of service.
759	We need to think about internet alternatives
760	N/A
761	No answer
764	I think it is hardly possible to replace normal internet use, but I definitely think we should raise awareness and invest in (decentralized) alternatives and use them were possible, Still, easier said than done, I tried a few things already (diaspora, Freifunk, will try Mattermost), and hosting as much as possible myself (email, web, storage). But it's hard to get anything beyond the experimental stage, in terms of technology and especially support from communities - because all of this is always less convenient, less polished, more troublesome to use than the shiny offers from GoFaceTwapple.
766	sdadsad
768	networks are good
769	It sounds good.
770	I do not have the time to be involved
771	I would consider it in principle but depends on the practical issues like accessibility, speed etc.
772	Local news, local information that is publicly accessible in an open, transparent manner is critical ..
773	It depends on who is running it and if it works efficiently.
776	It will depend: if the network is easy to access and to use, possibly will be a good alternative
777	...
778	-
779	this would be nice, but it is difficult to imagine how it would work out. much internet communication happens at a global level, and if there is a community level platform (presumably we are meaning like a neighborhood by community), then this would only enable communication at a small area, or within small networks. so this could be an interesting add-

	on to more transnational internet services, but I think the same problems would remain, as people would still keep using the big companies.
780	I prefer to pay for a reliable service
781	I believe in alternatives to large monopolistic platforms. We need different ways of doing things.
782	I would consider it to get additional services such as data storage for backup purposes closed to home, very fast access to local services etc
784	Internations tries to bring together expats all over the world. I am a member but I never made it to meetings because of other obligations and meeting REAL friends.
789	I would like that if it was carefully planned and fair to all as far as contribution is concerned.
790	The problem is that existing social networks have inertia through most people being on them. It takes a lot to get a new platform to that scale.
791	I think an alternative deserves to be tested. To some extent, I would be interested in it, that is, in using it and be involved voluntarily.
792	I would if that was easily available for me - of the usual sort: social capital, warm experts to introduce me, did not need time to invest. OR if I felt had a serious political or civic reason to do so
796	It would be great to be part of a project which purpose is to help people take back the control on their data. To be part of something designed to help people, instead of stealing from them. Plus, it would probably be technically fun :)
797	would be great.
798	-
799	I would use it as addition to my current Internet provision
801	s
806	Depending on the availability of and access to such a community network, I would volunteer to be a part of building and maintaining the network.
807	I still can't imagine totally how this will work but will be interested to try anything that is non-centralized and liberated
808	I would consider anything ... but for me to want to participate it would have to offer a similar level of service and I would have to trust in its future. In my experience local community activity is rarely long-term
811	This is a great idea, it would reactivate the concept of "community" and it would be less scary that what there is now ! I would be happy to be involved in a such project.
810	N/A
814	Now the Internet is a place where fundamental rights are more and more exercised and violated. This means that by delegating the management of the networks and the Internet services we delegate the basics of our political life. Therefore, I think that to change the actual practices in the Internet we need to engage directly to acquire the capabilities to build a cooperative, self-organised, network. Conclusively, I would perhaps try to give my contribution (and to use) an alternative network, but most probably I would do it if it happened to be managed by the community as a common good.
815	I am interested in the idea but not as a first responder. i would wait and see how the new network performed before committing time or money.
819	I would be willing to get involved both time-wise as much as I could, and depending on what is being offered with a financial contribution as well. Much to be explored here, as a lot would depend if what is available does reflect the community and is totally unbiased in its presentations.
821	It would be more efficient and less expensive
822	Hi, my friends, go to life
828	In addition to current provision. I suppose the Tor network is a peer-to-peer alternative Internet network and I use that. But community-owned WiFi schemes have been trialled and have largely been unsuccessful.
829	Operating my own dedicated infrastructure is inefficient. I share where possible.
832	I would personally certainly get involved, but people nowadays want things ready and served. Especially non-tech people would find it hard to go with this choice. The issues on privacy could be a very attractive incentive.
835	Penso sia importante superare certi problemi, ma sono utente troppo saltuaria per impegnarmi a fondo
836	if there would be such a network, I would join.
837	If it's a viable alternative, I would likely try it out, and even use or contribute to it - some of my communities would likely jump to such a place as well. Platforms are tough - there are some and they have a hard time of it.

	Networks are tough - regulatory and cost hurdles favor incumbents.
	These are two different sets of alternatives and two different sets of issues, so lumping them together is a little simplistic.
838	I do not possess the relevant knowledge to build Internet networks.
841	I love the idea of a community network. I wholeheartedly support the belief that we can have Internet and Web 2.0 services without giving up our private information.
842	I would prefer to participate in a local community network.
845	I would be interested in trying it.
847	If it gave me better services I would definitely consider my options.
849	I am extremely sceptical that such a network would even come close to providing the level and quality of internet service that I need. Even the current market leaders in ISP barely meet the minimum of my expectations. I don't see how a local project could ever surpass them.
852	if this alternative internet provider would be reliable I surely would consider to use it
854	Much better but much more complicated to run
856	.
857	it is definitely an answer to my concerns. however, dealing with emails for example, we will still have to write to people usig main stream providers (eg. G) and therefore our information cannot be totally protected...
858	My ISP if fine, thank-you very much. Often "local"-solutions create for too much red-tape. Look at the mess local councils make.
860	I already work for alternative internet publication (websites and other services hosted by non profit organizations) and as computer science and IT teacher i also contribute to training for it
862	need to find our more and better understand benefits vs threaths
863	It would be a rational development and I would strongly support this idea. In practise , it requires two main objects : 1) a fully open and decentralized platform to attract users 2) the infrastructure network support alternative to the existing carriers or providers.
864	J think it' s a good opportunity and a necessity
868	This Will boost the internet connection access for people with low income
869	This model would be an alternative to the dominant commercial model of network provision. Additionally, it could rely less on the closed non-transparent company-specific platforms (e.g. Twitter, Facebook, Google) whereby platform users can communicate with only the users of that specific platform. It could also provide opportunities for Internet users to participate in the building and running of networking infrastructure and in the development of (local) services and, in doing so, strengthen community ties.
873	A municipal wireless network is generally operated by a local government authority, or under a public/private partnership agreement. They are the best economical networks for the people who can't afford private high speed services. Also, these networks are capable of enhancing and improving the network management with public safety feature more specifically in the situations when concerned employee is out of the city, etc.
876	There will be less monopoly risk and collusion with the community network described above but its worthiness will depend on the amount of users switching to the new network. It is likely to be a lengthy process and lots of potential users will be discouraged by this, as such I might switch and I am not sure that I will do so for sure.
877	Please tell me more about this community network.
878	what's to justify? i'd be willing to try a local community network.
880	It depends if I can get all the options I need through the alternative Internet network. If I can I'll be more than happy to only use it and contribute to it's existence and functioning.
883	I am interested in trying community networks. But I do not see the discussion on what information is kept, if it is not, but can it be accessed-hacked... At the end, it is like the saying that one prefers to stay with the evil force one knows rather than jumping into the unknown. There is some truth to it. I believe there can be changes made within what already exists and that should be the main focus. In the meanwhile there should be development made to offer strong alternatives.
884	I would rather support a smaller company but would also like the reliability of a larger provider
885	Alternative ways are welcome. But local networks are not likely to outperform the existing "giants". One would thus move toward a 2 levels set up with local and global networks used for specific purposes.
886	Given the chance, I would love to join and participate in a community network
887	I would not mind to use such network, however I am not sure whether I would find time to help in its development.
888	The privacy concern in my opinion is bigger. I dont think Google engineers or my IPS enginees go to look for my personal activity online. What they do is to aggregate the data from

