

# D6.5: ELSI guidance on public engagement

[WP6 – Ethics]



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 822337.



**Populism and  
Civic Engagement**



## 1.0 About this document

**Work Package 6 Lead:** Trilateral Research

**Task Lead:** Nadja Nickel, The Democratic Society

**Contributors:** Dr David Barnard-Wills and Dr Anaïs Resseguier, Trilateral Research;  
Robert Bjarnason, Citizen Foundation

**Due Date of Deliverable:** 31 January 2020

This document outlines the potential ethical, legal and social issues (ELSI) that could be raised through the public engagement activities as part of the PaCE project and provides recommendations for their development. These recommendations can also serve as guidance for other consortia or organisations designing similar engagement activities. This document is the official ELSI report for the PaCE project, under work package 6 ‘Ethics’, deliverable D6.5.

Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	X
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	



A brief summary of revisions will be recorded in the table below:

HISTORY OF CHANGES			
VERSION	DATE	KEY CHANGES	AUTHOR
0.1	06/09/2019	Initial version	The Democratic Society and Trilateral Research
0.2	23/01/2020	Receiving of feedback during the PaCE consortium Salzburg meeting	The Democratic Society and Trilateral Research
0.3	28/01/2020	Finalization of revisions following consortium review	The Democratic Society and Trilateral Research
1.0	31/01/2020	Final version submitted to the EC	The Democratic Society and Trilateral Research

The working language of this document will be English (EN), as required for reporting purposes by article 20.7 of the Grant Agreement.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 About this document.....	2
1.1 About PaCE .....	5
1.2 Consortium.....	5
2.0 Introduction Ethical, Legal, Social Issues (ELSI) Guidance .....	6
2.1 Relevance of this report.....	6
2.2 Goal of report .....	7
2.3 Guiding principles .....	8
2.4 Methodology .....	9
2.5 Audience .....	10
3.0 Public Engagement.....	11
3.1 Description .....	11
3.2 Purpose for public engagement.....	12
3.3 Target audience.....	14
3.4 Public dialogue.....	15
3.4.1 Basic principles.....	16
3.4.2 Study design.....	16
3.4.3 Spread of locations .....	17
3.4.4 Diversity .....	17
3.4.5 Results and continuity .....	18
3.4.6 Children and minors.....	19
3.5 Data protection management .....	21
3.5.1 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).....	21
3.5.2 Personal information.....	22
3.5.3 Lawful base .....	25
3.6 Framing of information .....	25
3.6.1 Language bias .....	26
3.6.2 The politics of information visualisation.....	28
4.0 Pathway to impact.....	32
5.0 ELSI assessment of PaCE public engagement.....	34
6.0 Conclusion and recommendations .....	38
7.0 Guidance documents.....	40



## 1.1 About PaCE

Across Europe there is a rise of political movements that claim to challenge liberal elites and speak for the 'ordinary person' - movements that can be loosely categorised as 'populist'. Many of these movements have undesirable tendencies. The Populism and Civic Engagement project (PaCE), with others, aims to better understand and respond to the negative tendencies of populist movements, to build upon the lessons of positive examples (such as Reykjavik), and hence play a part in constructing a firmer democratic and institutional foundation for the citizens of Europe.

PaCE will analyse, in detail, the type, growth and consequences of such movements in terms of their particular characteristics and context. From this, it will analyse the causes of these movements and their specific challenges to liberal democracy. In particular, it will focus on transitions in these movements (especially changes in leadership) as well as how they relate to other kinds of movements and the liberal reaction. PaCE will propose responses to these challenges, developing risk analyses for each kind of response, movement and transition. To this end, it will employ the agent-based simulation of political processes and attitudes to allow for thorough risk analyses to be made. Throughout the project, it will engage with citizens and policy actors, especially groups under-represented in public affairs, face-to-face and via new forms of democratic participation appropriate to our digital age to help guide the project and to comment on its outputs.

The project will develop new tools, based on machine-learning algorithms, to both identify and track populist narratives and aid online consultation. It will result in specific interventions aimed at the public, politicians, activists and educators. It will look further into the future, developing new visions concerning how different actors could respond to populism and it will warn about longer-term trends.

## 1.2 Consortium

#	PARTICIPATING ORGANISATION	CODE	COUNTRY
1	Manchester Metropolitan University (coordinator)	MMU	UK
2	City of Reykjavik	RVK	Iceland
3	The Centre for Liberal Strategies Foundation	CLS	Bulgaria
4	The Paris-Lodron University	PLUS	Austria
5	The Technical University of Dresden	TUD	Germany
6	The Democratic Society	DEM	Belgium
7	Trilateral Research	TRI	Ireland
8	University of Helsinki	UH	Finland
9	Citizens Foundation	CF	Iceland

Table 1 Consortium Partners

## 2.0 Introduction Ethical, Legal, Social Issues (ELSI) Guidance

### 2.1 Relevance of this report

Exploring the potential ethical, legal and social issues (ELSI) of public engagement requires questioning the relationship between scientists and the general public. Literature on public engagement - which is generally focused on public engagement in relation to the physical sciences, not the social sciences - points out the change of paradigm there has been in this activity. Public engagement has moved from a paradigm of “deficit” - according to which the public had to be educated by experts on a particular topic - to a paradigm of “dialogue” in which the general public is recognised as an interlocutor with legitimate views, concerns and claims<sup>1</sup>. Although this change of paradigm did not emerge from the context of political sciences, it is of particular relevance to this area of research. This relevance is even more acute for PaCE’s research topic: populism.

Populism manifests itself as a rejection of “the elites” - whether they are political, economic, or intellectual - by a group imagined as “the people”. It implies a positioning within the social landscape based on a distance between the elites and the general public, whether this distance is actual or only perceived. It is precisely this distance that public engagement seeks to overcome. As public engagement experts have pointed out, for this to happen, it is essential to ensure proper conditions for engagement<sup>2</sup>. This primarily starts from recognising that the public is not “ignorant” or “hostile”<sup>3</sup> but that it holds views that are legitimate and that need to be taken into consideration. This is especially relevant to the exercise of public engagement in relation to research on populism.

In other words, two aspects make this analysis of the ELSI of public engagement in relation to research on populism particularly relevant. Firstly, the polarisation - especially between perceived “elites” and an imagined “people” - at the root of populism, makes the need for a dialogic form of public engagement especially necessary. Secondly, the current political situation that populism research studies makes it particularly challenging to bring about the proper conditions to ensure an appropriate, i.e. dialogic, form of public engagement (despite it being acutely needed). Researchers, particularly those in receipt of public funding have an obligation to disseminate the results of their research. To the extent that they wish to better understand social phenomena, they also need engagement with society.

The present report presents the reflection undertaken in the PaCE project to put in place a proper form of public engagement in relation to PaCE research on populism. It presents the risks (i.e. the ELSI) that it has identified and the solutions found to address these risks. By presenting this reflection, it hopes to contribute to similar

<sup>1</sup> Stilgoe, Jack & Lock, Simon & Wilsdon, James (2014) Why should we promote public engagement with science?. Public understanding of science. 23. 4-15. 10.1177/0963662513518154.

<sup>2</sup> Idem

<sup>3</sup> Idem



research projects conducting public engagement, as well as, more broadly, to research on public engagement on the one hand and to populism research on the other.

## 2.2 Goal of report

The PaCE project aims to engage with the public under the Work Package (WP) 5 *Dissemination and Engagement* as well as *WP3 Narrative Analysis and ICT Tools*. WP 5 will produce the following deliverables that are of interest for the ELSI guidance:

- **T5.2 Establish an online and media presence:** Design, develop and update the PaCE project website. Create and maintain the project's social media accounts (e.g., Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook, YouTube) and create the PaCE press kit including the project logo, colours and strapline, infographics, poster, brochure and other promotional.
- **T5.3 Links to other projects and public outreach:** Developing synergies with and connect the project with the activities of other relevant national, European and international projects. Jointly review and plan dissemination to politicians and policy makers, taking particular notice of opportunities to join with other projects and organisations for the most effective means of doing this.
- **T5.4 Policy Maker Dissemination:** To disseminate the outputs of research activities to policy makers and to engage them in dialogue around implications for the future whilst identifying strategies for strengthening democratic values and practices, especially by seeking support for a future and foresight project for schools. Explore with other projects and organisations the possibility of organising a Policy Roundtable in Brussels
- **T5.5 Local Democracy Labs:** To assess the public's attitude to, and aspirations for, democracy and to identify ways of democratic involvement and to understand the way in which traditional and social media influence and shape political and social opinions
- **T5.6 European Democracy Lab:** A high profile closing point where PaCE will exploit new connections to existing and new democracy networks to draw together a range of experts, practitioners and officials who will be able to receive the output of research and take it forward into practice, increasing and speeding up impact.
- **T5.7 Future and Foresight Project:** Capacity building with education and school authorities to support and enable young people to think about future policy challenges and to encourage them to debate future policy challenges and solutions and to secure the support and engagement of policy makers for the programme.
- **Task 5.10 Final conference and webinars:** The consortium will convene a final conference for at least 70 stakeholder representatives. This event will be used to disseminate the major findings and outputs of the project. PaCE will also host three webinars in association with six other organisations.

In addition to the above, we will also be looking at *WP3 Narrative Analysis and ICT Tools*, especially considering D3.2, as part of the public engagement activities of the PaCE project:

- **D3.2 : Tool to identify populist narratives:** Publicly available tool (algorithm or application software) allowing policy actors and citizens to identify populist narratives and counter-narratives in the media and allowing policy actors and citizens to assess their individual exposure to public populist narratives and policy actors and citizens to adequately react to populist public narratives.

The PaCE consortium sees the mutual benefit of public engagement activities for the general public as well as the consortium itself. The public engagement activities will provide the consortium with an opportunity to distribute its research findings to the target audience of the PaCE project and step into a dialogue and discussion around its implications. In doing so, the consortium aims at entering into an active exchange with policymakers, civil society, the general public, and other stakeholders about the implications of the research findings, opportunities to introduce them into practice, as well as policymaking.<sup>4</sup> The aim of the consortium is to not only distribute research findings via the public engagement activities, but also use the engagement as a means for the generation of findings itself. The outcomes of the public engagement activities shall be introduced into the academic research of the consortium.

