UNIVERSITETET I BERGEN

Evaluering av DIGSSCORE

Bakgrunn

I fakultetsstyremøtet 11. september 2019 ble det vedtatt budsjett for 2020 (sak 59/19). I denne saken ble det gjort følgende vedtak «Styret ved Det samfunnsvitenskapelige fakultet vedtar det fremlagte budsjettforslaget. Styret ber om ekstern evaluering av DIGSSCORE som grunnlag for å vurdere finansiering av infrastrukturen etter 2020.»

I forlengelse av dette vedtaket ble det 25. november 2019 oppnevnt følgende evalueringskomité:
Universitetslektor Elin Naurin, Statsvetenskapliga institutionen, Göteborgs Universitet
Professor Svend-Erik Skaaning, Institut for Statskundskab, Århus Universitet
Professor Pål Erling Martinussen, Institutt for sosiologi og statsvitenskap, NTNU
Elin Naurin ledet komiteens arbeid.

Evalueringskomiteen fikk følgende mandat:
«Det ønskes en faglig vurdering av hva DIGSSCORE som en infrastruktur siden oppstart med bevilgning fra Trond Mohn stiftelse (tidligere Bergen forskningsstiftelse) i 2016 har bidratt til ved Det samfunnsvitenskapelige fakultet og Universitetet i Bergen når det gjelder:
- tilgang til relevante og oppdaterte data
- kvalitet og omfang på forskning og publikasjoner
- bidrag til eksternfinansiering ved Det samfunnsvitenskapelige fakultet og andre fagmiljøer ved Universitetet i Bergen
- rekruttering av stipendiater og postdocs
- bidrag til nye undervisningstilbud ved fakultetets institutter.
Evalueringskomiteen bes spesielt gi en vurdering av i hvor stor grad DIGSSCORE som en infrastruktur har bidratt til økt søknad om eksterne midler ved fakultetet, og hvilken betydning DIGSSCORE kan ha hatt for å lykkes med å oppnå finansiering fra attraktive finansieringskilder. Komiteen bes også vurdere DIGSSCORE sin betydning for utvikling av ny infrastruktur og datatilgang for norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig forskning.»

Evalueringskomiteen fikk følgende materiale tilsendt som grunnlag for arbeidet:
25. november 2019
- Søknad til Bergen Forskningsstiftelse og kontrakt inngått 2015
- DIGSSCORE evalueringsrapport til Trond Mohn stiftelse

20. desember 2019

- DIGSSCORE status report 2019
- DIGSSCORE status report 2019 appendix

18. desember 2019 sendte evalueringskomiteen en rekke spørsmål som ble besvart av DIGSSCORE 16. januar 2020. Evalueringskomiteen ønsket også et intervju med DIGSSCORE og dette ble gjennomført 26. februar 2020.

Evalueringskomiteen leverte sin evalueringsrapport som avtalt 6. mars 2020.

Evalueringsrapporten legges her frem som orientering for fakultetsstyret. Imidlertid vil vi komme tilbake til fakultetsstyret med en finansieringsplan og en egen beslutningssak der videreføring av DIGSSCORE skal behandles. Det vil være naturlig å se dette i konteksten av langtidsbudsjettet for fakultetet.

Forslag til vedtak:
Fakultetsstyret tar evalueringen av DIGSSCORE til orientering og imøteser en nærmere behandling av en egen sak videreføring av DIGSSCORE i forbindelse med behandling av budsjettet.

Jan Erik Askildsen
dekan

Alette Gilhus Mykkeltvedt
fakultetsdirektør

Evaluation of The Digital Social Science Core Facility (DIGSSCORE)

Introduction and summary assessment

It was with great pleasure that we received the request to evaluate the DIGSSCORE at the University of Bergen. We were asked to dedicate attention to five aspects of the work of DIGSSCORE: 1) the collection of relevant and updated data; 2) the quality and quantity of research output; 3) the contributions to attracting external funding to the Faculty of Social Sciences and other research environments at University of Bergen; 4) recruitment of PhDs and Post Docs; and 5) contribution to new study programs. The number of pages of the report were set to be around 10 pages.

