The Generative Portrait of Poland. Part II, “Poland for Business”. Press-kit extract

Language models (LLMs) almost always talk to companies about Poland, even when nobody asks about it: it comes up in 98 answers out of 100. The problem is not presence but role: in questions about a sales market, Poland is recommended in more than nine in ten answers, and in questions about a warehouse for Europe in six in ten, because it loses on geography, not on cost. It is the first map of its kind, measured rather than clicked through by hand: this is Poland as it emerges from 4,200 answers given by six models to questions from companies in 12 countries.

What we studied. The study covers six generative AI models queried through their official APIs: ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude, Perplexity, Grok and DeepSeek. Between 25 August and 28 September 2026 we put 1,400 questions to them in 11 languages, 700 on behalf of individuals and 700 on behalf of companies from 12 markets: China, Czechia, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Ukraine, the United Kingdom and the United States. The questions were asked on behalf of personas, scenarios prepared for the study, and concern everyday decisions: where to go for a weekend, where to study, where to move, where to build a plant, whom to contract production to, how to vet a business partner. That makes 8,400 answers; each was assessed by the same model judge, and the results were checked through the five control layers described in the annex. Part I reads these answers from the perspective of individuals, Part II from that of companies (700 questions, 4,200 answers). Because companies almost always named Poland in their questions, Part II also includes a separate shortlist measurement of 96 questions that do not name Poland, across eight decision areas (576 answers, 30 September). There are also two thematic measurements: Poland on request (the largest companies and industries) and Poland in the shadow of the war. The research programme as a whole comprises more than 14,500 answers from language models (LLMs). The subject of the report is the brand semantics of Poland: the entities (places, people, events, traits) that the models link with the name “Poland”, and the ways those entities connect to the situations that people and companies ask about.

Part II. Poland for Business

1. The models almost always talk to companies about Poland, and they describe it more coolly than they do to individuals. Poland appears in 97.4% of the 4,200 answers. When a company does not name it, the model brings it in of its own accord in 75.2% of answers and explicitly recommends it in 65.1% of those. The tone is lower than for individuals (6.78 against 7.12), but for one reason: 281 of the 700 company questions themselves ask about risk, barriers and pitfalls. In those, the tone is 6.16, one answer in eight is negative and Poland is recommended in one in two; in the remaining questions the tone is 7.20, negative answers account for 1.6% and the recommendation rate is 79.2%. The model answers the question it is asked.

2. Poland is always on the shortlist; the decision area determines its role. When a company asks without naming Poland, the models mention it in 98.4% of the 576 answers and explicitly recommend it in 82.5%. What matters is the decision area: in questions about a sales market,

Poland is recommended in 93.1% of answers; about engineers, in 93.0%; about contract manufacturing, in 69.4%; about a warehouse for Europe, in 62.3%.

3. The competitors are the same in both sets. Czechia (79.2% of shortlist answers), Romania (74.1%), Hungary, Germany and Slovakia stand in the same order in both the study and the shortlist. Romania, which barely featured in individuals' questions, is the second candidate for companies. In questions about Europe in general, Poland comes first for companies (69.5% against 55.7% for Germany), unlike for individuals, where Germany headed the list. This is because a company puts a criterion into its question (cost, engineers, distance from Germany), and Poland meets it.

4. Poland loses on geography, not on cost. The decision area chooses Poland's competitors. In questions about sales markets, incentives, service centres and nearshoring, its competitors are its regional neighbours, and the recommendation rate reaches 81–93%. In questions about suppliers, manufacturing and logistics, Germany, Italy, Austria and the Netherlands join the list, and the recommendation rate falls. In answers about a warehouse for the whole of Europe, the models know Polish locations (in 53 of 72 answers), but the hubs are the Netherlands and Germany, because from there goods reach the west in two to three days; cost is Poland's argument in every one of these answers. To suppliers, the models describe Poland as a base that is growing, and Germany as reliable.