Yet, there are certain potential risks and challenges when engaging the public around the topic of populism. These negative impacts can be grouped within the categories of ethical, legal and social issues (ELSI) around public participation. The goal of this report is therefore to present the potential risks around public engagement on the topic of populism and civic engagement, and its potential impact on individuals and communities across Europe. The report under task 6.5 aims at highlighting potential ways of mitigating these risks and the steps the PaCE research consortium is taking to address these ethical, legal and social issues. The ELSI report will serve as guidance for the PaCE consortium to develop its public engagement and can also be used as a guidance for other organisations or similar research consortia.

## 2.3 Guiding principles

Core guiding principles for the development of PaCE engagement activities are based on Article 34 of the PaCE Grant Agreement and can also be found in the PaCE Ethics Handbook. With regards to research integrity, the Grant agreement refers to the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity by the ALLEA<sup>5</sup>. This implies compliance with the following fundamental principles:

- **reliability** in ensuring the quality of research reflected in the design, the methodology, the analysis and the use of resources;
- **honesty** in developing, undertaking, reviewing, reporting and communicating research in a transparent, fair and unbiased way;
- **respect** for colleagues, research participants, society, ecosystems, cultural heritage and the environment;

<sup>4</sup> Potential ethical, legal, and social issues that may emerge through engagement with policymakers will be especially addressed in T6.6 that aims at conducting an ELSI analysis of policy recommendations.

<sup>5</sup> ALLEA, European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity, March 2017. <https://allea.org/code-of-conduct/>



- **accountability** for the research from idea to publication, for its management and organisation, for training, supervision and mentoring, and for its wider impacts and means that beneficiaries must ensure that persons carrying out research tasks follow the good research practices and refrain from the research integrity violations described in the Code.

Furthermore, from the proposal stage of the project, the consortium's partners committed to taking into account **the social responsibility principle** as developed in the SATORI project that defines it as the “responsibility to consider the societal impacts of research and innovation and for taking steps to minimise anticipated harm and maximise benefits”<sup>6</sup>. This is a key element of this ELSI analysis and is especially important considering the highly polarised context the PaCE research project engages with.

The PaCE consortium has voluntarily adopted the following principles, agreed at its kick-off meeting (February 2019). These principles are compatible with, and supportive of, the above legal, contractual and institutional requirements. The consortium aims to:

- Adhere to the highest standards of legal compliance, integrity, ethics, fairness and openness;
- Seek to do research of the highest possible rigour, significance and usefulness;
- Actively engage with, and listen to, outside voices (other academics, citizens, stakeholders, etc);
- Sensitively address any cultural issues (gender, minorities, citizens' rights, etc);
- Actively promote the careers of early stage researchers working on the project;
- Use all project resources carefully and appropriately, getting the greatest value for money.

The PaCE Ethics Handbook can be consulted for more details about the guiding principles.

## 2.4 Methodology

The report for the ELSI guidance on public engagement is based on the current discussion around engagement. The report was developed through a literature review of the current debate in the field of public engagement and ethics and through several discussions with the public engagement contributors as well as other partners in the PaCE project. It draws on the ethical, legal and social aspects of engaging the public in research activities. While most of the literature and debate in the field is based on the considerations for universities, we believe that it also holds true for the PaCE research consortium and potentially other organisations or consortia.

As part of its Ethical Monitoring (T6.2), Trilateral Research (TRI) has developed and shared the Ethics Touchpoint table for this task under chapter 5.0, highlighting the critical ethical, legal and social considerations for *Work Package (WP) 5 Dissemination and Exploitation of Activities*.

The 3rd partners meeting in Salzburg on 22-23 January 2020 provided an opportunity for the consortium to present the key findings of the ELSI guidance on public engagement and discuss its implications with the partners.

---

<sup>6</sup> SATORI, “Report on standardizing operating procedures in ethics assessment”, July 2017. [http://satoriproject.eu/media/D7.1\\_Standardizing\\_ethics\\_assessment.pdf](http://satoriproject.eu/media/D7.1_Standardizing_ethics_assessment.pdf)



The report was then sent to all consortium partners for comments and review before handing it in to the European Commission.

While the D6.5 ELSI guidance on public engagement is a stand-alone report to inform the PaCE consortium and other interested potential actors about the ethical, legal and social issues around public engagement, it draws on the learning developed around the development of the PaCE D6.4 ELSI guidance on ICT tools. The guidance documents are consulted for the development of ICT tools and public engagement activities and have been developed alongside those activities.

## 2.5 Audience

The main audiences for the ELSI guidance on public engagement report are the PaCE partners themselves and similar projects that aim to include public engagement as part of their research and dissemination activities, especially projects that engage with sensitive topics in politics. As a public report, it also aims to inform any interested parties, whether researchers, policymakers, or the general public, on the potential ethical, legal and social issues raised by public engagement developed in PaCE and the measures put in place to mitigate them.

## 3.0 Public Engagement

### 3.1 Description

Academic research has a long history of public engagement, with the strongest shift in framing of a public understanding of science having been introduced by the Royal Society's 'Bodmer' report<sup>7</sup> from 1985. The Bodmer report outlines the need for academia to engage with the public so as to ensure a general public understanding of science and to highlight the need for debate on issues where science and technology pervade modern life. The Bodmer report discussed public engagement in terms, among others, of science education, or outreach to the media.

While most universities and research institutions include an aspect of public and civic service, it is only recently that academia moved from a 'public understanding' approach, implying a public deficit, to a 'public engagement' approach, building on a mutual exchange with the public. Since then, academia has not only identified the benefits of public engagement for the non-scientific general public but has also considered the potential scientific and economic benefits, providing different perspectives and insights to the discourse.<sup>8</sup>

Considering the recent challenges, including a distrust of experts, the significant polarization of European society, and a discomfort with the 'others', academia is challenged to find new ways to respond to intense public scrutiny and engage with the public in an effective manner.<sup>9</sup>

While new technologies and information media have brought many benefits to society, the sphere difference in quality and reliability of information has had an impact on the acceptance of science and scientific institutions. The extent to which public knowledge of science has seen a decrease in recent years due to new technologies is debatable; however, one can argue that the intense public scrutiny is leading to a change in authority relations.<sup>10</sup> An explorative study carried out in 2011 states that much of academia views public engagement still as a sort of 'goodwill exercise.' Public engagement is broadly being used in different sectors for different purposes. In academic research, public engagement is not clearly defined and much needs to be done to measure impact as well as set certain standards for quality assurance.<sup>11</sup>

Following a consultation with actors across the higher education sector, the National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE)<sup>12</sup> chose to define public engagement as: *the myriad of ways in which the activity and benefits of higher education and research can be shared with the public. Engagement is by definition a two-way process, involving interaction and listening, with the goal of generating mutual benefit.*

A report<sup>13</sup> by an independent High-Level Group on maximising the impact of EU research & innovation programmes reviewed the process of the European Commission. In its recommendations, it is calling on the European Commission to, next to other points, *mobilise and involve citizens*<sup>14</sup> by stimulating co-design and co-

<sup>7</sup> Bodmer, Walter. (1985) Public Understanding of Science: The BA, the Royal Society and COPUS64 *Notes Rec. R. Soc* <http://doi.org/10.1098/rsnr.2010.0035>

<sup>8</sup> Watermeyer, Richard (2012) From Engagement to Impact? Articulating the Public Value of Academic Research, *Tertiary Education and Management*, 18:2, 115-130, DOI: 10.1080/13583883.2011.641578

<sup>9</sup> National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) <https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/about-engagement/current-policy-landscape> [access 27 November 2019].

<sup>10</sup> Nowotny, H. (2014) 'Engaging with the political imaginaries of science: Near misses and future targets', *Public Understanding of Science*, 23(1), pp. 16–20. doi: 10.1177/0963662513476220.

<sup>11</sup> Neresini, Federico & Bucchi, Massimiano (2011) Which Indicators for the New Public Engagement Activities? An Exploratory Study of European Research Institutions. *Public Understanding of Science*. 20. 64-79. 10.1177/0963662510388363.

<sup>12</sup> National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) <https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk/about-engagement/what-public-engagement> [access 26 November 2019].

<sup>13</sup> Directorate-General for Research and Innovation (European Commission) (2017). 'LAB – FAB – APP' Lamy Report 'Investing in the European future we want'.

<sup>14</sup> Recommendation n°8/11

creation through citizen involvement. It also calls on the *European Commission to launch a wide stakeholder debate among citizens, scientists and innovators on potential future research and investment missions for Europe*<sup>15</sup>.

The European Commission has a specific definition of public engagement for its Horizon2020 projects, stressing the need for deliberation on and co-creation of solutions and ideas. It implies “*the establishment of participatory multi-actor dialogues and exchanges to foster mutual understanding, co-create research and innovation outcomes, and provide input to policy agendas. It is about bringing on-board researchers, policy makers, industry and civil society organisations and NGO, and citizens, to deliberate on matters of science and technology. Public engagement also creates the space for ethical value-laden issues to be explored, while bringing inclusiveness, transparency, diversity, and creativity into the research and innovation process.*

*Furthermore, public engagement processes enable multiple actors to establish a common language, arrive at joint understandings, learn from each other, explore controversies, and co-create ideas, knowledge or solutions. To be of greatest impact, public engagement needs to be designed as a two-way process with feedback loops, so that the outcomes of the engagement processes are usefully fed back into the research and innovation process.*”<sup>16</sup>

### 3.2 Purpose for public engagement

There are a number of **purposes** that public engagement activity can serve. According to the University of Cambridge, these can be described as inspiring, consulting and collaborating.<sup>17</sup>

As highlighted by NCCPE, public engagement is envisioned to have mutual benefits for the public and for the academic partner at the same time. Public engagement can include many different aspects, such as outreach, collaborative research, citizen science, participatory arts, lifelong learning, community engagement, engagement with partners, community-based learning, widening participation, corporate social responsibility, etc.