	many people to make Marketing studies. But the local provider, that has access to personal log data for the local community, that is more scary. The local IT guy could be curious to look at the logs to see what people are doing, spying on them.
891	I believe it is possible and also believe that is not very far in the future
894	If this would be possible I would probably participate gladly
898	The big ISPs have virtual monopolies with too much control of content data and pricing
899	(there was no question...) This is not a hypothetical scenario. There are community networks as for both network infrastructure and platforms. I do put voluntarily hours helping to support and strengthen them (other that IT). Yet there is a very strong lobby in favour of corporate services (google, fb, tw, MS) even from local government / universities etc forcing people to accept their services. Also the community based projects are struggling against restrictive laws, regulations and reforms or unjust economical help provided to monopolistic companies.
901	I'm part of guifi.net, and I installed nodes, and I try to have a healthy community, etc.
902	We are supposed to be the owners of our infrastructure, that's the first solution to the market crazy industry
905	-
909	again dudes, realy too long survey with some strange answering options
910	Good idea. I am already part of it. To be precise: I am building such networks. It's called Freifunk. We have more than 600 WIFI devices spanning 6 counties. We provide free WIFI (without ads, without landing page, without registration).
911	I'm already participating on Freifunk. Dezentralized WiFi Networks.
912	Well, i am member of the freifunk movement, so...
913	Already part of a "Freifunk"-group, providing local access and services
914	It sound like a good idea. Would depend on the implementation and market adoption
915	I have spent quite a bit of time trying to promote Internet access including various community and non-profit approaches. I still actively support such efforts but I'm becoming a little cynical about the likelihood of success in most cases.
916	My expierience with community networks is that most of them are slow and uncontrolled. I would not recommend a standard user with low or no knowledge about protecting his machine on a local network to accesssuch netorks where no access control is performed.
918	Not sure I like the idea. I can't see a benefit to it based on my current situation and internet usage.
920	It could be a possibility but needs strong privacy agreements
923	establishing alternative networks will need more than just a few good people...It would be a community or even state wide effort and as such it must be first rationalized and mediated to the public or else people will stay on digital monopolies platforms
924	Managing a network (equipment, security aso...) is a full time job, done by professionals. Alternative networks must professionalize themselves ...it is a matter of confidence
925	This sounds awesome if it were managed correctly.
926	ok (elaborate on what?)
928	Informatics is a personal interest of mine. So I would get to know tech loving people in my local community. I could gain valuable knowledge which I might be able to use in my profession as a software developer. I might take pride when 'we' as a (small) local community can outperform (large) ISP companies on fields like network throughput, services and/or member satisfaction.
930	Better at all levels.
931	NA
932	depends, doesn't it?
934	I use this kind of network to connect to my friends. If I had another option, I would be the first one asking them to migrate and be elsewhere with me.
935	In a city of over four million people I cannot see this work easily.
937	I would support this in my community and actively join it, pay for it, and do work for it if I were able to do so.
938	In the absence of any chance of global agreement and legislation to regulate markets of all kinds, and the internet in particular, the only viable option is to inject as much genuine choice as possible into the market, and any community-based infrastructure free from the baleful practices of global behemoths would make me want to use it to the almost complete exclusion of Google, Facebook and their kidney. The only power we have in an unregulated market is to vote with our feet in sufficient numbers to make alternatives sustainable in the long term.
939	I would definitely consider it. Whether I would actually end up using it depends on a number of factors, including the voluntary effort required.
940	I dont believe that these can compete with world networks.
941	I can only assess the value of this through usage, its hard to image a community service providing the same level of service that I am used to. I could be persuaded and sometimes feel that my somewhat careless use of the internet and indifferent attitude to security etc is a

	time-bomb. But then I'm not a great subscriber to dystopian theory. Certainly the recent evidence of the influence of the internet on politics, nationally and internationally gives pause for thought. The 'Big Brother' level of control (1984 is an exception to my last comment) that is now available was predicted but the darker consequences are yet to come to fruition. As long as commerce is the guiding force not political power then c'est la vie! And money rules our world.
943	Sounds like a good idea. My only concern would be that people would get into a bubble of only talking and working online with the same types of people which may limit inclusiveness and diversity of thought (and a broader perspective).
944	I have absolutely no interest in involvement in my local community. Local communities aren't an essential good. Local communities are, on the whole, closed, bigoted, prejudiced, narrow minded, uncomfortable places. Who burned witches? Who carried out lynchings? Who ostracises ethnic minorities? Local communities. I don't want to strengthen community ties. I don't want to feed a localised nationalism. I want to participate in a global community. I also don't want to do voluntary work for the benefit of this 'community'. I have no idea what you mean by informatics in this context.

Sidebar: I really think you should reconsider the use of this survey as a research instrument. If you showed this to any reputable quant sociologist they would shred it for its biased questions, poor design, lack of sampling. It doesn't reflect well on the reputation of the named data manager or the institution. |
946	Not really sure - need more info
949	I would like to use a collaborative platform, but it is the social part, and not the technical that fails for such an scenario to exists. The Diaspora project is the best example for it. The platform was open and worked perfectly, but it lack a model for sustainability and was unable to move the masses already gathered by facebook.
951	I'm against monopoly
954	I do not consider it a good idea, as an Internet connection is so important for my daily life that I would not risk logging only to a non-professional network. Moreover, I think it is the competition that makes the market go on.
955	It would be a space that wasn't controlled by a near-monopoly.
957	Community networks are not viable due to socio-economic conditions - lack of public awareness of need or capability, lack of public motivation, lack of government or other support, limited technical support skills in the wider community, frequent regulatory barriers. Seeing them as a solution is re-committing the error of technological determinism - there is nothing inherent within them which would guarrantee they did not merely reinforce existing power structures, just like the internet has. They can easily become tools of oppression where local communities are dominated by local elites.
958	To replace extortionate physical infrastructure - but we would have to run it -- look at the state of must uni networks - do you want to?

For data, size matters. Purpose matters. |
960	I did sign up for an open source network but to get the momentum I needed friends to see the benefits and join. Most of my friends are on facebook as it seems to be the most easy to connect. If there was an alternative I would use it and promote it to friends
963	these projects always fail due to technical shortcomings. plus, in London people constatnly move around and change houses.
967	Why not?
968	j
969	The investment option puts me off - I don't want to invest in something that I don't know what would turn into.
970	na
971	Still want to minimise time spent online...
976	Depending on the aim, use and managment
978	-
979	H
982	Competitiveness thrives based on free market, any regulation under the disguise of local community etc is eventually very difficult to sustain.
984	This is the kind of grass-roots service provision I can really get behind. I would definitely consider moving my consumption to such a service if it were to be available. My hesitations would arise from such things as privacy and the interests of those running the service (because I simply cannot work with people who would oppress others and I would imagine a smaller, community-oriented service may admit such folks).
985	Can repeat the issue. Monopoly again.
986	We need to develop alternatives to the corporate/state profit/control, and if the technical and

	physical infrastructure could be (or already are) developed, local networks could help inform and organize improvements and communication across the globe. Many of the challenges involved are common, and there should be a large potential to identify across cleavages or boundaries of tradition. From what I see on fx Twitter, there are many activists who operate in local social networks already.
989	I agree with the philosophy behind that
993	I think initially I would have to try it alongside the existing connection. We are so used to many conveniences that the monopolies supply, so a change may be challenging. Also, there is a case to be made for 'benevolent' monopolies who can utilise economies of scale. This is something I ethically struggle with!
994	I'm happy with my service, but I would support a community network because I value the services they offer (including challenging existing telecoms).
998	There were some such efforts in earlier years .. none of them suvived due to the big companies taking over like DSL connections etc .. though certainly it would be interesting to try that again
1003	It would be nice
1005	The problem with a new network is the number of users. Networks have value as they unite people. Some years ago I used an alternative network to facebook, encrypted and respectful of rights, by nodes, I think it was called diaspora, but it was not socially successful, so it can not be useful, because you have to resort to traditional networks as well. To access the information that circulates. The problem is not only physical infrastructure, but where the information circulates.
1006	Having alternatives for dominant players creates a more fair society.
1009	Unfortunately most of the people don´t think this kind of questions and they are not concerned of these items. People just don´t care because big firms have made their services usage so easy. There has been alternative try-outs (like Diaspora) but they have not succeeded.
1010	If I understand it well, in the alternative model you can only communicate with others in that specific network. This means that when my family or I travel we cannot communicate via the Internet? As we travel a lot, we would not be able to communicate via the Internet most of the time, which makes it very expensive to call or text via cellphone.
1016	I would consider it as a forma o f citizenship and participation, as a volunteer work to benefit the community.
1018	No technical know how, not sure how I could contribute.
1021	I do not think that this kind of network is practical. Or I do not really understand your description? You would build up a community platform that also provides my internet access, i.e. via wi-fi? I do not see, how it changes thinks! First, I do not have big privacy concerns against my internet provider since I think the laws in Europe prevent (commercial) data collections. Second, wi-fi is not practically - how many access points do you want to install? And what about the countryside? Third, you do not need an alternative internet access/provider to rely less on platforms like google or twitter - just do not use them! Even as an it professional I do not know until today how to use twitter and I do not care! Fourth, how about the communication between users of your intended platform? I do not think you would or could provide the possibility to communicate with users of other communities or will/can you? Than the argument of the closed community communication holds also for your community!
1024	It would depend on the usability, accessibility and transparency of the platform. It's a great idea in theory, but the incentives have to be enough to make me willing to learn the necessary skills to participate in such a project (FYI: Linux was too convoluted for me to get my head around, so I suppose I am not very patient with such things).
1025	there is no question
1028	It could help in finding a new way of sharing info, without commercial interests behind
1029	THERE SHOULD BE NON-PROFIT MAKING ALTERNATIVES WHERE THE SOCIAL SERVICE SHOULD HAVE THE PRIMARY PREFERENCE. USERS SHOULD TAKE PART IN IT AS CO-OPERATIVE MEMBERS WHICH REQUIRES ALSO ONLINE VOTING MECHANISMS FOR DECISIONS. HAVING RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITY GOES TOGETHER.
1031	I think that the notion of a community is mostly irrelevant today. The majority of humanity lives in metropolitan areas, where there are no communities. I do not know my neighbors in my building, and I don't consider them or others to be "my community". Maybe there are communities in small rural villages and in more religious groups that meet at churches, synagogues or mosques.
1032	Meet like minded people to enable political and social organisation
1036	a
1039	Cannot really justify
1048	Not something I totally understand but unlikely I would be interested in participating or using.