Our work has consisted of evaluating the reports sent to us from University of Bergen, as well as utilizing the online material made public at the DIGSSCORE webpage. We have also sent detailed additional questions to DIGSSCORE twice. One of these times, we requested written answers, and one of the times we asked for a Skype meeting, which was held on the 26 of February 2020. More informally, but still of value, have been our efforts to talk to colleagues in our respective research fields regarding their impression and awareness of DIGSSCORE. We have also sent e-mails to some of course holders that use DIGSSCORE, to receive information about their experiences. Furthermore, Elin Naurin had reason to visit DIGSSCORE in late November 2019, and was then shown the facilities, met with staff as well as had a personal meeting with the faculty in her role as chair of this evaluation committee.

Our overall impression of DIGSSCORE is positive. We are impressed by the work that has been possible to implement during such a short time. The facilities offered at University of Bergen through DIGSSCORE should be regarded as something valuable and worthy of continuing, meaning that we recommend long-term engagement from the side of the university and of the Bergen Science Foundation. This being said, we take the opportunity to discuss how to move forward with the work within DIGSSCORE, as we interpret our task also to include suggestions for issues that deserve more attention or prioritization.

Elin Naurin, Pål Erling Martinussen, Svend-Erik Skanning

Gothenburg, Trondheim and Aarhus, 6 March 2020

1. Contributions to the collection of relevant and updated data

DIGSSCORE provides scholars with two important possibilities to collect data; the Norwegian Citizen Panel (NCP) and the Citizen Lab.

The NCP is an online panel survey that consists of a population-based probability sample of citizens. It is clear that the NCP provides remarkable opportunities for Norwegian survey research. The NCP was originally set up to mirror world-leading probability-based panels such as TESS in the U.S. and LISS in the Netherlands. DIGSSCORE is about to establish itself as the Norwegian version of these commendable research endeavors. This is a praiseworthy contribution, and thus one that the University of Bergen has all the reason to be proud of.

Recruitment to the panel is done using random sampling from the Norwegian Population Registry. Every year, new recruitment takes place, which is important since panels like this tend to become smaller over time as participants stop answering. The target number of participants is currently 7500. Thus far, recruitment rate for the NCP has varied somewhat, but is comparatively high for each round of recruitment. Still, as is the case for all panels like this, most people do not answer the call to participate. This means that efforts to recruit new panel participants are needed on a running basis. This is something that is lifted forward by DIGSSCORE themselves. According to the most recent methods report available from the NCP website (Wave 15, May-June 2019) the panel has a systematic underrepresentation of respondents belonging to the lowest educational groups. There is an overrepresentation of citizens from the capital area as compared to rural areas. Biased samples is a problem shared by most surveys, but it is an even larger problem for panel surveys with repeated measurements. Ongoing research indicates that the Norwegian Citizen Panel stands strong in comparison to similar panels, although clear comparative work is yet hard to find.[1] In their methods reports, the NCP describes the weights used to attain a better representation of

---

[1] There is, for example, ongoing comparative work on acquiescence and response effects where several survey research infrastructures participate. DIGSSCORE and University of Bergen is represented in this work by Endre Tvinnereim in the version of the paper that we have read. See also earlier work (then not including the NCP); Blom, A. G., Bosnjak, M., Cornilleau, A., Cousteaux, A.-S., Das, M., Douhou, S., & Krieger, U. (2016). A Comparison of Four Probability-Based Online and Mixed-Mode Panels in Europe. *Social Science Computer Review*, *34*(1), 8–25.

Norwegians in the analyses done on data from NCP, which is a well-needed description. However, there will be a need for further discussion around how different recruitment strategies are, or could be, used to attract citizens from the currently underrepresented groups. This seems like something DIGSSCORE should place emphasis on in the coming years, not because the NCP has larger problems than other surveys - it certainly does not - but because they have excellent possibilities of contributing world-class data many years ahead if they do so.

