Plan Overview

A Data Management Plan created using DMPonline

Title: Evaluating civic technologies for political engagement: Experiments

Creator: Laszlo Horvath

Principal Investigator: Laszlo Horvath

Data Manager: Laszlo Horvath

Project Administrator: Laszlo Horvath

Contributor: Kieran Cutting, Ben Worthy

Affiliation: Birkbeck, University of London

Funder: Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC)

Template: ESRC Template

Project abstract:
Do digital platforms increase civic participation? We first explore level of existing civic engagement, then randomly assign participants to platform usage to complete an infrastructure reporting task. This is followed by questions regrading intended behaviours and perceptions of local government.

ID: 171073

Start date: 24-02-2025

End date: 30-09-2025

Last modified: 18-02-2025

Copyright information:
The above plan creator(s) have agreed that others may use as much of the text of this plan as they would like in their own plans, and customise it as necessary. You do not need to credit the creator(s) as the source of the language used, but using any of the plan's text does not imply that the creator(s) endorse, or have any relationship to, your project or proposal

Evaluating civic technologies for political engagement: Experiments

Assessment of existing data

Provide an explanation of the existing data sources that will be used by the research project, with references

Original data collection

Provide an analysis of the gaps identified between the currently available and required data for the research

Question not answered.

Information on new data

Provide information on the data that will be produced or accessed by the research project

survey data, N = 2,000, stored on MS Excel spreadsheet, collected via Qualtrics platform

Quality assurance of data

Describe the procedures for quality assurance that will be carried out on the data collected at the time of data collection, data entry, digitisation and data checking.

- using instruments from established sources, as follows:

Pre block: 10 questions: political participation in the past 12 months (based on DCMS' Community Life Survey, CLS), public consultations in the past 12 months (CLS), membership in decision-making groups (CLS), membership in civic/recreational clubs (CLS), political interest (based on British Election Study, BES), avg. time spent on paid work, housework, and caring (three questions based on Understanding Society surveys, USoc), extroverted personality (two questions drawn from BFI-10)

Post block: 9 questions: trust in local government (BES, adapted), perceived political efficacy locally (BES, adapted), importance of influencing local decisions (CLS), would you like to be more involved locally (CLS), likelihood to attend council meetings or consultations in person, online (2 x CLS), intention to vote next local election (custom), social anonymity preference (Keipi 2015, adapted)

Tasks: in Experiment 1 participants do a visual conjoint where we vary the type of public consultation, using screenshots designed to vary: digital vs analogue method, top-down (council initiative) vs bottom-up (resident initiative), structured data collection vs unstructured, discussion-based consultation. Under each trial, respondents are asked to rate: To what extent do you think this action will improve services or conditions for the local community? To what extent do you think this action gives local residents the power to influence or make decisions for their community? To what extent do you think this action gives local government officials the power to influence or make decisions for their community? How effective do you think this public

engagement method is at reaching a wide range of local residents? For example: different age ranges, non-native speakers, people with disabilities?

In Experiment 2, respondents view a simulation of one of above consultation methods, and are asked to report an infrastructure fault. See survey for specific wording.

Click behaviour: Depending on which group respondents were assigned to, we give them the option to be redirected to a real-life version of the method (e..g civic apps or council websites).

Backup and security of data

Describe the data security and backup procedures you will adopt to ensure the data and metadata are securely stored during the lifetime of the project.

our research panel vendor is Delta Poll. We do not collect person identifying data. The anonymised research data is stored on institutional OneDrive and will be deposited at UKDS at project end. Data security procedures follow institutional policy.

Management and curation of data

Outline your plans for preparing, organising and documenting data.

documentation will draw on Delta Poll provided codebook which clearly lists questions and coded answers. We will deposit an extended version of this explaining what visual elements were displayed and why.

Difficulties in data sharing and measures to overcome these

Identify any potential obstacles to sharing your data, explain which and the possible measures you can apply to overcome these.

The anonymised survey data can be shared on UKDS without further issues

Consent, anonymisation and strategies to enable further re-use of data

Make explicit mention of the planned procedures to handle consent for data sharing for data obtained from human participants, and/or how to anonymise data, to make sure that data can be made available and accessible for future scientific research.

We do not handle person identifying information, this is processed on panel vendor's end. We only receive anonymised survey responses. No further issues on confidentiality.

Copyright and intellectual property ownership

State who will own the copyright and IPR of any new data that you will generate.

Following Birkbeck institutional procedures on this (higher education).

Responsibilities

Outline responsibilities for data management within research teams at all partner institutions

PI manages data and is responsible for all further activities related to final delivery and sharing. The two team members do not work with it directly but will have access as a backup.

Preparation of data for sharing and archiving

Are the plans for preparing and documenting data for sharing and archiving with the UK Data Service appropriate?

Yes, sharing on UKDS at project end

Is there evidence that data will be well documented during research to provide highquality contextual information and/or structured metadata for secondary users?

Question not answered.

Planned Research Outputs

Journal article - "Understanding the impacts of civic technology (working title)"
Drawing on final report, we aim to publish main results in a political science journal as appropriate.

Report - "Project report"
This is the final report as requested by funder. Will form the basis of further evidence notes, conference and journal publications.

Planned research output details

Title	DOI	Type	Release date	Access level	Repository(ies)	File size	License	Metadata standard(s)	May contain sensitive data?	May contain PII?
Understanding the impacts of civic technology (wor ...		Journal article	Unspecified	Open	None specified		None specified	None specified	No	No
Project report		Report	Unspecified	Open	None specified		None specified	None specified	No	No