5. The corporate canon appears on request, but in use the registers win. Asked about the largest Polish companies, the models name KGHM in every one of the 144 answers, and PGE and PKO Bank Polski in 143. In answers to companies' questions, KGHM appears in 21 of 4,200 and PZU in one; the leaders are Krajowy Rejestr Długów, a Polish debt register (143 answers), BIG InfoMonitor, a credit-information bureau (97), and PSE, the Polish transmission-system operator (95), because they address the company's situation. A company that asks for names in an industry gets a Polish company in two answers out of three (99 of 150), but when it asks for certified subcontractors, only in 5 of 30. Aviation, electronics and pharmaceuticals appear rarely even on request (in one in four, one in six and one in fourteen answers about the strongest industries), and the study asked no questions about companies in these sectors.

6. Polish institutions are in the models' answers, but search in the market's language does not lead to them. Of the URLs the models give companies themselves, 54.5% lead to Polish sites (35.0% to official ones); of the sources from live search, 25.0% (6.9%). The Polish Investment and Trade Agency (PAIH) is among the three most-cited domains in each of the 12 markets, and in questions about incentives it appears in 26 of 27 answers with URLs given in the answer, and in 3 of 12 with sources from search.

7. Twelve cards, no ranking. In every market, Poland appears on the shortlist in 95.8–100% of answers; what differs is who stands alongside it, and whether the persona's home country is named (Czechia 75.0%, Germany 72.9%, China and the United States almost never). Three markets have a thread of their own: the models add the Baltic ferry for Swedish companies of their own accord (87 of 348 answers; no question asks for it), while the China–Europe railway appears for Chinese companies mainly when the company asks about it (77 of 98), and for German companies the models point to the bilateral chamber ahk.pl of their own accord.

8. The war: Poland recommended with conditions. Asked directly about investment, nearshoring, energy or insurance in Poland, the models did not advise against Poland as a choice because of the war in any of 864 answers, but only 3.8% of answers to questions about

investment risk recommend it without any caveat, and some answers point boards that are sensitive to risk to a country further west. About two thirds of answers present Poland as more exposed than the countries it is compared with, and nine in ten of those recommend it all the same. As a base for the reconstruction of Ukraine, Poland is recommended in every answer; as a safe country in the region, when the question does not name it, it is placed in the “with caution” group in 37.5%. Companies hear different arguments from individuals: the European Union (86.9% of answers) and energy (75.0%) instead of Belarus and ministry warnings.

9. The models differ, but every one of them warns when a company asks about risk. The six models agree on whether to talk to companies about Poland in 95.0% of the 700 questions; in the 68 questions that do not name Poland, they bring it into between 57.4% and 83.8% of answers, and the difference comes from the way they answer (a procedure rather than a list), not from how they assess Poland. On the same question, the warmest and the coolest answer differ by 1.8 points of tone on average. When a company asks about risk, every model lowers its tone by 0.9–1.3 points; where they differ is in how often they turn a list of risks into a negative answer (from 6.1% to 17.5%).

10. What this means for economic promotion. The goal is not “for the models to recommend Poland” (they already do) but the decision area in which Poland is to be a candidate rather than a backdrop. In industrial areas, Poland needs evidence of maturity, not of growth: certifications, references, the names of subcontractors in the languages of the markets. An argument makes it into the answer when it is linked to a decision situation (the ferry), not when it is merely an association (the railway). Content for models that use search has to be citable in the market’s language, because PAIH is in the models’ answers, not in the search results. Poland’s image in the answers for companies is a flow, not a state, so it requires control measurements at regular intervals, with the same set of questions.

What the report does not say. It measures neither what the consumer app shows, nor website traffic, nor the effectiveness of any campaign. It does not forecast investment decisions and does not assess the work of any institution. It does not rank markets or models. It does not combine figures from the study with those from the shortlist, because these are two sets with separate denominators, and the shortlist is not a check on the study. It does not compare individual models’ recommendation rates in the main text, because four of them were subject to a length cap on answers in the study (annex). It is a dated snapshot, a map of the representation of Poland in the answers of six models to questions from individuals and companies in 12 markets, and it should be read as such.