Participation rates are comparatively high also when considering the continued participation after recruitment. According to the information provided to us by DIGSSCORE, around 70 percent of those who answer the first survey also answer their second wave. The number thereafter is 85 percent for the third, and 90 percent for the fourth. These participation rates testify to the quality of the infrastructure, even though it is normal that those who agree to participate in a panel also are more interested in continued participation.

Participants in the panel get surveys sent to their e-mail addresses three times per year. It takes them on average 15 minutes each time they answer, which is what they are told when they are recruited. When this is written, 15 waves of the panel have been fielded, the last of which was answered by 8000 participants. DIGSSCORE evaluates survey satisfaction among participants of the panel via open ended-survey questions by the end of the surveys, as well as via personal e-mails and phone calls from participants. From the information that has reached us, there seems to be no major issues regarding survey satisfaction among respondents.

One concern that comes up in the evaluation of the NCP is how to make best use of the *longitudinal* data that comes out of NCP. Up to date, most publications from the NCP focus on survey experiments, or cross-sectional analyses. This likely has to do with the fact that a research infrastructure like this needs to be able to publish quickly in order to prove its productivity to funding agencies. It is by default difficult to have large publications on panel data early on in a project like this, since it takes so long to gather the data. This being said, we hope to see more use of the panel component in the future.

Another concern that seem pertinent, is how a research infrastructure like this best can combine the task of providing long term longitudinal measures of the same individuals on the one hand, and to use the same citizens in experiments where treatments are provided to them in different ways, on the other. There is a balance to strike here somewhere, where the panel should not be too

"bothered" by treatments from survey experiments. The NCP have taken on both tasks – to both implement long term measures and to perform experiments on the panelists. This is not a problem reserved only for the NCP (other similar panels have similar problems), but it is one that requires strategical empirical research leadership. We note that the NCP should have excellent opportunities to provide the research community with methodological research on this matter. The need for strategic and long-term decisions regarding main focuses of the data collection is also something that the current leadership of the DIGSSCORE will need back-up for in the coming years. Renewed support for the institute in this regard seems crucial for the years ahead.

It is relevant to note that the implementation of the surveys is not done at DIGSSCORE, but with a collaborating partner: Ideas2Evidence, a Bergen based analysis company who is subcontracted to do coding, fielding and data management of the NCP. Our task has not been to evaluate Ideas2Evidence, and as DIGSSCORE portrays the collaboration as very productive, we rest with that in this report. This being said, there is reason to lift the risk of underestimating the importance of struggling with the data collection when achieving good quality data when one outsources the data collection and management. One such immediate consequence that comes to mind for the University of Bergen is that the detailed knowledge of collecting and managing data is contained and developed within the private actor, rather than at the university. Again, this is a situation that DIGSSCORE shares with facilities like TESS and LISS, while the Swedish Citizen Panel is differently organized and operates within the university-based Society, Opinion and Media Institute (SOM) and performs the data collection and management at the University of Gothenburg – leading to other challenges. We do not propose any specific changes to the current organization of the data collection, but we note that the way in which data collection and management is organized will matter for the output of the infrastructure. Less focus on data collection and management will lead to more time to do and publish substantial research. More focus on data collection and management will lead to more knowledge about data quality, and more insights into the craftmanship of surveys. Some of the formulations in the background texts of the NCP seem to indicate that one aims for both. While this actually seems possible to do thanks to the strong position and support one has in the Norwegian research community, it will definitely require a thought-through strategy and data-focused research leadership. As it is now, we count to clearly more research leaders in the specific theoretical research areas compared to in the data collection part of DIGSSCORE.

It seems possible to encourage more research projects on the ongoing, earlier and future data collection of NCP, maybe in connection with the promising student courses on methods provided by the infrastructure. It seems like NCP has the potential to contribute tremendously to research on survey methods, which potentially would be beneficial to the preservation of the knowledge at the University of Bergen. As it is now, the scholars using NCP has focused more on the substantial research compared to methodological survey research. While this is probably in line with the goals of DIGSSCORE, one also sets out to establish oneself as the major hub of survey research in Norway and could focus more on that in the years ahead to ensure that the knowledge is kept within the organization.