1050	I think it would depend on the community, but experience of other community led projects has shown that they are successful to begin with but are unable to keep the momentum going.
1053	I think that this is the way forward...
1057	the net is free for all kind of communities.
1058	I think it could make sense, but will obviously also depend on my own size of network I require for my personal life. I assume this local network is limited in its reach. This could probalby limit its applicability, as also now already, alternative services are available, however are often not used due to not being conveniant enough. This is the classic privacy vs conveniance trade-off
1060	This is a great idea. The problem is to cope with the habits and the user-friendliness of contemporary systems and technologies. The psichological and time investment in such projects requires in my opinion a strong motivation based on a good communication strategy by the promoters of these networking infrastructures
1061	To gain back some control at the local and community level
1062	localization
1066	Building and running networking infrastructure is a job better left to professionals— just like any other kind of infrastructure. I wouldn't relish the need to be involved with maintaining sewers, electrical mains or gas pipes, and the same applies to network connectivity. That doesn't mean that the model of commercial ISPs is a sensible one, but small-is-beautiful is not the answer.
1070	I would definately contribute to build a local network!
1072	Internet access has become an essential utility, as much as electricity and more so than POTS. The final mile should be managed like power lines.
1073	Local community networks are not very common in my country for various reasons, political, economical, cultural, etc.
1074	I think it could work to strengthen local communities. But the big advantage of the internet I am used to is the irrelevance of geographical distance. I want / need to collaborate with people who are in distant locations.
1076	I do not like mandatory questions, respectively answers. It is my choice to participate in the survey and it is my choice whether I would like to elaborate on or justify (!) my answer.
1077	If I could use a SNS that is local to where I live and a different one for the line of work I am in and a different one for 'general' relationships, that would be cool. However, that could have other problematical by products, of echo-chambers etc. But at least those would represent the needs and uses of that community, and less of the internet company.
1078	I am too much networked in the existing internet as it is
1079	The more collaborative, the better.
1082	If brings equal and fair services, why I shouldn't?
1083	Options are good and non-profit models are driven by sustainability, not year over year growth in revenue.
1084	I would definitely use the local network. However, I rely on fast internet connectivity for my work. I teach online synchronous and asynchronous university courses. If the local netwrok would provide me with comparable speed and reliability, I would switch. I would also be very willing to invest and volunteer.
1089	instead of!
1092	for a time we had some alternative wireless in our town and i loved it! but the problem was, that the people, who have been establishing it, really tried to design it in an open way, so that everybody could fix an antenna on his roof on his own, but at the end for the common user it was to complicated.
1093	It would be great because it would build community and it could make decesion making more democratic. And i could contribute and add value to my community
1095	Mine fits partially the description. It is just quite expensive (2 or 3€ more than the commercial ones). And definitely small (few hundreds members across France). Let's says there are a few obstacles still to overcome to make it big (a large techno-social protest movement) and cheap (collective seizure or the infrastructures ?).
1102	Hay otros factores que determinan el estado de la cuestión, como las características geográficas que inciden en el servicio
1103	I feel safer in this platform plus the fact that I can contribute to its development.
1107	why?
1109	good idea, but I am not at all confident that there are enough folks with the time, energy, motivation to make it work as imagined.
1112	I would definitely be on-board, as a volunteer, with the caveat that I have some skill and knowledge limitations. (In other words, there would be a learning curve). But here in the U.S., the monopolies/duopoly flood state legislative houses and members, often via organizations such as the American Legislative Exchange Council) with "model legislation," hammered out

	behind closed doors between Big Telecom and state legislators (who have all-expense "paid scholarships" for such meetings) that is specifically meant to squash such efforts.
	Larry Lessig credits the late Aaron Swartz with shifting his focus to the overall corruption that continues to disenfranchise so many. That, too, has to be accounted for.
1113	higher transparency
1115	I read the previous question wrong. I would use this network
1116	community network has speed problems. That's why I only use it part time
1121	...
1123	I would definitely consider joining an online community which I can trust in terms of not collecting or violating my data.
1124	Sounds too difficult. I need to go online without any hassles.
1126	please refer to the experiencie of barcelona in comu, I hear that the community options are better now (especially in comparison to the old private system).
1127	i would use it in addition to existing services
1130	If speeds were in excess of what I could get through my provider, I would consider it. I would also be open to taking an active role in setting such a system up.
1131	The idea of local power over corporate monopoly is inherently attractive to me. If the speeds/access was comparable, then there would be no question. The use of Google/Facebook/etc. doesn't seem directly connected to a local network, however.
1132	Depends on how powerful it is, and how much time/effort I have to devote to it.
1133	If there was such a stable community system, that would be great. However, I am concerned about the actual efficacy of such a system and its users. Many Internet users don't know anything at all about the back end of the digital technologies they're using, so such a community would have to be composed of intermediate and advanced or expert users to understand the idea behind it. In theory, this is a good idea. In practice, who knows how it'll play out. Consider the RELATIVE failure of BitCoin and other cryptocurrency: Many people don't know how it works so they won't invest or participate in that economy, even if cryptocurrency is more reliable than other currency systems.
1134	I think that this kind of network has potential to create strong ties in a community, the issue here is the interconnection with other networks like the Internet, a situation that promotes some agreements with other providers with different points of views of how a network and its data should be managed compromising the integrity of the local network
1135	I do not need a pressure to quest for alternative solutions
1136	It is difficult for me to speculate on this, though I can imagine working on the service would be challenging and a reason the service would be unlikely to develop into a comparatively large one. It also seems limited, and I personally do not post the same content on all of my social networks (different audiences). Paradoxically, while I use social media to communicate with friends and strangers, I would also not be too keen on developing a close local community in the offline sense, which this scenario seems to imply.
1138	I would like to get involved but do not have much free time. However, it might be a project I would get very involved in if I thought it was going somewhere.
1143	in local situations it seems easier to control "the control".
1144	I'd be willing to volunteer to build of such a network.
1145	I have limited experience with social networks. In fact, I have tried to use Facebook but I am repeatedly shut out and do not know the reason. I have been unable to get a reason from them. On the other hand, I enjoy many aspects of coding and would would also probabaly enjoy many aspectws of maintaining such a site.
1146	Because there is little competition between ISPs and speeds here are horrendous, I am in the process of founding a community/inter-municipal ISP in my area. We can assure customers that we're not selling their browsing habits and may be able to help protect (and advocate) against other bad Internet behavior.
1147	Depends on how complicated and time-consuming it is to join
1149	People will still want the "brand name" content which may make such an effort rough. I'm still willing to try, though.
1153	I'd be willing to financially and physically support an alternative network that empowers communities.
1154	I am a researcher myself and I think your questions cannot be considered open. They are biased.
1155	sounds pretty time consuming and I can't say I'm overly concerned about the current state of things
1156	It's just a better alternative in many regards; less surveillance, less expropration of mental and social work, less centralized power structures, more flexibility etc.
1157	no guarantee that community networks would be more responsible - need legislative solution
1158	Open access seems to be a good alternative.