According to the European Commission<sup>18</sup>, public engagement in research and innovation further contributes to:

- Enhancing creativity in research and innovation design process and results
- The likelihood that research and innovation outcomes are more societally relevant and desirable
- Achieving shorter time to market and greater consumer acceptability of research and innovation outcomes
- Providing a breeding ground to foster a more scientifically literate society of knowledge-driven and empowered citizens, able and interested to participate in and support democratic processes, including on decisions of Research and Innovation financing, and evidence-based policy making

While part of the exercise for the PaCE projects lays with the public engagement to communicate as well as exploit the results from the research, another aspect is the direct engagement with citizens themselves, consulting and involving them in the research.

The PaCE consortium developed a Plan for Exploitation and Dissemination of Results (PEDR) as task 5.1 of the WP5 *Dissemination and Exploitation of Activities*. The dissemination and exploitation of project results will take place throughout the duration of the PaCE project, including but not limited to the planning, research and

<sup>15</sup> Recommendation n°5/11

<sup>16</sup> European Commission, Public Engagement <https://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/index.cfm?pg=policy&lib=engagement> [Access 4 December 2019].

<sup>17</sup> University of Cambridge, Public Engagement <https://www.cam.ac.uk/public-engagement/information-for-staff-and-students/what-is-public-engagement> [Access 3 December 2019].

<sup>18</sup> European Commission, Public Engagement <https://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/index.cfm?pg=policy&lib=engagement> [Access 4 December 2019].

dissemination stage. The PEDR has set out to achieve the following aims of the PaCE project team, separated by aims for the dissemination and exploitation phase of the project–

#### **PaCE's aims for dissemination activities**

- To identify, mobilise and engage with a multidisciplinary network of stakeholders across the European political sector, to conduct with them gap and needs analyses which will inform the development of PaCE tools and website;
- To facilitate stakeholders' participation in an online survey and interviews aiming to gather information about their future needs as well as their suggestions for an innovative EC research;
- To shape the design of the PaCE social platform and contribute to its applications;
- To maintain and build upon existing efforts in the field of populism.
- To publicise and raise awareness of the PaCE project and its associated activities (e.g., workshops, webinars);
- To use PaCE's dissemination activities to stimulate the participation of different types of stakeholders in both the project's events and outputs;
- To provide mechanisms, through the PaCE social platform, to support the provision and adoption of good practices and a unified agenda.

#### **PaCE's aims for exploitation activities**

- To maintain and build upon existing efforts in populism research;
- To identify, mobilise and engage with a multidisciplinary network of stakeholders across the European political sector;
- To develop and engage with a community of key old and new stakeholders relevant to strengthening democratic institutions in Europe;
- To present and raise awareness of the PaCE findings and research activities to the stakeholders;
- To facilitate stakeholders' uptake of research-based interventions that strengthen democratic institutions in Europe within their field of expertise;
- To provide mechanisms, through the PaCE social platform, to support the provision and adoption of good practices and a unified agenda.

While all PaCE deliverables will contribute to the dissemination and exploitation efforts, specific deliverables will directly inform the development of material and activities, such as:

- **T1.3 Identifying and analysing geographic, philosophical, social, cultural and gender-based explanations for populism.**
- **T1.4 Develop a typology of populist parties and develop a series of infographics:** A synthesis of T1.1 and T1.2, this task creates a typology of populist parties across Europe based on three distinct types of populism - populist nativist, antidemocratic. The task will involve the creation of an interactive infographic tool that will illustrate and situate different types of populism in Europe and track their development from 1990 to 2020 according to region, type, regional and global social and economic developments and leadership.

- **T4.1 Causal mechanism of populism:** Based on a critical analysis of the current state of research on the major external and internal causes of populism, identify and study the major causes of the three modes of populism (illiberal, nativist and antidemocratic). Identify both the common and the specific causes for each of the three modes of populism and interview populist party elites as to their understanding of democracy, pluralism, and the rule of law. Identify and study in detail the causal mechanisms linking different socio-cultural, economic, political, media, etc. phenomena and developments in member states, EU and beyond with the emergence and growth of populist (illiberal, nativist and anti-democratic) social movements and political parties in Europe.
- **T4.2 Theoretical model of causes of populism:** Building and testing a theoretical model of the external and internal, supply and demand side causes of illiberal populism.
- **T4.3 Identifying possible policy responses:** Identify possible policy responses to address the causes of illiberal populism, according to the theoretical model.
- **T4.4 Creation of scenarios:** Workshops with a broad range of stakeholder representatives (understood broadly and including public participation from WP5) so as to develop scenarios in a participative way. Exploring future implications with stakeholders, and the paths of action that would address the emerging needs of each future.
- **T4.5 Finalisation of scenarios and steps towards desired future:** Finalisation of scenarios, with the posting of the final scenarios on the project website and circulating them widely to all stakeholders, including the media and the public. The scenarios will be developed in coordination with the risk indicators developed in T2.6. Identifying the steps society, as a whole, needs to take to avoid the undesired futures. This task will strongly support the project's dissemination activity.

### 3.3 Target audience

The Plan for Exploitation and Dissemination of Results (PEDR) also outlines the target audience for the dissemination and exploitation efforts of the PaCE project. To maximise the impact of PaCE, dissemination and exploitation activities will seek to reach defined target audiences from several sectors through different messages and channels.

Lövbrand et al. suggest that there is a ‘fundamental problem of scale’ with engagement: processes seem legitimate only for the people who are involved in them. For those interested in broader questions of science and democracy, this would seem to be a fundamental problem, unless we take a wider view of the governance experiment of which engagement is a part.<sup>19</sup>

To address the fundamental problem of scale, the project consortium believes it is critical to include a wide range of sectors and actors in the public engagement activities. The consortium has identified the following target audiences as relevant to achieving the aspirations of the project:

---

<sup>19</sup> Lövbrand E, Pielke R and Beck S (2011) A democracy paradox in studies of science and technology. *Science, Technology & Human Values* 36(4): 474–496.

1. Primary Target Audience: **Policymakers and politicians** with responsibility for democratic engagement and the power to react to research findings at the local, national and European level of governance.
2. Secondary Target Audience: **Media** representatives that frame the national and international debates and can function as multipliers reaching specific sectors and the general public as trustworthy actors.
3. Tertiary Target Audience: **Educators and civil society organisations** that can have access to youth and the general public. Research findings can be of interest to their work and be shared to a broader group via their outreach.
4. Quaternary Target Audience: **General public, including youth organisations and under-represented groups** of society that are interested in countering and responding to populism.

A detailed breakdown of the audience groups as well as suggested channels to reach these audience members can be found in the Plan for Exploitation and Dissemination of Results (PEDR).

### 3.4 Public dialogue

Only recently we saw a development of public engagement that moved from assuming a deficit to engaging in a dialogue with the general public, recognizing that publics possess important local knowledge and the capacity to understand technical information sufficiently to participate in policy decisions<sup>20</sup>. One process that developed from this strategic shift within the field of public engagement are various dialogue processes between the public and academics. In academia, these dialogues are loosely categorized as mini-publics, considering e.g. planning cells, deliberative polls, consensus conferences or citizen assemblies.<sup>21</sup> It is unrealistic to expect mini-publics to represent a wide public deliberation but it is possible to understand what informed and deliberative publics would advise on certain issues from a mini-public.<sup>22</sup>

While mini-publics have gained growing recognition as a tool in recent years, there is a need to be conscious of the trade-offs of different forms of public participation and the potential impact they have on policy or practice. Research has considered the different methods and standards that are needed for a successful and deliberation process, however, there are concerns about mini-publics actually not having any effect on policy but serving to legitimate the policy-decisions taken independently of the public participation processes. In that context, a significant risk is that public participation processes may confer legitimacy without having influence<sup>23</sup>.

In accordance with the deliverables stated in the Grant Agreement, the PaCE project aims at disseminating findings to and stepping into a direct dialogue with specific target audience members, to inform the research but also policies around populism and civic engagement. The public participation sector, while still being an evolving field, has developed certain criteria and principles for public participation.

While the PaCE project has a research focus and does not aim to carry out wider public participation activities across Europe, the European and local Democracy Labs under T5.5 and T5.6 will be engaging with citizens in a dialogue around the research findings and its exploitation. In that sense, the basic principles for public participation are also relevant for the PaCE project.

<sup>20</sup> Burgess, M. M. (2014) 'From 'trust us' to participatory governance: Deliberative publics and science policy', *Public Understanding of Science*, 23(1), pp. 48–52. doi: [10.1177/0963662512472160](https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662512472160).

<sup>21</sup> Goodin, RE and Dryzek, JS (2006) Deliberative impacts: The macro-political uptake of mini-publics. *Politics & Society* 34: 219–244.

<sup>22</sup> Idem

<sup>23</sup> Burgess, M. M. (2014) 'From 'trust us' to participatory governance: Deliberative publics and science policy', *Public Understanding of Science*, 23(1), pp. 48–52. doi: [10.1177/0963662512472160](https://doi.org/10.1177/0963662512472160).

### 3.4.1 Basic principles

Contemporary public participation practice should be<sup>24</sup>:

- **Adapted to the context** – Understanding and appreciating the social institutions, values, and culture of the communities in the project area; and respecting the historical, cultural, environmental, political and social backgrounds of the communities which are affected by a proposal.
- **Informative and proactive** – Recognizing that the public has a right to be informed early and in a meaningful way in proposals which may affect their lives or livelihoods. Increased interest and motivation to participate occur by diffusing simple and understandable information to the affected and interested public.
- **Adaptive and communicative** – Recognizing that the public is heterogeneous according to their demographics, knowledge, power, values and interests. The rules of effective communication among people, in the respect of all individuals and parties, should be followed.
- **Inclusive and equitable** – Ensuring that all interests, including those non-represented or underrepresented are respected regarding the distribution of impacts, compensation and benefits. The participation or defence of the interests of less represented groups including indigenous peoples, women, children, elderly and poor people should be encouraged. Equity between present and future generations in a perspective of sustainability should be promoted.
- **Educative** – Contributing to a mutual respect and understanding of all stakeholders with respect to their values, interests, rights and obligations.
- **Cooperative** – Promoting cooperation, convergence and consensus-building rather than confrontation. Engaging conflicting perspectives and values as well as trying to reach a general acceptance of the proposal toward a decision that promotes and supports sustainable development should be pursued.
- **Imputable** – Improving the proposal under study, taking into account the results of the public participation process; including reporting and feedback to stakeholders about the results of the process, especially how their inputs have contributed to decision-making.

For T5.5 Local Democracy Labs and T5.6 European Democracy Lab, the PaCE consortium developed a methodology to guide the development and delivery of these workshops, ensuring ethical, legal and social issues are considered. Key aspects of the Labs methodology and risk mitigation strategies, that might have an impact on the public engagement explored below.

### 3.4.2 Study design

The Labs are a form of a *qualitative study, a small group deliberation process with core questions* (World Café format), consisting of ideally a diverse group of people which are asked about their perceptions, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes towards a product, service, concept, or idea. Questions are asked in an interactive group setting where participants are free to discuss open-ended questions with other group members. Participants will be asked to capture the findings of their small group deliberation, co-creating the findings of the Democracy Labs together

---

<sup>24</sup>André, P., B. Enserink, D. Connor and P. Croal (2006) Public Participation International Best Practice Principles. Special Publication Series No. 4. Fargo, USA: International Association for Impact Assessment.

with the facilitators. These provide the research with an opportunity to learn from the participants' experiences and generate new ideas in regards to the questions at hand.

### 3.4.3 Spread of locations

The Labs can be stand-alone events or can be carried out as a series of meetings. In this case, we will be carrying out a series of six to eight Democracy Labs and one European Lab in Brussels, Belgium. The selection of locations is important in the sense that it will influence the outcomes of the Labs. This project aims at selecting locations representing different geographic and demographic characteristics throughout Europe, in line with the selection of case studies. We will therefore aim at the best representative selection of rural areas, municipalities and cities for the location of the Democracy Labs. The PaCE project and its partners aim at carrying out the Democracy Labs at locations that are easily accessible for citizens, in terms of geographic location and barriers for people with disabilities. Furthermore, a location choice that has a neutral connotation in the community can be helpful for a discussion that might include some heated discussions.

As for the European Lab, this will be carried out in Brussels, Belgium to ensure proximity to the European Union and other European-focused organisations as well as stakeholders.

A challenge that the PaCE consortium might face is the shrinking civic space across Europe. In several countries and local communities, civil society organisations are facing legal and financial scrutiny, making it harder for the PaCE consortium to find local partners to collaborate with. One mitigation strategy is to collaborate with networks and partners, such as the H2020 project DEMOS, that face similar challenges. By sharing databases and connections, there is an opportunity to reach a wider spread of locations and ensure collaboration with local partners.

### 3.4.4 Diversity

Invitations to participants will be distributed through local partners and networks that know communities and their composition. Invitations will be shared widely in the community via traditional and social media outlets, as well as through targeted outreach to certain under-represented groups of those communities, online and offline. There are certain groups in communities, predominantly white and male, that are more likely to be heard.

Targeted invitations to under-represented groups, with a special gender-component, will reduce the likelihood of only the 'usual participants' attending these events and voicing their opinions.

The PaCE consortium will ensure that specifically under-represented groups have the opportunity to participate and make their voices heard. For the purpose of these Labs, we will define under-represented groups as–

- Women;
- elderly people, especially women;
- people with a migration background;
- people of colour;
- youth; and
- location-specific under-represented groups.

The outreach to under-represented groups will take place in those communities before the official sign-up via online tools. This will provide an opportunity to these local networks to spread the word about the event itself

in harder to reach communities as well. We will also aim at providing translation services, childcare support and transportation to and from the event, if needed.

We aim to have a dual-moderators approach, a male and female facilitator at each event. We also strive to have moderators from under-represented groups, to be able to ensure that the team of facilitators represents the host community. We assume that this will be challenging, however, we are aware of the benefits of a diverse representation and will strive to work with local partners so as to include a diverse set of facilitators, if possible. For example, the contract with local partners will point to the requirement of preferring a diverse team of facilitators.

There is a risk that the Labs will attract only a limited number of participants, or participants that do not include under-represented groups. To address this risk, we will be working with partners in the specific communities to tap into their experiences and networks. They will enable us to reach out to potential participants and specifically engage with under-represented groups. To ensure that under-represented groups participate, we will work towards reducing barriers to their participation, such as transportation options, childcare, or interpretation services. Furthermore, we will be reaching out to local and regional media outlets to foster transparency as well as spread information about Democracy Labs.

### 3.4.5 Results and continuity

In accordance with the participation principles, transparency and clear communication are essential for avoiding disappointments and false expectations. Participants will be informed about the objectives of the Labs and how the results are being used. The Democracy Labs will be standalone events, so participants will feel they have had a complete experience, but they will be connected into their own programme of transnational, cross-cultural research and innovation, which links deeply into the other research strands. The contribution of the Labs will not only be to a research programme. We aim to use these Labs as the connection between different elements of research, and as an important way of testing how to talk about research in the field – what aspects resonate with participants, what language works for them. However, there is a risk that the findings of the Democracy Labs will not be considered by the wider project partners. To mitigate this risk, the PaCE partners need to co-develop the research objective of the Labs, ensuring the findings can feed into the project goal of the PaCE project.

As for the participants, several of the Democracy Lab participants will be invited to take part in the European Democracy Lab highlighting the results of the research and the next steps, making it a full experience for participants. Local partners will provide an opportunity to continue the conversation even after the end of the Democracy Lab. We welcome any continuation of the debate even after the workshop. However, we are aware of the potential risk that a heated debate will spill into the local media, social media, and public debate that cannot be facilitated by PaCE or local partners. At the debriefing towards the end of the workshop, we will raise the opportunity to continue the discussion with the local partners, even after the day itself. We will additionally highlight organisations that could be approached to discuss the discussion in the local community.

### 3.4.6 Children and minors

As mentioned in the *Ethics and data protection* document from the EC and in the PaCE Ethics Handbook, “all research involving children and young people raises significant ethics issues, as they may be less aware of the risks and consequences of their participation. This is also true as regards the processing of their personal data.”<sup>25</sup> As a result, research activities involving children and minors will be subject to extra attention in order to avoid any ethics-related issues their participation may imply.

Partners conducting activities involving children or minors will obtain the consent of a parent/legal representative as well as the assent of the child and provide information to him/her in a language that he/she may understand. As suggested by the *Ethics and data protection* guidance document, researchers will “minimise the collection and processing of their data as far as possible.”

According to the EC *Guidance on How to complete your ethics self-assessment*, a justification for the involvement of children should be provided. As the document puts it: “Research involving children (or other persons unable to give consent) — should be carried out only if:

- studies with consenting adults would not be effective
- participants are subject to only a minimal risk and burden
- the results of the research will benefit the individual or group represented by the participant.”

The partners wish to include young people (age range 16-18 years old) in the Democracy Labs and in the European Labs.<sup>26</sup> The justification for this is as follows:

- Young people's political attitudes towards politics, populism, political movements and civic engagement are highly relevant for research into populism and civic engagement. They comprise the next generation of citizens, who will be of voting age in a short number of years. Many of them are already engaged in political activity of some form or are exposed to political issues through the media.
- Based upon existing polling and research, young people's political attitudes are likely to differ systematically from those of older adults on several different variables<sup>27</sup>, so older adults cannot realistically be used as a proxy for the opinions and attitudes of young people. Asking adults about the political or social opinions and perspectives of the young people in their lives is also likely to produce a distorted picture.
- Young people are also likely to have different patterns of engagement with populist politics, different levels of media access and different levels of political awareness.
- Young people below voting age are systematically not represented in the election statistics that are often used to study populism, and that are likely to be collected in Task 2.1. Whilst Task 2.1 will identify data

<sup>25</sup> European Commission, Ethics and data protection, 14 November 2018. Accessible online at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants\\_manual/hi/ethics/h2020\\_hi\\_ethics-data-protection\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/hi/ethics/h2020_hi_ethics-data-protection_en.pdf) [accessed 13 March 2019].

<sup>26</sup> We need to highlight an error in the *Grant Agreement* on this aspect. There is a mistake in Section 5 of the proposal that mentions that only adults will take part in research activities conducted as part of the project. However, the Ethics self-assessment of the proposal rightly acknowledges their involvement.

<sup>27</sup> UNESCO, 2012. Young people's political attitudes: a cross-national comparison of public opinion surveys <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000217876>  
<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2017/08/15/why-are-younger-voters-less-likely-to-back-populist-politics/> [accessed 26 November 2019].

sets that include children's perspectives (where they exist), they are not as substantive as voting and polling data.

Minors will be recruited by the partners with the support of local structures and partners on the ground who are familiar with the population and the area. Terms of the recruitment still need to be determined but will most likely happen via school events. PaCE will subject young people involved to only a very minimal risk and burden, as detailed below:

- A Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) (or equivalent check) will be required from the researchers to ensure the safety and security of participants.
- A safeguarding policy has been developed for the engagement with youth and minors.
- The researchers will work with local partners that are recognised actors in local communities and are able to ensure the participants represent the local context.
- Local partners are essential to preparing participants for the event and ensure a follow-up after their participation.
- The research methods are non-invasive and non-physical.
- The researchers are experienced in working with young people in these contexts and have prior experience of putting in place procedures and mechanisms to ensure that participants are safe, and are treated with respect and dignity.
- The extent to which participants are active or passive participants in the Democracy Lab is voluntary.
- The most significant risk is that participants are made to feel uncomfortable by the viewpoints or behaviour of other participants. Harassment or abuse will not be tolerated by the facilitators, and any participant expressing discomfort will receive support from the facilitators.

The results of the research that PaCE wishes to conduct with young people will benefit both the individual and the group represented by the participants.