1159	It's risky, but it can work...
1161	It could be a good idea.
1162	..
1163	...
1165	I live in an urban area and I think there would be sufficient interest in my community. I am unsure about other communities and areas, especially those that are poorer and more rural.
1169	I can see models of social networking and news tht are local, aggregated, and some decent algorithms going on to cut out the offensive things . But larger scale (city wide, state, national) still very important and local might not allow for this (in relaiton to news). Participated in a little in a local social network that was supported by a large business, gave up, was more interested in knowing what friends were doing than people nearby that I didn't know.
1170	Local control is good, and any competition for large companies/corporations or bureaucracies is potentially good.
1173	As long as Facebook, Google, et al, are still in business I don't see this as a likely scenario since they will not be able to compete
1174	I have little knowledge of how a community network would work but I am definitely keen on trying it as a way of breaking free from the current monopoly of big tech companies like Google and Facebook.
1176	It will reduce costs and top-down control, will promote equality, and be more participatory
1180	Both Internet and social media are global connected⍰as they affect with each other and play the mutual role.
1185	This changes everything, because it could work for building a robust local infrastructures for different projects. A bad thing is that maybe the community could lose something that has been worked out outside the community, lose that thing that globalization gives to people, that is the possibility of look for trends and other points of view of a unique situation.
1186	Yes. However I am tight and lazy. Still I could find it pleasantly stimulating.
1187	Now I rent a flat so I have no control of the interner provider of the flat. As soon as I can choose my internet provider, I would definitely choose a community network.
1191	I really dont understand what a community network would be,, but i would like to try it if there is available sometime.
1192	No justification.
1194	Collectivise the network!
1196	This is one of the better ways to make Internet public good.
1197	I'd love to hear more about community networks.
1198	I don't think it is possible.
1199	This model sounds wonderful, and I'd like to learn if this has been piloted anywhere and what has been discovered. I am keen to conduct further research.
1202	The problems with Internet companies from ISPs to online sales platforms, search engines, etc. are not primarily networking problems, but rather societal issues. As long as the vast majority of people buy into neo-liberal systems as the only way to organize societies and the world, problems of profiteering, abuse of privacy, inequalities,etc. will only be exacerbated. 'The Internet' is a large set of communication/media/... tools - it is people/societies that make and accept behavior and practices.
1204	For as long as the community network presents an alternative model of internet provision, taking into consideration the issues of access, privacy and transparency. Community of users could mean more control over data and discourses/interaction online. The network should serve the community above all.
1205	depends on initial investment and if i have time in the day to organize others to join. i am already fighting a new jail, a landfill and have several full-time jobs across continents (at least it feels that way) but the cause is very noble.
1206	Well, of course I am in favour of socialism, and would like to help construct such an ideal society. I am not sure that internet services are the place at which I would start, though. But, in the abstract, it is a good idea.
1208	Alternative model would have to provide almost equivalent level of usability in order to attract critical mass of people to change from an existing service.
1209	I have donated to Wikipedia, Democracy Now and Young Turks funding campaingns. does this count ?
1210	Community based organizations such as FreeNet on Canada had governance issues as well
1211	I would try it, however I am concerned about the quality of services provided since it is very difficult to reach the level of professionalism of commercial services
1214	Japan actually has better network service provision than most places. The Japanese government worked out a deal for urban fibre rollout which provides competition for provision while funding the necessary infrastructure for the backhaul. Online services are a different matter.

1216	It's hard to tell about such a hypothetical local network, but it sound like a nice idea which is certainly worth a try.
1217	Seems as a start to address some otwhat's wrong currently
1218	-
1221	Concerning network-speed , costs, etc., small Internet-providers can hardly compete with large corporations. The problems with security, privacy, surveillance, etc., are not automatically solved by using a local Internet-provider.
1223	Are we talking about initiatives like the Freifunk in Germany? I think those might be a viable future, but I'm a little scared about security issues. If a project like this is led by voluntary staff and created somewhat ad-hoc, I wonder if the lose organisational structure is quick enough reacting to threads and new technological developments.
1226	I'm always interested in learning and exploring alternatives.
1227	...
1230	1
1232	It will make one feel more empowered and in control of this rather unwieldy criss-crossing of information and data. It will be an opportunity for people to learn more about this domain of their lives that is so important yet so poorly understood. I feel very disempowered with regards to the internet and its usage and mechanisms. This will put agency back into the hands of ordinary people who all face the same perils of our "network society".
1233	In this terms could be an utopic scenario but also interesting if focused on this goals: break the monopoly / oligopoly of incumbents and provide an infrastructure native anonymous
1234	I am not sure whether community network can solve some of the problems as I have never used one. However, considering the existing circumstances, I will not rule out the potential of such a system.
1236	For local purposes this would be ideal, for local needs, run by neighbourhoods. I would support it financially and also a small number of hours per month as far as possible. And as long it is transparent.

(however we had some projects like these in my neighbourhood and it didn't succedd in the end because the start capital couldn't be gathered) |
| 1237 | depending on the individual case |
| 1238 | This is a great idea and I have slowly migrated to the platforms. It has been difficult as I have to explain about my behaviour changing to people around for thinking and doing something different, particularly peers in a developping country seems to be less concerned about privacy right.

But in my opinion, alternative platforms are good for the short -term solutions because we can't always run and hide the media Empire which colludes with nation state. They have more resources than activists in the civil society. The solution would be that these activists run campaign for social media change to lobby nation state and regulate the market in order to create alternative platforms by the public and for the public. We need a campaign that can shift the market monopoly at the policy level. |
1239	I am very interested in alternative offers that protect data and improve social life, also in the local community. I would be happy to participate in such an endeavor.
1240	it is hard to explain
1241	In theory such a network would be great for the community. However, I am unsure if it would reach a critical mass of active users over time. In my country, local newspapers have created various types of community sub-pages, and most of the content posted here is birthday greetings to kids and reports from the kids' football team.
1242	- if the services are convincing
1244	It all depends on the level of effort - I do not think it would be so much work, probably some kind of sharing of experiences between alternative Internet communities would make it easier and less costly.
1245	I would love the idea of being online without constant surveillance /metrics being taken of me, the idea of my identity not being a fiscally quantifiable property.
1246	I would support such a network by telling other friends
1248	I would be willing to join this network in addition to my current network to see if it was something that would work for me.
1249	good, but I might insist on Google because of its almighty functions...
1250	Sounds great. It's also really necessary if we're going to make the world less unequal and capitalism less cruel.
1251	As specified above.. certain support i may be able to do - something like..voluntary work, if initial investment is very minimum then may be able to do. otherwise it will become difficult.
1252	Infrastructure is (still) expensive, so large corporations are still needed to create this infrastructure. An alternative would be tax-financed free networks without restrictions on

	access - but in my opinion, state control is even less desirable than economic control!
1253	Physical infrastructure is only half the story. Of course it would be nice to have more competition in this area through local community networks. However, I don't see how this could change the monopolization in services on these networks that we see today with Google and the likes. These platforms have developed for a reason because there are scaling effects. These scaling effects mean that the bigger, the better the service, which is why customers choose it. Rather than building an alternative infrastructure, there should be more and better platform regulation: changing competition law to avoid further monopolization, forcing platforms to share their data with competitors and open up their algorithms to public scrutiny, restricting their collection, use and sale of personal data, forbidding tracking of users and non-users on- and offline and over various websites, enabling users to switch platforms through data portability, making it easier to ask a platform to erase all or part of one's personal information (e.g. Netflix keeps your information even when you leave the platform "just in case you may one day want to come back"), in short: empower users, modify competition and consumer safety laws to the modern requirements
1254	Unlikely that oligopolies will allow this foothold
1255	I support the idea of local networks, but the difficulties in starting and maintaining such networks means that they are, in my opinion, unlikely to become popular.
1258	Since I am not too satisfied with my service, or content, providers I would consider alternatives. The choices are narrowed down due to monopolies and oligopolies...
1259	I'm not really that concerned
1264	elab
1265	ANYTHING TO ESCAPE CONTINUAL BOMBARDMENT OF ADVERTS
1266	It would require some form of long term involvement, which might be in conflict with short term involvement, transitional engagements and such which are strong forces in today's society. Could these co-exist? There could be potential when connecting with existing networks of long term users of other services as well
1268	I like this idea and can see the value of it. If wifi is now a necessity to modern life, it would be good to run it on a co-operative or non-profit basis divorced of the need to monetise people's data.
1273	Not clear what this would look like
1275	Because it would probably five me less benefits and it would be less powerful than my current network. Furthermore, I would probably not be available for a personal investment on it. Also given that I'm not worried about the current condition, I would probably not support a project like this.
1277	Do not wish to
1280	Some of my current activities online probably require a mass provider. But a new local network may be able to cater for some of my needs.
1281	Check https://wiki.coops.tech/wiki/Main_Page
1283	more people could be involved in the decision making
1284	It's good to have alternatives.
1286	think it would work and there are already a precedant of it working.
1287	Your scenario above is something I would support - I doubt I would be able to contribute my personal involvement however - so this would be one of those things that I support in principle (e.g. community gardens) but not in practice by actually contributing.
1288	Although affordable internet access is important (my monthly cost is very high) it wouldn't solve the problem of huge corporations such as Google and Facebook dominating the internet.
1289	Hey, I live in Finland! It would be too crowdy and unpleasantly familiar for us if it would be a local community Wi-Fi.
1291	I worked as a professional sysadmin. It broke my physical and mental health. I have no intention of doing it again for free, nor do I believe that many of my colleagues, even or possibly especially those most passionate about the Open-ness of the Internet, have the time or energy required for such a project to work well on a large scale.