- Individual young people participating in the Democracy Lab will be taking part in a stimulating, educational event that will introduce them to new people, expose them to different political views, and give them a space to put forward their own perspectives. We hope they will gain something from the experience.
- The results will be used to inform the development of the "futures and foresight project" in Task 5.7 where the PACE consortium will engage in capacity building with education and school authorities to support and enable young people to think about future policy challenges and to encourage them to debate future policy challenges and solutions. This includes making the results from the PACE project accessible and useful for young people.

Furthermore, as specified in the EC *Guidance on How to complete your ethics self-assessment*, the following will be collected as part of the ethics monitoring task of the project (T6.2).

We will follow the EC guidance and provide:

- Details of the procedures for obtaining approval from the guardian/legal representative and the agreement of the children or other minors.



- Steps taken to ensure that participants are not subjected to any form of coercion.
- Details of the age range.
- What are your assent procedures and parental consent for children and other minors?
- What steps will you take to ensure the welfare of the child or other minor?
- What justification is there for involving minors?

### 3.5 Data protection management

Since the PaCE project will be using personal data, it is relevant to carry out a data processing assessment for the PaCE project, involving the relevant consortium partners. The data processing assessment, in line with the general data management for the PaCE project, is structured around the key issues and potential consequences for the individual and society in general as set out in the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

#### 3.5.1 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)

The GDPR was introduced by the EU in 2016 with the aim of regulating the processing by an individual, a company or an organisation of personal data relating to individuals in the EU. It replaces the apparently outdated 1995 Data Protection Directive. Member States had to ensure that it was fully implementable in their countries by May 2018.

The GDPR is based on the approach of privacy as a fundamental human right. The GDPR regulation has a wide impact beyond the European Union due to its wider territorial scope and its definition of personal data<sup>28</sup>.

The GDPR is structured around six key principles:

- Fairness and lawfulness;
- Purpose limitation;
- Data minimisation;
- Accuracy;
- Storage limitation; and
- Integrity and confidentiality.

To ensure the operationalisation of these principles, a proactive design, also known as privacy by design, and conceptualisation of privacy as the default for any data collection activity is needed. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of data controllers to adopt the necessary transparency and accountability measures to protect individual privacy<sup>29</sup>.

<sup>28</sup> Goddard, Michelle 2017. "The EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR): European Regulation that has a Global Impact". *International Journal of Market Research*, Vol. 59. No. 6., pp. 703–705. <https://doi.org/10.2501/IJMR-2017-050>

<sup>29</sup> Idem

The GDPR creates the same playing field for data collectors within the European Union, ensuring the privacy of individuals. The European Union Agency for Network and Information Security (ENISA) argues that if “privacy principles are not respected, big data will fail to meet individuals’ needs; if privacy enforcement ignores the potential of big data, individuals will not be adequately protected. Therefore, all involved stakeholders should work together in addressing the new challenges and highlighting privacy as a core value of big data. Technology, instead of being a rival in this attempt, should be the main weapon and support tool.”<sup>30</sup> Standards similar to those set by the GDPR have been applied in many other countries and states, such as Brazil and California.

### 3.5.2 Personal information

The public engagement activities of the PaCE project might be handling personal information, this is especially the case for the deliverables under *WP5 Dissemination and Exploitation of Activities*. Under the GDPR, personal data should not be processed unless one has a lawful basis to do so. Personal data is defined in Art. 4 as “information relating to an identified or identifiable natural person (‘data subject’); an identifiable natural person is one who can be identified, directly or indirectly, in particular by reference to an identifier such as a name, an identification number, location data, an online identifier or to one or more factors specific to the physical, physiological, genetic, mental, economic, cultural or social identity of that natural person.”<sup>31</sup>

Each of the PaCE project partners has been asked to carry out a Data Processing Assessment to share their handling and potential processing of personal data and personal information. The assessments have been accumulated in the PaCE report *Data Processing Assessment form* and *D8.3 Data Policy Officer and Data Protection Policy*.

### What personal information will be collected or processed

#### Specific activities

- Recording, filming (vox pop) and photographing participants during workshops and local democracy labs;
- Interviewing participants before, during, after the workshops and the local democracy labs, and as part of other research activities as deemed necessary and in line with the objectives of the PaCE project;
- Sharing content on social media, on the internet and on traditional media that may include images of participants or content produced by them. In this case, the content i.e. expression of views, contributions or other data will be fully anonymised unless otherwise agreed by research participants by written consent;
- Other activities may include processing of secondary data that is fully anonymised as quantitative e.g. survey data or qualitative e.g. data related to earlier research on Iceland’s ‘Pots and Pans Revolution’. In this case, according to Recital/Paragraph 26 of the GDPR on p. 5 *‘the principles of data protection should not*

<sup>30</sup> The European Union Agency for Network and Information Security), 2015. “Privacy by design in big data. An overview of privacy enhancing technologies in the era of big data analytics.” <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1512.06000.pdf>

<sup>31</sup> European Parliament and The Council. Regulation 2016/679 of 27 April 2016 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/2016-05-04>



*apply to anonymous information, namely information which does not relate to an identified or identifiable natural person or to personal data rendered anonymous in such a manner that the data subject is not or no longer identifiable’.*

## Description of activities

### **Local Democracy Labs and workshops**

**Recruitment** - We will use our networks, our social media accounts and those of local partners to extend an invitation to individuals and groups to join the local democracy labs, workshops and other PaCE events. We will apply a mixed methodology of targeted outreach to certain individuals and groups through our networks and open calls for participation distributed via media representatives and social media. With this mixed outreach approach, we hope that the Democracy Labs will reflect the demographics of the location. RVK will work in collaboration with PaCE partner DEMSOC in order to organize and implement the democracy labs in Reykjavík. All data related to the recruitment process will be deleted after each democracy lab, retaining only such personal data that is required for research purposes and reporting. The Democracy Labs and other events and workshops will be recorded, filmed and photographed by members of the PaCE team. All participants will be asked to provide their consent for participation in writing via a consent form that will explain in detail what data is collected, how it will be processed, used and stored. The consent form will also detail the rights of data subjects and the obligations of data controllers and data processors according to the GDPR. All data will be stored on the PaCE project data repository hosted by the Technical University of Dresden, supervised by TUD’s data protection officer and will be password protected

**Informed consent form** - Participants will be asked to sign the PaCE informed consent form (D8.1 – Informed consent) that will highlight which data is being collected by the PaCE project, how their data is being used, processed and stored. The consent form will ask the participants to consent to being recorded, filmed, photographed and/or interviewed during PaCE events. If participants choose to not be recorded, filmed, photographed or interviewed during the events, they will be able to opt out and will receive a sticker on their name badge to identify them for the photographer. Participants will be asked on the consent form if they consider themselves to be part of an under-represented group in their community. The consent form will ask participants to tick a box they most closely identify with together with a box for other and a space to specify, if needed. The consent forms will be in English but translated into local languages and the template document will be stored on a shared drive. Completed documents will be stored on the PaCE project data repository hosted by the Technical University of Dresden supervised by TUD’s data protection officer and will be password protected. The consent forms will either be digital or printed and both versions will be stored on the PaCE project repository at TUD supervised by TUD’s data protection officer and will be password protected. The original paper version shall be destroyed once the scanned version is available. The consent form will include information on;

- The nature of the data PaCE is collecting and processing.
- Information on how data collected fits with the aims of the PaCE project
- How this data will be collected, processed, used and stored, including for how long the data will be stored and how and where it will be stored
- The lawful basis and legal constraints for the data collection as stipulated by the GDPR

- The rights of data subjects to check the accuracy of the data and their rights to have it rectified or deleted
- Who else will have access to the data
- The rights of data subject to be withdrawn their consent and participation in the project and have their data deleted.
- The potential risks involved and risk mitigation measures

**Data storage:** All PaCE data will be stored on servers at the Technical University of Dresden in full compliance with the GDPR and under the supervision of TUD's data protection officer (see PaCE D8.3 Data Policy officer and Data Policy Procedures). Personal data will be stored only for the purpose of the PaCE project activities and deleted a maximum of 5 years after the end of the PaCE project – with PaCE retaining only anonymized data that is needed for reporting or project delivery. The exemption is the data of individuals that want to participate in the European Lab.

**Data types:** Data captured for the Democracy Labs and other events will include: personal data, such as names, contact and demographic details, in addition to research data. The provision of these details is optional but included for research purposes e.g. in the event of following a line of enquiry. In all cases and in line with Recital/Paragraph 64 of the GDPR, p. 12, *'a data subject will have the right to have his or her personal data erased and no longer processed, where the personal data are no longer necessary in relation to the purposes for which they are collected or otherwise processed, where a data subject has withdrawn his or her consent or objects to the processing of personal data concerning him or her'* Specific data types include;

**Recordings:** The Democracy Labs, workshops and interviews will be digitally recorded for research purposes. Transcription may be made of the recordings. In all cases, the transcriptions will be anonymised, scanned and stored into the PaCE data repository at the Technical University of Dresden, with a password. Research participants will be asked to consent to this processing in writing.

**Filming:** The Democracy Labs and workshops will be filmed with the consent of participants.

**Photographs:** Select films and photographs from the events will be used during and after the event for dissemination purposes. Films and pictures will be shared via social media and might be included in media coverage.

**Interviews for task 6.2:** Unstructured and semi-structured interviews were carried out to learn more about the potential ethical, social and legal risks of the PaCE project. These interviews were anonymised, if the interviewee requested it, or in some cases and where anonymisation is not possible, pseudonymised. In this case a process was ascertained *'whether means are reasonably likely to be used to identify the natural person, account should be taken of all objective factors, such as the costs of and the amount of time required for identification, taking into consideration the available technology at the time of the processing and technological developments'* as laid down in Recital/Paragraph 26 of the GDPR, p. 5. Some interviewees also requested to be specifically named and acknowledged for providing input.

### 3.5.3 Lawful base

The PaCE project will only collect such data that is deemed necessary and proportional to the aims and objectives of the project and in full accordance to the principle of data minimisation of Article 5, letter (c) – Principles relating to the processing of personal data of the GDPR, p. 35 state that the collection of personal data should be *‘adequate, relevant and limited to what is necessary in relation to the purposes for which they are processed (‘data minimisation’)*.