I'm also unconvinced that systems such as the one described would make people break away form the dominent commercial social medial platforms, simply because people go where their friends are. It's rather the point of *social* media. |
1292	Because community network is a safe place where i have some sense of ownership.
1293	-
1297	These are *essential* going forward, but not sufficient. In combination with efforts like Tor they can mitigate some but not all issues. However, without them we are doomed to a monopolist corporate controlled "internet" without transparency or freedom, and vulnerable due to centralization to both surveillance and disaster.
1298	Local networks and information concerning security and privacy may help build new models

	for internet consumption; new technological developments are also aiming towards an internet 2.0 where the ecossystem is not so dominated by big corporations.
1299	That would be great, but the change must occur 'outside'. You can have a community net, but within a capitalist society it'll succumb since monopolies have always ruled throughout history.
1302	Providing free or cheap networking strikes me as a good idea - it doesn't solve the whole of the problem though - there's still the infrastructure/service/etc provided by the actual social network platforms and the content providers to consider - but it's part of the equation.
1304	I like my privacy
1305	Ww try it here in my country, but the laws are helping the big companies to monopolize the market
1306	This would offer an alternative access to internet
1307	Free, open meshnet!!
1309	To force people to answer to an open question is not what social sciences should do, BTW!
1310	I would be feel safer. Definitly i will use it and help to mantain it
1311	No thoughts on this
1312	Honestly, I fear this is beyond the level of effort that I'm willing to invest in this area
1313	As I said, competition in many telecoms markets in the US is minimal. We have the 'choice' to use one ISP, two max, even in major metropolitan areas (e.g. here in Pittsburgh). The telcos have bored a tunnel of ad-infused, commercially-driven content across the US and into our homes, yet prices for even basic internet access and cable TV are astronomical. The only way to disrupt this effectively monopolistic practice is to provide alternatives, and a community-driven alternative is also a way that the isolation and alienation of users (as a direct result of social media and excessive dependency on the internet) who feel disconnected from local 'real life' networks. In the UK I was aware of some initiatives in this respect, but not here in Pittsburgh. (I found cheaper internet access and cellphone bills only through long periods of searching, and I'm pretty savvy with computers - those that actually need cheaper services to find jobs, pay bills etc cannot get such good deals, which is a tragic and infuriating irony)
1315	Years ago I established a node of FidoNet that had, as a part of the offerings, a national clearinghouse of software used in the human services. It worked very well. Later I was a co-founder of Denver Free-Net. It worked very well. These days there is nothing comparable to that available in our community.
1316	Local networks of this nature may be a good thing. However, since community means hanging with the like-minded, it doesn't necessarily mean that more and more separated social spheres will lead to larger-scale freedom from bigotry, abuse of power, and other problems that concern me. The local KKK could have a fantastic local internet service/platform. This would not be desirable in my view as a person who would suffer from better-organized racism. I do not believe the organization of local networks is a better option than making law that enforces a free Internet including an ad-free search engine. Ponzi schemes are against law. There could be laws against the worst of the abuses of Internet freedom.
1317	I firmly believe in creating as much local buying power as possible, I assist with helping local groups in my area to have offline networks, it is part of the mazizone project.
1318	I would use and support an alternative local network in addition to the commercial services I now use and I would like to see public or user-owned and governed networks and platforms at the national and international level as well.
1319	I'd want to encourage but think it may be very hard to turn the tide not his one. And professionally am obliged to engage with companies e.g. Amazon, Facebook, Twitter that are not in the 99%'s best interests.
1320	Of course I would be interested in trying it. Who wouldn't? I'm not sure it would help much though. Still worth trying.
1322	I would love to be involved in such a project and would try to convince my friends/family/work colleagues to do the same.
1325	The association between capitalistic profit and internet created a culture and social actor that are guided by greediness, and extremely powerful. Any alternative will be attacked to preserve the oligopoly. But if there were option, even small ones, I will be happy to contribute.
1326	I just don't see it happening. It would encompass such a tiny part of all the things that we use on the internet, that it would just not be useful.
1327	A community ISP as an alternative to comcast/spectrum/etc would definitely be welcome, but ultimately all the data needs to flow upstream, so the ISP of the local network can pull the same tricks as current ISPs. Replacing twitter/facebook/google is nontrivial and probably not something that these networks could accomplish, especially given the network effects at play in the first two.
1328	If local providers could offer good quality, I would consider using their services.

1330	I believe in local community and the value it creates
1332	I will definitely use such a community to encourage them
1333	I would involve myself in such task as well as promoting other forms of interaction outside the site virtual space: face-to-face interaction.
1335	I like the communal basis of cost sharing, but not sure how a local, shared wifi network solves any of the problems of platform monopolies. Most of what I do on the internet is not about local contacts or content. So the ubiquity of FB, Google, Twitter, etc. are not disrupted by this model. I just get a different pipe to the big platforms. Is this sort of a wifi version of the Credo Mobile model?
1337	It relies largely on widespread adoption of users, without that it would be useless.
1338	My main concern with these alternative networks is their possible exploitability. It would take only one person in a key position to, for example, extract information and sell it forward. This information might end up being used by the same corporations that are making profit with metadata even today. I like the idea of community closeness and volunteering in order to make it work, but personally I would look more into it before deciding to use it.
1339	I don't know what I'm elaborating here.

Is there an alternative internet where I live? What would be it's purpose? Much of the power of the internet comes from global access and network effectsZ |
1340	internet must be decentrally organized
1344	I would like to participate in trying to build and popularise alternative access, search, and sociality models.
1345	It could be a way to break monopolization from big companies and we could know those who are offering Internet to us
1346	I would love to see the return of reliable community-based freenet services.
1349	Text
1359	Won't happen
1355	Depends on the network, what it covers. Migrants need transnational networks, not only local ones.
1357	The one thing the internet does is allow you to connect more widely with people with similar interests and concerns, and with people I know who live away. Living in proximity to someone does not mean I share their interests.
1361	I am willing to use or be part of a community solution.
1362	I am interested in alternative network infrastructures - but they have to be practical (both from the time that needs to be invested into it and when it comes to speed - and most importantly, the stability of the network).
1365	I am not sure what a 'community network' means in practice and which will be its advantages. But I think that I would definitely consider it as an option.
1366	Community networks seem to be a possible alternative..
1368	Having a democratic alternative is always preferable.
1371	Interesting concept. Challenge is aggregating community to make service relevant and meaningful enough so that it drives adoption. In this space, if you build it, users might not come.
1373	Building community is awesome and managing your own means is great.
1374	If such a network would exist, I will certainly consider it provided it's publicly funded and free from commercial companies.
1375	If a community network which is open about data storage and access, and not using it for profit or commercial use comes up it would definitely be beneficial
1377	I am an early adopter of open tech so I think I would join, but it would be tumbleweed all around… I don't think many people are in the headspace to actively participate in something like this, especially in cultures in Northern and Central Europe. Maybe it would work in the South? I hopw this project proves me wrong and more people than I think are willing to volunteer.
1378	I think the future is either for the companies to adapt them selves to a more critical point of view by their users, or fail to contains this need for a free internet.
1379	didn't understand
1380	There is no reason not to have municipal internet bar the political power of existing providers.
1382	If a service was provided was a public utility at a lower direct cost, I would use it.
1385	I would need such a network to work without distraction, and to feel more secure about my privacy.
1388	Not really concerned
1389	Choices are too limited. I might use it, but, to be honest it depends on the set up. I certainly wouldn't be likely to use it, but not likely is rather too strong!
1394	Sounds good, but would be nice to know more about it to understand the basics.
1395	I'm unsure about the idea. But if it democratises the owner ship of content and access I'm all

	for it and would contribute
1396	Yay community networking.
1398	I am very interested in such things and want to participate but I did not find the time. The projects like FREIFUNKER are to complicated for people who have a limited technical background.
1399	It would be a great idea for social cohesion and engagement.
1400	A big obstacle is time. We are the precariat: overworking, busy, living in difficult cities, stressed out. There is little time for extra activities. I remember how Tiziana Terranova wrote about free labour. But I would certainly try.
1401	Competition can encourage fairer prices and accelerated innovation.
1406	I believe such initiatives could actually help create online ties among users based on multiple types of social relationships, for example local government or trade activities among individuals. This would add new externalities to online social networks, and could help develop an alternative Internet that were less dependent on global dynamics, perhaps preventing phenomena like viral spread of information or fake news thanks to the trust built within these more cohesive local networks.
1407	I don't have opinion about this question.
1410	I am not sure what this service would look like/how it would work. The idea sounds good, but I would need more info to make an informed decision.
1412	Rather than enrich huge international companies without a local presence, it would be better to use a local network that would be more in touch with local issues and can be used for solving problems. However, the possibility of such a local network creating the feeling of lack of privacy seems higher as the network would 'in the know' about all things local, but could be a security threat if not properly secured.
1414	Of course I like and support the idea of the alternative platforms and internet providers, but how about the material infrastructures, i.e. cables, satellites, and now also drones? The network and its services, indeed any digital communication, are made possible by the material and physical infrastructure. And these infrastructures require huge investments that a local community could never afford. So this is the dilemma of a really free and independent Internet: unless we really change the power structure, for example by saying that the infrastructures should be owned or supervised by publicly accountable authorities, the Internet will never be "free". For more info on this see http://www.surfacing.in/ and http://andrewblum.net/#tubes-book
1416	I think it will be difficult to initialise such networks, and even with the reliance on voluntary involvement it would probably require not insignificant investment from government in technology and skills, particularly at the start-up phase. I think that it would be a very positive step and I would certainly be happy to use such a network and invest time in it.
1418	Local Radio Stations can be a potent tool to inform and educate the masses.
1419	community networks have potentials to influence but they do not possess any power to bring changes at the policy level
1421	I would be willing to try, but I think such a system would need to be very secure, be very transparent and allow me fine-granular control over settings.
1423	I support and am heartened by efforts within local communities to democratise aspects of the internet and web provision, and where possible would welcome the chance to contribute.
1425	If it is more affordable and reasonably fast, I would like to use it.
1426	It sounds like a lovely idea, but I'm not confident about how viable and manageable such a plan is.
1428	I forgot the question
1431	I am keen to support initiatives that can reduce the concentration of power
1433	I would certainly participate in an alternative network since its very existence undermines the big company platforms. Additionally it would people in the communities to approach one another.
1436	These services that currently exist have emerged as many people's only service(s) because that's sort of how people function. The emergence of a new network, platform, or product — even one community-oriented and non-profit — may soon run into the exact same issues that we are currently facing.
1437	I may use it depending on whether i need my voice to be heard especially when it comes to becoming a part of a community and strengthening community ties.
1442	I am already thinking about alternative platforms and the possibility and sustainibility of these platforms. I think people should consider about how they can take power back from these componaies which is their only concern is their profit. this is an unjust system we should fight. if someone just increase their power in any curcimstances it means they weaken disadvanteged peoples.

1443	In Brazil, people are afraid of the companies/government power.
1448	The community network would need access to national/international networks for this to work for me and my rural community.
1450	I would use them - I used Freenet in the 90s - but I don't think the will/resources exist for them to emerge
1452	I would consider it, but I imagine that it would not be as effective as Google, etc.
1454	I would very much prefer to be part of a network where I had some opportunity to influence the quality of service.
1459	internet should be a de-commodified infrastructure, such as transportation and health
1460	I would rather see my money go towards local development.
1467	Though only in addition to the global, open and free Internet.
1468	I would like to ultimately benefit from the advantages of having common platforms for the entire global community. Fragmentation of our internet platforms is not the ideal outcome, but only a stopgap in the face of corporate domination. What we need is socialized control of the internet so that the platforms serve the users and not corporate profit at the expense of the interests of the users.
1469	It would be good to have a local network that provides internet services with greater data security. I recognise that some form of income generation would be necessary to make that a reality.
1471	Have to check first. The companies have safeguards and rules about misuse and may be contacted for complaints. What will be the case in a free free scenario?
1473	There are many uses of the Internet that do not require all of its power, such as queries about local businesses. Community networks would be best at filling this need, and fostering engagement and teaching skills locally.
1474	As someone who is supporting a group of developers and privacy advocates in their attempt to build an independent smartphone that I would immediately start to use instead already existing surveilling devises that we are carrying around, I would also help fund and build an independent community network. It is important that we as people get more involved and engaged, to work more on changing things that we are concerned about.
1483	building local community online could be an alternative to the existing monopolys
1486	It could be a useful complement to main stream services, depending on its reach
1487	Likely to be much too slow and/or expensive
1488	I have used such networks outside the U.S. with positive effect. They don't seem to take here in the U.S. Here we seem to have lost our collective sense of trust and community.
1500	I would definitely give it a try hoping that it would serve my needs
1505	My inclination to join the initiative depends on its sustainability
1515	Yes. The value is obvious and compelling.
1520	Here in Germany, there are currently still some legal constraints to open community provided networks ("Störerhaftung"). As in other areas, we can see a tendency that the rule of law is being subverted by giving far-reaching legal possibilities and responsibilities into the hand of private institutions without any judicial or public oversight. One such example is the current german law that currently allows for copyright owners to instruct the providers of community networks and public wifi to ban access to certain sites which providers are required to conform to without any legal proceedings (see http://www.zeit.de/digital/internet/2017-06/stoe rerhaftung-bundestag-bessert-wlan-gesetz-nach (german link)). It is unclear at this moment, whether community based, non-profit solutions will not be outlawed or at least put at a severe disadvantage compared with commercial ones, so I can't say that they have a "definite" potential to overcome privacy concerns (at least some, mostly those related to data usage by commercial companies). But I would definitely use them to support them if there was already one close by. Currently too uncertain about potential legal effects to become a first provider myself.
1524	This is certainly something which should be further explored and developed, the example of Creative Commons being probably the paradigm example.
1537	New challenge. Why not.
1538	The reason is that my concern is to communicate with my closest friends. In a community network seems to be more easyfor a moment.
1539	In some ways, I have even more concerns about privacy in a community run network, given local and state political situations and the treatment of marginal communities in conservative areas. Quite frankly, it's 2017 in Trump's America and I don't trust my neighbors or my town, or parent's neighbors or my parent's town. It would so entirely depend on the non-profit running it. For example, what if the non-profit was an evangelical church and that was the only way to access the Internet - through them? I've seen the local battles to control what books are in the public schools, and what's in the textbooks used. I can see something similar happening in many parts of the country, while other areas are far more open, free, and protect privacy.

1540	I am not that concerned about the privacy of my data or the cost of my internet provider.
1547	Depends on the maturity of the provided service
1552	.
1559	the problem with local communities is the risk that local issues (or even national ones) dominate then while globally relevant issues remain unconsidered. the internet is a global network which is basically great! making everything local again is not a good alternative (at least not one i can imagine to be functioning without falling back to the 1990s or so).
1563	I have a choice of multiple, professionally run networks which meet my needs
1571	Enable participation on public interest issues on the part of community. Enhance communication between community members on local matters. Address and resolve issues more quickly. Increase liability
1575	In addition yes, but that doesn't substitute WWW
1581	It would depend on the 3 key aspects of any ISP: 1. Speed: We are in 2017, file sizes grow bigger, so does storage, we have massive cloud based systems all over the globe, that information needs to be accessed immediately. 2. Reliability: We use our computers and phones and tablets with active internet connections more and more, from music, to tv and video, news, blogs, social media, video games, etc. It is crucial that the connection is stable and does not suddenly drop for any reasons other than complete power-outs or in extreme cases of solar flare activity. 3. Price: Many would be willing to pay more if it assures the above made points but only to a certain extent.
1583	the internet is the internet, `pseudo networks ` only provide a false sense of safety
1585	It's still risky I don't see any improvements over the current model. Also I would never trust the people in my community or any community as regards their internet traffic so this would never work. Not everyone is well informed or at all about the internet and its dangers so you never know what one person could potentially by mistake bring into the network.
1588	Ideally the world would focus on the individual and the their place in a community but, as has become self-evident by the regression to nationalistic, angry, introversion in the political sphere since 2015 - this ain't going to happen.
1591	Love cheap/free internet
1597	One of the main selling point of Facebook, Twitter, etc.. is its ability to act and connect globally. We would need another provider with more transparent policies and laws which also acts global and not solely local.
1600	nothing
1602	I'm part of a student one in halls- not happy, I payed an extra £5.00 to talk to my friends and family but, because the connection is so bad I keep breaking up with them.
1603	My community is global so if the community network enabled me to be in touch with them and get access to information around the globe i would participate.
1607	This would not overcome my concerns about Internet safety in general however it would be nice in the sense of me not sharing all my data to one and the same provide/platform. A non-for profit/ free and local Wi-Fi network could be more secure (but not necessarily and cannot be completely guaranteed) but it would be great to use alternatively" with all the rest out there".
1614	I live in a student accomodation so I do not have a choise of what type of wifi I am using
1617	May not provide same service
1618	I would be happy to consider it.
1623	I'd be likely to try it but dubious as to its longevity and popularity, as currently society is very much led by the masses who seem not to care about anything
1624	I like reading opinions of people around the globe, not just restricted within my community.
1626	As I stated before, I'm not pressed when it comes to data harvesting. I wouldn't consider making an investment in a closed community network unless I had confidence that I would benefit from it.
1629	much more convenient
1631	no
1639	So long as helps to promote competition, and provide consumers with a chance to retain their privacy.
1641	I don't believe that such network would work.
1643	Sure. it seems better than the mass providers. Less corruption !
1651	I am a node in ninux.org. Making the community grow is REALLY difficult. People here are not concerned about technology ownership nor digital rights nor privacy. The only appeal to join the network is to have a cheap or free alternative to a commercial isp. As we (ninux.org) are not an ISP, having people joining us is quite difficult.