Participants will be asked for their specific consent to sign up to the newsletter, event participation, media purposes. Only the purpose consented to shall be considered. The data subject will be informed of his or her rights as expressed in **Recital/Paragraph 65 of the GDPR, pp. 12-13** i.e. *‘a data subject should have the right to have his or her personal data erased and no longer processed where the personal data are no longer necessary in relation to the purposes for which they are collected or otherwise processed, where a data subject has withdrawn his or her consent or objects to the processing of personal data concerning him or her, or where the processing of his or her personal data does not otherwise comply with this Regulation’*.

Partners and networks will be briefed about data handling, in accordance with PaCE’s internal data protection policy. They will also be reminded to delete any data after the project.

As set out in the *D8.3 Data Protection Officer and Data Protection Policy*, the lawful bases for processing personal data for the public engagement for the PaCE project is mainly–

- **Consent:** individuals asked to provide personal information for PaCE public engagement will be informed about the handling of personal data and asked for consent.
- **Legal obligations** – The project may process personal data in order to meet any legal obligation required by e.g. the Grant Agreement.
- **Legitimate research interests** – The project processes personal data when it is necessary to achieve the following legitimate interests:
  - *Enhancing the research delivery; and*
  - *Undertaking project dissemination activities*

## 3.6 Framing of information

Most of the material and information for the public engagement activities are developed by PaCE consortium members themselves. Consortium partners are responsible for the development of deliverables that will then be disseminated to the target audience. In addition, target audience members will be asked to actively engage in the exploitation efforts of the PaCE project. The framing of the public engagement activities will be crucial and can have an impact on society.

### 3.6.1 Language bias

Language can be a powerful tool for shaping public opinion. It is a common understanding in linguistic theory that language, thought and action shape each other. Language is never an independent instrument or simply a tool for description. By naively perceiving it as a tool only for description, we underestimate its power in shaping public discourse on issues<sup>32</sup>. Several examples describe the impact of how an issue is framed on public opinion. A campaign in the USA reached the conclusion through qualitative and quantitative research that a narrative focusing on rights and benefits for same sex marriage was not sufficient to reach the middle of the population and gain majority support for the issue. What resonated with many Americans were values-based arguments around love, commitment, and family<sup>33</sup>. On the same note, we saw that the language chosen in the media on immigration in 2015 framed the issue as a migration crisis, playing directly into the rhetoric of populist movements and creating a sense of fear among Europeans. Resulting in a much more restrictive consensus on migration policies<sup>34</sup>.

Through the public engagement for the PaCE project, the consortium is able to take part in the shaping of public opinion and discourse on the issue. Language is powerful and the consortium needs to be aware that the words chosen can fuel or ease the polarization in society. This entails the language chosen for the research itself as well as the language to disseminate and exploit the findings to the target audience.

#### How to avoid further polarization through language

To mitigate the risks of further polarization of society through language, the PaCE consortium aims at adopting the following mitigation strategies.

##### A) Communication principles

While acknowledging the diversity of the PaCE project partners, and its access to different target audiences, the project has developed a suggested communications guidance for the PaCE consortium to be used when engaging with the public. It entails the use of communication principles based on the general human rights principles<sup>35</sup> and communication rights<sup>36</sup>. The following principles shall guide the communication, dissemination and exploitation activities of the PaCE project:

- **Diversity:** We believe that diversity of opinions, experiences and origins are a benefit and therefore embrace them.
- **Equality:** We believe that all people are equal and do not discriminate against any person, opinion, or belief.
- **Non-partisanship:** We are operating without any party affiliation.
- **Research-based:** The information shared is research-based.
- **Respect:** We treat participants and stakeholders with respect.

<sup>32</sup> Edelman, M. (1974) 'The Political Language of the Helping Professions', *Politics & Society*, 4(3), pp. 295–310. doi: 10.1177/003232927400400301.

<sup>33</sup> Wolfson, E. and Nix, K. (2015). *The Chief Engine of Change: Conversation*, Stanford Social Innovation Review.

<sup>34</sup> Charlemagne – Back to the barricades (*The Economist*, June 29th 2019, p.28).

<sup>35</sup> Universal declaration of Human Rights: [https://www.ohchr.org/en/udhr/documents/udhr\\_translations/eng.pdf](https://www.ohchr.org/en/udhr/documents/udhr_translations/eng.pdf)

<sup>36</sup> More information about Communication rights can be found here: <https://ccrvoices.org>

- **Transparency:** The PaCE project is transparent about the aims, goals, and activities of the project.

## B) Testing and evaluation

Additionally, the consortium partners engage in a critical exchange about the framing of its public engagement activities. By reflecting upon and testing the language used for the public engagement activities, we can consider that the project is not adding to the polarization of society. In this context, language that is antagonising and is adding to the divisive rhetoric in society should be avoided by the PaCE project partners. Example of antagonising language are framings that suggest the need for ‘combating or countering populists’ in society. This report therefore recommends a positive framing for public engagement activities, highlighting the outcomes we are aiming to achieve, such as strong democratic institutions and societies where people feel they can shape the decisions that affect their lives.

Language and its meaning evolve over time. Rhetoric transforms and has in certain societies a specific meaning, as demonstrated by the connotation of terms in France and the Netherlands. The Dutch far-right leader Geert Wilders uses the word ‘Islam’ symbolically to mean something that is the opposite of freedom: oppression or occupation. Marine Le Pen has said as much by comparing Muslim’s praying in the streets to the Nazi occupation of Paris. For many, Wilder’s use of the word ‘freedom’ and Le Pen’s use of the word ‘occupation’ fly in the face of the meaning of those words in a democracy.<sup>37</sup> The public engagement of the PaCE project therefore needs to consider the connotations certain terms might have. Cross-partner efforts and collaboration when developing public engagement activities can be one way to mitigate the risk of adding to the polarization of society.

## C) Avoiding polarization through language

Language that fuels the polarization of society should be avoided. A comparative study of populism<sup>38</sup> by Aslanidis (2017) has looked into how polarization can be avoided in the study of populism. The findings suggest that analysts should–

- **Avoid generalizing from region-specific perspectives:** Failing to encompass the full spectrum of populist politics when generalizing from particulars will inevitably lead to errors. By stipulating features for populism that only pertain to specific settings and are unable to travel further, scholars exhibit a regional bias, effectively treating their familiar cases as ideal types.
- **Remain sceptical of any association of populism with economic policy:** Commentators regularly associate populists with the specific policies populist parties enact when in power that presumably lead to economic disaster. Empirical evidence from across right-wing as well as left-wing populist parties across Europe are at odds with the ‘populist policy cycle’ often times claimed.
- **Refrain from exaggerating populism’s impact:** The term populism has been turned into a political buzzword, it is understood along its various negative angles – the links to extremism, the irrational

<sup>37</sup> Hines, A. (April 6, 2017) ‘How to understand the language of political populism’, The Conversation.

<sup>38</sup> Aslanidis, P. Chin. Polit. Sci. Rev. (2017) 2: 266. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41111-017-0064-0>

approach to economics, its authoritarian elements. It is a term loaded by definition with many connotations that the researcher should be aware of.

This report suggests avoiding any generalization that only pertains to specific instances of populism, and instead considering a wider set of factors when assessing the record of actors labelled as populists.

### 3.6.2 The politics of information visualisation

As part of its activities, PaCE proposes to develop a public facing dashboard displaying the results from a search of online content, using algorithms for the identification of populist political language developed using a machine learning approach. As discussed previously, the intent of ‘D3.2 : Tool to identify populist narratives’ is to provide the public, policymakers and academics with a tool with which to investigate populist content online.

The tool is limited by the available data, as well as by measures being put in place to offer ethical protection and data protection. Whilst the fundamental architecture of such a tool is in place (the content data is functional, and the language recognition algorithms are under development) there is still quite some freedom on how the dashboard may present the results from this tool, what types of query may be made, and how this can be accessed.

This dashboard will be presenting political information. The aim is not to reinforce one particular partisan political perspective, but the project is motivated by the belief that greater understanding about the trends of populist language is beneficial for society at large. However, the systemic mapping of quantitative data into visual images has a politics and an ethics.<sup>39</sup> “Data are not naturally occurring phenomenon. The world does not spontaneously quantify, curate, or data-mine itself. Rather, the process of observing the world and quantifying it is a political act, and deserves ethical consideration.”<sup>40</sup>

There are fundamental questions about level of abstraction – how much complexity can we show in such visualisations, and how much would be appropriate to show, given our audience?<sup>41</sup>

#### Principles for presenting political information

Winghager & Smuc argue despite a strong increase in options with regard to the accessibility of data, tools, and methods – no conceptual framework or discussion has as yet sought to organize these emerging visual vocabularies and their possible (re-)combinations in the field of political information. Politics is lacking the consolidated conceptual toolbox that might be found in other domains.<sup>42</sup> They propose a first scaffold for organizing the discussion and practice of political information visualization. They summarise physical and political maps, cartograms, bubble charts, network graphs, Word clouds, statistic data visualisations, dynamic data visualisation, political infographics, and the systematic integration of different modes of representation – where “various visualization methods would [...] serve as complementary layouts for complex data,

<sup>39</sup> Michael Correll, “The ethical dimension of visualization research”, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1811.07271.pdf>, 2018

<sup>40</sup> Idem

<sup>41</sup> Lev Manovich “foreword” in Manual Lima, *Visual Complexity: Mapping Patterns of Information*, New York, Princeton Architectural press, 2011.

<sup>42</sup> Florian Windhager & Michael Smuc, “The Arts of the Possible: Information Visualisation in the field of politics” JEDEM – eJournal of eDemocracy, 2014 <http://www.jedem.org/index.php/jedem/article/download/308/283>

disclosing themselves as varying but interoperable perspectives which focus on the same subject matter from different distances and angles.”<sup>43</sup> This article gives a sense of the potential tools available, but does not go into great detail on the potential for purposive or accidental misrepresentation or distortion of the world through data visualisation.