	Also, as wireless network, it is quite challenging to provide a good and reliable alternative to vdsl or adsl2, quite diffused in all the major cities in italy. A good parenthesis would be talking about digital divided people in some rural areas but 3g/4g penetration is quite high at this date and the appeal of a wifi community network (maybe to share a fiber or a sat connection) is low.
1654	I like the idea of a basic online access for all citizens. Reasonably fast and very reliable access to the Internet is as important as other infrastructure such as roads.
1655	I am doubtful it will happen
1687	N/A
1714	Concerns about limited sustainability
1921	I am not totally sure what a community network means - however, at home I have access to a cheap internet connection (cable) because we in the co-op (245 apartments) have chosen a shared solution with just one provider. I see that as a community network ...?
1967	Were it usable with no decreased access to global communication, I would do so in a heartbeat.
2004	Oh hell yeah! Everything's political: I'd love to stop supporting this right-wing bigwig who owns my internet connection. And humans can only remain human with community, I fully support that.
2016	The problem is that participation on Facebook etc. is basically mandated these days. I don't understand the 'alternative internet', does it still provide access to the ordinary Web? It's not much use if you can't access the regular internet. People in the local community are not the only ones you need to communicate with. I need a better explanation to answer the question.
2044	It would motivate me to support it. It would help me in my personal daily practice of using the internet. I would feel better "online".
2050	I am part of a community network in my foreign home, and it is a joy to use compared to my poor quality, advertisement heavy BT connection
2057	I believe that the power of Internet is to gives access to different ways of thinking and interaction with other groups of people. I am not interested in joining a community where we all share the same thoughts or are located in a specific geographic area.
2068	While I have no objection to community wifi, and wouldn't object to paying for it, I find it difficult to imagine how a local network could have access to the same volume of information without using a service such as google. I would also perhaps worry that it would limit your network to people in the local community instead of worldwide.
2069	I would probably add this to my existing network as I am already a part of one for my university's computer science group.
2070	If it's comparably or most cost-efficient for the service provided.
2078	I would be interested to see if such a network worked and improved upon what already existed and be willing to help see that become the norm.
2080	Need more information
2083	Sure
2087	I don't really get how big this community will be.. a village? a city? a country?a continent? I could use it if the content is as interesting and full as the existed websites and platforms.
2089	I don't like the monopoly of the internet network by the dominant companies. I would probably use this alternative network in addition to my current internet provision in order to compare them. I would then choose the one that fits my needs best.
2090	--
2094	I would definitely consider changing and adapting but I believe there is a long way until reasonable progress can be achieved
2097	No
2100	Depending on 1. How long research needs to be done first to decide my best option 2. How complicated/ % possible the process is to switch to a new Internet provision.
2103	An open, community network would be more vulnerable to privacy breaches
2107	I think that using a community network would be better.
2114	I would applaud the efford
2118	Seems promising.
2122	I would not have a problem
2123	Yes because I would feel more safe about using this network.
2124	In order to receive services with higher quality (broadband speed) and/or lower cost
2136	I would certainly get involved, although I understand most people would not, as they have no free time or skills.
2139	Community feeling
2140	Participating in a community network empowers citizens to become more active and to take things in their hands. It's a "human transformation" from the role of consumer to active decision- and change-maker. Plus it creates a framework via which local communities can

	strengthen their ties.
2141	I am member of a community
2142	The main reason is that the goals of such networks differentiate from those of big companies, where the pursuit of money justifies all means. Alternative networks guarantee safety and push forward social creativity.
2146	This could be a move towards autonomy. Internet access is a right for everyone and is really under consideration who will control it.
2149	Closer community ties are not always a good thing, especially if you are different. And attempts to create a better world often have unintended negative consequences and these need to be thought through and weighed up against the benefits.
2153	I would do use it.
2163	I would definitely try it out, but if it is not as efficient as the current platform, then i may not switch to it.
2164	by participating in such project, the costs in terms of money and time are too high compared to those when you use normal platforms.
2175	Involvement and lack of global exposure would deter me from joining.
2199	yes
2204	If has quality and security,
2217	I don't trust it
2223	pdf
2227	I would consider it, but it would mostly depend on me believing that this is a long term project I can put my resources behind confidently and knowing there is strong support for it within the community as well.
2230	Unsure
2235	since I worry about the privacy problem caused by the internet provider.
2237	I am used to my current Internet provision.
2244	Not interesting
2246	I believe, although perhaps no true, that smaller community networks would be more susceptible to cyber attacks and less protected. There is some sort of comforting factor when using a large network. I would say I feel more protected.
2253	I am quite used to the current Internet provision.
2261	-
2264	I have little information about this
2267	Alternative solutions must always be tested, and as we realize that the Internet monopoly is becoming a bigger problem, a community network seems like a good solution.
2300	Yes in order to test capabilities and have increased privacy and control over my data and the people that I can reach (or reached by). I would do that simultaneously with a commercial internet connection to ensure I can meet my needs. I believe this would allow a smooth transition.
2304	Because the community cooperation is very neccesary in front of too many risks about security, drug dealers, street burglary; but also, to create awareness about how to take care of animals, parks, gardens, and common goods.

Field summary for QE1

Age: What is your age?

Answer	Count	Percentage
16-30 (A1)	224	22.40%
31-45 (A2)	381	38.10%
46-60 (A3)	283	28.30%
> 60 (A4)	112	11.20%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QE1

Field summary for QCE2

Gender: What is your gender?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Male (A1)	564	56.40%
Female (A2)	391	39.10%
Other (A3)	9	0.90%
Prefer not to say (A4)	36	3.60%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QCE2

Field summary for QE3

Educational attainment level: What is the highest level of education you successfully completed ?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Primary education [duration typically varies from 4 to 7 years] (A2)	4	0.40%
Secondary education [duration typically varies from 2 to 6 years] (A4)	37	3.70%
Post-secondary education [e .g. technician, professional, or administrative diploma] (A5)	48	4.80%
Bachelor's degree or Diploma (A6)	179	17.90%
Postgraduate degree (A7)	732	73.20%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QE4

Employment situation: How would you describe your occupational status?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Full-time employed (SQ001)	633	63.30%
Part-time employed (SQ002)	161	16.10%
Unemployed (SQ003)	26	2.60%
Student/young person (SQ004)	201	20.10%
Retired (SQ005)	57	5.70%
Not able to work (SQ006)	4	0.40%

Field summary for QE4

Field summary for QE5

Occupational Classification: How would you describe your occupation?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Manager (e.g. Managing Director and Chief Executive; Sales, Marketing and Development Manager) (A1)	81	8.10%
Academic/Research Staff (A2)	611	61.10%
IT Professional (e.g. Technician; Software and applications developer and analyst, database and network professional) (A3)	98	9.80%
Administrative/ Clerical Staff (A4)	46	4.60%
Services and Sales Worker (e.g. Waiters, Child care workers) (A5)	14	1.40%
Other (A6)	150	15.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QE6

In which country do you reside?

Answer	Count	Percentage
United Kingdom (A2)	282	28.20%
Afghanistan (A9)	0	0.00%
Albania (A11)	0	0.00%
Algeria (A262)	1	0.10%
Andorra (A264)	0	0.00%
Angola (A265)	1	0.10%
Antigua and Barbuda (A266)	0	0.00%
Argentina (A267)	8	0.80%
Armenia (A268)	0	0.00%
Australia (A23)	14	1.40%
Austria (A24)	13	1.30%
Azerbaijan (A25)	1	0.10%
Bahamas, The (A26)	1	0.10%
Bahrain (A27)	0	0.00%
Bangladesh (A28)	1	0.10%
Barbados (A29)	0	0.00%
Belarus (A31)	1	0.10%
Belgium (A32)	3	0.30%
Benin (A34)	0	0.00%
Bhutan (A36)	0	0.00%
Bolivia (A37)	1	0.10%
Bosnia and Herzegovina (A38)	1	0.10%
Botswana (A39)	0	0.00%
Brazil (A43)	15	1.50%
Brunei Darussalam (A44)	0	0.00%
Bulgaria (A45)	2	0.20%
Burkina Faso (A46)	0	0.00%
Burundi (A48)	0	0.00%
Cabo Verde (A269)	0	0.00%
Cambodia (A49)	0	0.00%
Cameroon (A50)	0	0.00%
Canada (A51)	31	3.10%
Central African Republic (A52)	0	0.00%
Chad (A55)	0	0.00%
Chile (A56)	3	0.30%
China (A57)	9	0.90%
Colombia (A61)	6	0.60%
Comoros (A62)	0	0.00%
Congo (A63)	0	0.00%
Costa Rica (A67)	0	0.00%
Cote d'Ivoire (A68)	1	0.10%
Croatia (A69)	3	0.30%
Cuba (A70)	0	0.00%
Cyprus (A71)	2	0.20%
Czech Republic (A72)	1	0.10%
Democratic People's Republic of Korea (A270)	0	0.00%
Democratic Republic of the Congo (A271)	0	0.00%
Denmark (A73)	6	0.60%
Djibouti (A75)	0	0.00%
Dominica (A76)	0	0.00%
Dominican Republic (A77)	0	0.00%
Ecuador (A78)	1	0.10%
Egypt (A79)	1	0.10%
El Salvador (A80)	0	0.00%
Equatorial Guinea (A81)	0	0.00%
Eritrea (A82)	0	0.00%
Estonia (A83)	0	0.00%

Ethiopia (A84)	0	0.00%
Fiji (A274)	1	0.10%
Finland (A273)	25	2.50%
France (A272)	28	2.80%
Gabon (A275)	0	0.00%
Gambia (Republic of The) (A94)	0	0.00%
Germany (A283)	83	8.30%
Georgia (A96)	0	0.00%
Ghana (A98)	4	0.40%
Greece (A284)	52	5.20%
Grenada (A276)	0	0.00%
Guatemala (A105)	0	0.00%
Guinea (A107)	0	0.00%
Guinea-Bissau (A108)	0	0.00%
Guyana (A109)	0	0.00%
Haiti (A110)	0	0.00%
Honduras (A277)	0	0.00%
Hungary (A115)	4	0.40%
Iceland (A116)	0	0.00%
India (A117)	11	1.10%
Indonesia (A118)	2	0.20%
Iran (Islamic Republic of) (A119)	2	0.20%
Iraq (A120)	0	0.00%
Ireland (A121)	16	1.60%
Israel (A123)	9	0.90%
Italy (A286)	75	7.50%
Jamaica (A125)	1	0.10%
Japan (A278)	4	0.40%
Jordan (A279)	0	0.00%
Kazakhstan (A131)	0	0.00%
Kenya (A132)	3	0.30%
Kiribati (A133)	0	0.00%
Korea (Republic of) (A281)	0	0.00%
Kuwait (A136)	1	0.10%
Kyrgyzstan (A137)	0	0.00%
Lao People's Democratic Republic (A138)	0	0.00%
Latvia (A139)	0	0.00%
Lebanon (A140)	0	0.00%
Lesotho (A141)	0	0.00%
Liberia (A142)	0	0.00%
Libya (A143)	0	0.00%
Liechtenstein (A144)	0	0.00%
Lithuania (A145)	0	0.00%
Luxembourg (A146)	1	0.10%
Macau (A147)	1	0.10%
Macedonia (The former Yugoslav Republic of) (A148)	0	0.00%
Madagascar (A149)	0	0.00%
Malawi (A150)	1	0.10%
Malaysia (A151)	1	0.10%
Maldives (A152)	0	0.00%
Mali (A153)	0	0.00%
Malta (A154)	0	0.00%
Mauritania (A157)	0	0.00%
Mauritius (A158)	0	0.00%
Mexico (A160)	9	0.90%
Micronesia (Federated States of) (A161)	1	0.10%
Moldova (Republic of) (A162)	0	0.00%
Monaco (A163)	0	0.00%
Mongolia (A164)	1	0.10%
Montenegro (A165)	0	0.00%
Morocco (A167)	2	0.20%
Mozambique (A168)	0	0.00%
Myanmar (A280)	0	0.00%
Namibia (A169)	0	0.00%
Nauru (A170)	0	0.00%

Nepal (A172)	0	0.00%
Netherlands (A173)	10	1.00%
New Zealand (A176)	3	0.30%
Nicaragua (A177)	0	0.00%
Niger (A178)	0	0.00%
Nigeria (A179)	9	0.90%
Norway (A183)	5	0.50%
Oman (A184)	0	0.00%
Pakistan (A185)	3	0.30%
Palau (A186)	0	0.00%
Panama (A187)	0	0.00%
Papua New Guinea (A188)	0	0.00%
Paraguay (A190)	0	0.00%
Peru (A191)	0	0.00%
Philippines (A192)	3	0.30%
Poland (A194)	4	0.40%
Portugal (A195)	13	1.30%
Puerto Rico (A196)	0	0.00%
Qatar (A197)	2	0.20%
Romania (A199)	2	0.20%
Russian Federation (A200)	2	0.20%
Rwanda (A201)	0	0.00%
Saint Kitts and Nevis (A203)	0	0.00%
Saint Lucia (A282)	0	0.00%
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (A206)	0	0.00%
Samoa (A207)	0	0.00%
San Marino (A208)	0	0.00%
Sao Tome and Principe (A209)	0	0.00%
Saudi Arabia (A210)	0	0.00%
Senegal (A211)	0	0.00%
Serbia (A212)	1	0.10%
Seychelles (A213)	0	0.00%
Sierra Leone (A214)	0	0.00%
Singapore (A215)	2	0.20%
Slovakia (A216)	0	0.00%
Slovenia (A217)	11	1.10%
Solomon Islands (A218)	0	0.00%
Somalia (A219)	0	0.00%
South Africa (A220)	6	0.60%
South Sudan (A221)	0	0.00%
Spain (A222)	20	2.00%
Sri Lanka (A224)	0	0.00%
Sudan (A225)	0	0.00%
Suriname (A226)	0	0.00%
Swaziland (A228)	0	0.00%
Sweden (A229)	16	1.60%
Switzerland (A285)	18	1.80%
Syrian Arab Republic (A230)	0	0.00%
Tajikistan (A232)	0	0.00%
Tanzania (A233)	1	0.10%
Thailand (A234)	4	0.40%
Timor-Leste (A235)	0	0.00%
Togo (A236)	0	0.00%
Tonga (A238)	0	0.00%
Trinidad and Tobago (A239)	0	0.00%
Tunisia (A241)	0	0.00%
Turkey (A242)	12	1.20%
Turkmenistan (A243)	0	0.00%
Tuvalu (A245)	0	0.00%
Uganda (A246)	1	0.10%
Ukraine (A247)	1	0.10%
United Arab Emirates (A248)	1	0.10%
United States of America (A287)	101	10.10%
Uruguay (A249)	1	0.10%
Uzbekistan (A250)	0	0.00%

Vanuatu (A251)	0	0.00%
Venezuela (A255)	0	0.00%
Viet Nam (A256)	0	0.00%
Yemen (A259)	0	0.00%
Zambia (A260)	0	0.00%
Zimbabwe (A261)	1	0.10%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QE7

How would you describe the place where you live?

Answer	Count	Percentage
A big city (A1)	561	56.10%
The suburbs or outskirts of a big city (A2)	135	13.50%
A small city or town (A3)	258	25.80%
A farm or home in the country (A4)	35	3.50%
Other (A5)	10	1.00%
Don't know (A6)	1	0.10%
No answer	0	0.00%

Field summary for QE7b

Please specify "Other":

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	10	100.00%
No answer	0	0.00%

ID	Response
164	village / small town
187	Doha the capital city of Qatar is considered small as Qatar is small country as well.
205	A university town
251	small village which is subburb of middle sized city
569	A city
749	Small island ~1200 people.
751	8 Mile island
814	A medium-size city
1204	near university campus
1281	An island in the middle of the River Thames

Field summary for QE8

Do you participate, or participated in the past, in the activities of one or more of the following organisations?

Answer	Count	Percentage
A social or sport club (e.g. gym, music or arts associations) (SQ001)	613	61.30%
A residents, neighbourhood, school or other local group (SQ002)	363	36.30%
A trade union (SQ003)	290	29.00%
An environmental or animal welfare organisation (SQ004)	195	19.50%
Any other political or campaigning organisation (SQ005)	378	37.80%
A charity organization or social aid organisation (SQ006)	344	34.40%
A religious or church organisation (SQ007)	164	16.40%
None of the above (SQ008)	135	13.50%