Dork et al<sup>44</sup> propose four basic proposals for a critical information visualisation, in particular in civic engagement. These principles provide a strong basis for PaCE’s information visualisation both on the ICT platform and in the Task 2.1 infographics.

- **Disclosure:** “Creating visualizations involves a range of decisions about data, representation, and interaction. Disclosing some of these decisions is a way to establish trust between visualization creators and viewers. When the designer’s intentions and decisions are concealed, it is difficult to trust a visualization and engage with the presented issue. While one may never be fully aware of one’s assumptions, disclosure describes the aspiration to be conscious of their potential effects and invite the viewer into exchanges with the designer, reflections about the visualization, and engagement with an issue.”
- **Plurality:** “Since no one visualization can capture all perspectives on a phenomenon, exposing multiple facets and enabling a variety of interpretations is preferable to limited views and singular readings. For example, one can consider how the perspectives of the people involved are represented. If there are main lines of argument, one can examine which perspectives are emphasized or hidden. It is feasible to expose marginal, unconventional, and challenging angles on an issue as an attempt to help the viewer to reflect on their own assumptions. There may be situations in which the visualization designer deliberately chooses to advocate a specific standpoint instead of offering a nuanced set of perspectives.”
- **Contingency:** “Instead of pre-determined conclusions to be drawn from a visualization, tools should provide for a range of possible ways viewers experience a visualization and make sense of a given issue. Since visualizations can change depending on the context of the viewer, it is possible to design a visualization that acknowledges the situation of the viewer in relation to the phenomenon being represented. Instead of providing fixed and unchanging views, flexible visualizations can engage viewers more deeply with a given issue and relate it to their life. By considering both viewer and phenomenon to be dynamic, contingent visualizations can provide room for more unique and profound experiences and insights.”
- **Empowerment:** Information visualization enable visualization creators to let their voice be heard and perspective been seen. Empowering visualizations should also allow viewers to question visual representations, utilize them to tell their own story, and shift from awareness to action. There may be a tension between the empowerment of visualization designers and creators. Interactivity can be provided to let the viewer steer data transformations such as selections, omissions, and emphases. Empowering visualizations help people interact with one another, and make linkages across different backgrounds,

<sup>43</sup> Ibid, p.159

<sup>44</sup> <https://mariandoerk.de/criticalinfovis/altchi2013.pdf>

and connect visualizations with actual civic engagement. In a critical approach, the designer attempts to be aware of their own power and who is being empowered by the visualization, and conversely, who may be excluded due to issues of access to technology, literacy, perceptual abilities, gender, and other forms of oppression.”

### Feminist data visualisation

Taking this line of thinking further, Catherine D’Ignazio and Lauren F. Klein explore an approach to data visualisation informed by feminist theory, which focuses upon emphasising the situated nature of knowledge and its perception.<sup>45</sup> They are “interested in exposing the assumptions involved in choices about data type, categorization schema, visual typology, interaction mode, and intended audience; as well as those associated with the qualitative aspects of visualization design and its reception”. For them, the key principles of feminist data visualisation are:

- **Rethink binaries:** “A feminist approach to data visualization should therefore emphasize representational strategies premised on multiplicity rather than binaries, and acknowledge the limits of any binaristic view.” Designers should ask: is our data the right type, what categories are we using and what assumptions underpin these? How do we cope with edge cases and outliers, and how can we communicate the limits of our categories to the user, and can we allow them to adjust or alter categories?
- **Embrace pluralism:** Be cautious about the “view from nowhere” and acknowledge the subject position involved in the creation of data visualisations. This involves asking questions about who is the intended or ideal user, what voices are excluded from the design team, and to what extent can our final design communicate our subject position – in the case of PaCE as researchers, but also our other multiple subjectivities. Does taking on different perspectives, potentially give us multiple perspectives on the data, and thereby facilitate multiple pathways to knowledge?
- **Examine power and aspire to empowerment:** D’Ignazio and Klein argue that a feminist approach to data visualization acknowledges the user as a source of knowledge in the design as well as the reception of any visual interface and suggest that the evaluation of the success any data visualisation should be done at a community level rather than just at an individual level. They encourage us to ask how power is distributed in the design team, and can we build capacity in user communities.
- **Consider context:** For feminist theory, knowledge is *situated*, that is, arises from a particular social, cultural and material context, and data visualisation should therefore consider how such contexts contribute towards the production of a visualisation. We should ask how we are homogenising data, and potentially removing or losing local context. They encourage exploring participatory design methods with user communities, and letting history and culture inform our data visualisation. What might we learn if we were to visualise “messy” data?
- **Legitimize body and affect:** what sort of affect or experience is our visualisation intended to create and what other forms might it engender? Are we attempting to create an emotional reaction or

<sup>45</sup> Feminist Data Visualization, Catherine D’Ignazio and Lauren F. Klein  
[https://static1.squarespace.com/static/574dd51d62cd942085f12091/t/5c157dfc562fa7836b296000/1544912383037/Feminist\\_Data\\_Visualization.pdf](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/574dd51d62cd942085f12091/t/5c157dfc562fa7836b296000/1544912383037/Feminist_Data_Visualization.pdf)

engagement with this data and the topic of populism? Might we ask about these experiences as part of our user evaluation activity? Can we consider social modes of engagement with the data visualisation, rather than assuming a single user isolated behind a keyboard?

- **Make labour visible:** “Information design processes often start with data, but a feminist approach would insist that they begin by working backwards to surface the actors (both individual and institutional) that have laboured to generate a particular dataset”. D’Ignazio Klein suggests that we foreground questions of data provenance and explore metadata visualisations that show the provenance of data and their stakeholders.

### Responsibilities of visual design

Finally, Michael Correll<sup>46</sup> identifies a set of responsibilities of visual designers, which are largely congruent with the above approaches.

- **Make the invisible visible:** Visualise hidden labour, don’t hide the steps in the construction of the visualisation, make our choices clear and don’t hide the alternative paths-not-taken, make the labour of design and visualisation preparation visible. Visualise where we are uncertain and where we have made assumptions. Visualise hidden impacts – how might our system or tool be used for harm or misuse?
- **Collect data with empathy:** Encourage “small data” and take caution with the privacy and data protection of data subjects. Anthromorphize data and take care not to move our visualisation too far into the realm of abstraction – this can even involve using human figures to represent data and including actual humans in the visualisation (privacy notwithstanding). Obfuscate, aggregate, fuzz or otherwise restructure data to protect privacy, then communicate the upper levels of accuracy to the user.
- **Challenge structures of power:** “Visualization work should be concerned with imbalances in power, and focus on distributing power in more equitable ways, and to more ethical ends”. This involves supporting data “due process”, act as data advocates and pressure or slow unethical data analytics.

There are a sufficient set of ethical principles here to inform the data visualisation component of the PaCE online tool and development of the infographics, relying on datasets, for the public engagement.

---

<sup>46</sup> Correll – Ethical dimensions of visualisation research <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1811.07271.pdf>

## 4.0 Pathway to impact

Due to the complexity of the nature of public engagement, it is difficult to carry out an impact assessment for public engagement activities. Public engagement is a fluid concept and it is difficult to establish a causal relationship between a specific public engagement activity and societal impact. The current literature and academic entities view public engagement mostly as *one element* of the pathway to impact.

For the purpose of the PaCE project, impact is defined as reaching the PaCE goals set out in the Grant Agreement. Furthermore, the consortium has set out clearly defined as well as measurable KPIs for its public engagement activities which ensure a baseline to be measured against when carrying out the evaluation of the project achievements. The detailed list of impact measurement can be found in *D5.1: Plan for Exploitation and Dissemination of Results (PEDR)*. The PaCE consortium acknowledges that its public engagement is only one aspect of achieving the set out goals of strengthening democratic institutions across Europe.

### Quality of dialogue processes

As for public engagement, it is not necessarily about the quantity of engagements but about its quality. A higher number of public engagement activities does not necessarily lead to a policy change, nor does the amount of scientific evidence provided. Instead, we can see the benefit of engaging in meaningful and critical dialogues that do not necessarily focus on a specific dialogue but that question the broader project of dialogue governance.<sup>47</sup> The relevance of it in the context of the PaCE project is even more pressing. Populism manifests itself often times in the dichotomy of the elites versus the ordinary people. The assumption is that the current system does not work for ‘the people’ and that the elites are not willing to question these dynamics. Public engagement, that is designed to question the broader project of dialogue governance, can impact the distance (perceived or real) between the elites and the ordinary people.

However, such public engagement has its challenges since it potentially includes the institutions that funds the public engagement activities. These institutions might see public engagement as an opportunity not to rethink their policies and practices, but to gain trust for a predetermined approach.<sup>48</sup> It is therefore relevant that the decision-makers themselves are enrolled in these dialogues. Public engagement, especially on the topic of populism, cannot be seen or handled as a one-off event. The project aims at generating further discussions and conversations on the topic, between different audiences. The public engagement activities of the PaCE project can only be understood as one step in this process.

### Costly and politically risky public engagement

While public engagement is usually seen by the literature and in practice as a crucial aspect of research activities, it is worth considering the costs and political risks it might entail. It is only recently that academia has moved from a ‘public understanding’ approach, implying a public deficit, to a ‘public engagement’ approach, building

<sup>47</sup> Stilgoe, Jack & Lock, Simon & Wilsdon, James (2014) Why should we promote public engagement with science?. *Public understanding of science*. 23. 4-15. 10.1177/0963662513518154.

<sup>48</sup> Idem



on a mutual exchange with the public.<sup>49</sup> As public engagement has become institutionalised by academic and democratic institutions, such as the European Commission, it is worth asking the question if meaningful dialogue and reflexivity has to give way to efficiency.<sup>50</sup>

It is almost impossible to answer the question whether public engagement is worth the risks and costs it entails. The PaCE project acknowledges that engagement fatigue can be fuelled by the activities of the consortium. However, the consortium understands that meaningful engagement with the general public and the target audience groups are essential to resolving the challenges we currently see across European societies. If we do not consider or critically engage with what others have to say, the PaCE project might actually add to the current polarization of our societies. Even if such criticism has some validity, meaningful engagement exercises are an opportunity for the target audience to open up areas of dissensus, and can generate a discussion about ways to address current challenges.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Watermeyer, Richard (2012) From Engagement to Impact? Articulating the Public Value of Academic Research, *Tertiary Education and Management*, 18:2, 115-130, DOI: 10.1080/13583883.2011.641578

<sup>50</sup> Stilgoe, Jack & Lock, Simon & Wilsdon, James (2014) Why should we promote public engagement with science?. *Public understanding of science*. 23. 4-15. 10.1177/0963662513518154.

<sup>51</sup> Stilgoe, Jack & Lock, Simon & Wilsdon, James (2014) Why should we promote public engagement with science?. *Public understanding of science*. 23. 4-15. 10.1177/0963662513518154.

## 5.0 ELSI assessment of PaCE public engagement

Following the current debates around public engagement, especially their potential ethical, social and legal impacts, this section provides an overview of potential social, ethical, and legal risks the PaCE consortium foresees in developing its engagement activities and the manner in which these are addressed and mitigated.

Task #	Task title	Potential ethical issues arising from this task (These are typical ethical issues that might arise with this type of research or activity, not an indication that this has or will happen in PaCE. These do not include risks associated with failure of the activity)	Mitigating measures (Ways in which the risks of these ethical issues can be reduced)
3.2	Employing Hermeneutic Computational Narrative Analysis (HCNA) to identify populist narratives and counter-narratives, as well as to locate these narratives in the public media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Targeting of particular social media users (individuals and groups), stigmatisation of these people and their antagonisation</li><li>- Privacy of social media users, processing of personal data, consent or other legal grounds for processing, data security, transparency of processing and data subject rights; Surveillance potential.</li><li>- Overrepresentation of the voice of certain categories of people at the expense of others (such as women, ethnic minorities, etc.)</li><li>- biases arising from training data, or from coding participants.</li><li>- Potential for weaponisation of the tool.</li><li>- see work done in D6.4.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- No publication of individual narratives to avoid targeting of particular users</li><li>- Attention paid in the development of the public platform to avoid stigmatisation and antagonisation</li><li>- Recognition of the potential legitimacy of claims relying on populist rhetoric</li><li>- See recommendations made in D6.4</li></ul>
5.1	Creating the plan for the exploitation and dissemination of results (D5.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Failure to include particular relevant audience or under-represented groups</li><li>- Failure to set measurable and achievable public engagement goals</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Make sure to plan to reach out to a large variety of groups</li><li>- A proper plan for exploitation and dissemination of results is itself a mitigating measure</li></ul>



5.2	Establish an online and media presence (D5.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Receiving bad publicity from certain audience who might disagree with PaCE approach</li><li>- Raising incorrect expectations about the project's results</li><li>- Accessibility issues (website should be suitable for screen readers, accessibility aids etc).</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Ensure inclusive, non-antagonising language</li><li>- Reach out to groups with alternative approached</li><li>- Honesty in presenting research results</li><li>- Online and media presence should take best practice guidance on accessibility into account</li></ul>
5.3	Links to other projects and public outreach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Bias toward other groups that share similar ideas as we do in PaCE, clustering along disciplinary/language or national lines.</li><li>- Failure to engage with other projects and working in isolation</li><li>- public communication is too "academic" in tone or language.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Ensure inclusive, non-antagonising language</li><li>- Communicate results in a way that can reach non-academic audiences</li><li>- Reach out to groups who do things differently from us</li><li>- Actively engaging with other relevant projects and groups</li></ul>
5.4	Policy maker dissemination (D5.5)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Neglect of particular policy makers (over emphasis on EC at the neglect of other policy makers with different responsibilities and who hold different views</li><li>- failure to "speak truth to power",</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Ensure inclusive, non-antagonising language</li><li>- Reach out to a variety of policy makers</li></ul>
5.5	Local democracy labs (D5.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- proportionate representation of different types of participants</li><li>- potential bias in recruitment associated with use of gatekeepers to participants.</li><li>- Neglect of citizens/groups who support populist parties</li><li>- Exposure of participants in the labs</li><li>- wasting participants time, or not providing participants with any value (extractive practices)</li><li>- handling conflict between participants</li><li>- Ethical moderation - When to steer discussions away from harmful abusing topics</li><li>- Not supporting participants after the event</li><li>- Physical health and safety considerations</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Reach out to various groups</li><li>- Ethical treatment of participants in the labs (managing their comfort, supporting their engagement, conducting appropriate debriefs, managing troublesome or hostile behaviour, follow-up and aftercare)</li><li>- Ensure non-judgemental political positioning</li><li>- Recognise that participants have valid and relevant knowledge to share (promote dialogue rather than 'deficit' approach to public engagement)</li></ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- risk of doing 'communication' and not 'dialogue' (Stilgoe et al., 2016)</li></ul>	
5.6	European democracy labs (D5.4)(D5.6) (D5.7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- proportionate representation of different types of participants</li><li>- potential bias in recruitment associated with use of gatekeepers to participants.</li><li>- Neglect of citizens/groups who support populist parties</li><li>- Exposure of participants in the labs</li><li>- wasting participants time, or not providing participants with any value (extractive practices)</li><li>- handling conflict between participants</li><li>- Ethical moderation - When to steer discussions away from harmful abusing topics</li><li>- Not supporting participants after the event</li><li>- Physical health and safety considerations</li><li>- risk of doing 'communication' and not 'dialogue' (Stilgoe et al., 2016)</li></ul>	See above
5.7	Future and Foresight project (D5.8)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Inclusion/exclusion of participants, fair reporting on process and not suppressing the voices of participants</li><li>- accusation of propaganda, or political intrusion in education practices</li><li>- lack of sensitivity to cultural norms in different educational contexts</li><li>- risk of doing 'communication' and not 'dialogue' (Stilgoe et al., 2016)</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Proper research ethics in place to engage with human participants</li><li>- Ensure non-judgemental political positioning</li></ul>
5.8	Networking across Europe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Bias toward other groups that share similar ideas as we do in PaCE</li><li>- Bias towards groups that are formally constituted, professional or well funded</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Reach out to various groups</li></ul>
5.9	Final conference and webinars (D5.9)(D5.10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Neglect of citizens who support populist parties</li><li>- Bias toward other groups that share similar ideas as we do in PaCE</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Reach out to a variety of individuals and groups</li><li>- explore the possibility of funding marginalised participants to attend</li></ul>



			- consider these issues when selecting the appropriate location for the final conference

## 6.0 Conclusion and recommendations

Based on the above discussion, we propose below a list of recommendations that can guide the development of PaCE's public engagements as well as similar activities designed by other consortia or organisations.

1. **Ensure that public engagement activities are set up as a dialogue:** Public engagement should not be seen as a process to only disseminate the research findings but as a dialogue in which the general public is recognised as an interlocutor with legitimate views, concerns, and claims<sup>52</sup>. For a dialogue to take place, it is essential to review and ensure proper conditions for public engagement to take place. This includes:
  - a. Reflect upon the target audience for public engagement activities, ensuring the best results of the engagement activities. Be as specific as possible to know who needs to be included in public engagement activities to achieve the set out goals of the project.
  - b. Be inclusive of groups that might usually not have a seat at the table. By including especially under-represented groups the project can gain new insights and bring voices and ideas to the table that are usually not represented.
  - c. Uphold safeguard measures, including for youth and minority engagement, as well as data protection standards. While conducting public outreach activities the rights of individuals should be upheld by the project partners.
2. **Ensure continuity of the dialogue:** the PaCE project and public engagement around its research is one step of a broader process to engage the public in a dialogue. By linking the PaCE project to a wider network of researchers and practitioners, its results and findings can be relevant beyond the duration of the project itself.
3. **Reducing potential framing bias:**
  - a. Do not focus only on policy makers as the target audience. There are different target groups that might be as relevant to achieving and contributing to the set out goal of the project. PaCE sees especially journalists and media, as well as the civil society as key target groups for this project.
  - b. Test and evaluate language used. While developing public engagement material, it is crucial to reflect upon the language chosen and its impact. Throughout the project, PaCE partners will evaluate the impact of its public engagement material on society.
  - c. Avoid language and visualisations that would further contribute to polarisation and resentment in the society. Language and visualisations that clearly generalize, exaggerate and play into a further polarisation of the society should be avoided.

<sup>52</sup> Stilgoe, Jack & Lock, Simon & Wilsdon, James (2014) Why should we promote public engagement with science?. Public understanding of science. 23. 4-15. 10.1177/0963662513518154.



- 
4. **Quality over quantity of public engagement:** while the impact of public engagement is difficult to measure, project partners will aim for highly qualitative engagement activities to achieve the set out goal of the project.



## 7.0 Guidance documents

The following list compiles documents that may provide guidance to conduct a similar ELSI process as the one conducted for PaCE public engagement. Please note that this is not an exhaustive list. The reference list (section 8 of the present document) may also be consulted for additional guiding documents.

- André, P., B. Enserink, D. Connor and P. Croal (2006) Public Participation International Best Practice Principles. Special Publication Series No. 4. Fargo, USA: International Association for Impact Assessment.
- Bodmer, W. (1985) Public Understanding of Science: The BA, the Royal Society and COPUS64*Notes Rec. R. Soc* <http://doi.org/10.1098/rsnr.2010.0035>:  
[https://royalsociety.org/~media/Royal\\_Society\\_Content/policy/publications/1985/10700.pdf](https://royalsociety.org/~media/Royal_Society_Content/policy/publications/1985/10700.pdf)
- European Charter for Researchers: <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/charter/european-charter>
- European Commission, Horizon 2020, Public Engagement in Responsible Research and Innovation: <https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/horizon2020/en/h2020-section/public-engagement-responsible-research-and-innovation>
- National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement <https://www.publicengagement.ac.uk>
- Wolfendale, A.W. (1995) 'The Public Understanding of Science: The Wolfendale Report' and Other Matters'. AIP Conference Proceedings 972:1, 570-575. DOI: 10.1063/1.2870469