The Citizen Lab is called the second pillar in the data collection performed at DIGSSCORE. It is a well-equipped research lab with places for as many as 32 participants. The facilities are nicely designed and welcoming. For a visitor, the building and the rooms connected to the lab looks professional and are nicely decorated.

Scholars are invited to suggest experiments that are performed on voluntary participants. There is a participant pool with about 2000 participants that are willing to participate in the experiments. These are mostly, but not only, students at the University of Bergen, thus offering a direct connection between DIGSSCORE and a variety of students at the university. The lab is used by both students and junior and senior faculty at the University of Bergen, as well as of scholars from elsewhere. The lab is not only used for research, but also for teaching method courses and internal courses for staff at the University of Bergen.

It seems obvious that the Citizen lab will continue being of high value to the University of Bergen. As yet, it is mainly used by scholars who already are comfortable with lab experiment methods in general. There is a clear potential to enlarge this part going forward, but it is not all clear what is the best strategy to encourage more use of it. It seems promising that it is used for education and student theses. Other paths would be to implement an information package to send to interested scholars in the Nordic countries, or to promote possibilities in larger international conference venues. There is also great potential for multidisciplinary work in the lab. Going forward it seems promising to further develop for example the connection between social and medical scientists using both the lab and the panel. An inspiring example is the highly placed paper in Nature and Climate using open ended Norwegian survey questions.

A last note on this first point: At the moment, the current organization seems somewhat slim when it comes to the research responsibility for the collection of the data and for setting the priorities for the data collection going ahead the coming years. It could be an interesting possibility to call for a research leader responsible for safe guarding the quality of the long-term panel, including the contact with the private company implementing the work. The process involved in the coming public procurement of contracts for data collection seems demanding. The tasks would also include making sure that the lab is used to its full potential. It is a job that likely needs to be done by someone with experience in survey and lab methodology and who can give empirical back-up to the scholars turning to DIGSSCORE.

2. Quality and quantity of research output

Regarding research output, we have mainly focused on journal articles, books/book chapters, and PhD theses published between 2014 and 2019. The overview mentions 52 journal articles for this period, 14 book chapters, a single edited volume, and 6 PhD theses.

The number of journal articles published in Level 2 journals is somewhat lower than the number published in Level 1 journal (23 vs. 29). Since the highest level only counts 20 percent of all journals, this ratio is rather good. The number of journal articles exceeds the number of book chapters. This is in line with current publications patterns, where less emphasis is put on edited volumes. Some of the articles are published in high-ranked journals such as Annual Review of Political Science, British Journal of Political Science, Comparative Political Science, Frontiers in Psychology, Nature Climate Change, Sociological Methods and Research, and Statistical Science. This is a great achievement, but there is still room for improvement regarding the number of publications in the most prestigious first tier journals.

It is comforting to note that the data are also used in PhD dissertations. It is somewhat surprising, however, that there are no research monographs among the publications. This situation probably reflects the fact that DIGSSCORE has not been in existence for many years, but it also indicates that this traditional type of publication is not prioritized. On top of the publication captured by Table 1, 24 master theses, 14 reports, and a single journal article published in 2020 have used data from DIGSSCORE.

Table 1: Number of DIGSSCORE publications by type

	Journal articles (level 2)	Journal articles (level 1 or not categorized)	Books/book chapters	PhD theses	Total
2014		1			1
2015	1				1
2016		5	1	2	8
2017	9	8	7	2	26
2018	5	6	4		15
2019	8	9	3	2	22
Total	23	29	15	6	

As expected, the number of publications was low the first years. It then increased significantly and reached an early peak in 2017. The number of journal articles and the ratio between Level 1 and Level 2 articles tend to have stabilized. The list of working papers and the mentioning of a number of submitted papers with revise and resubmit status demonstrates that the research production continues and that more publications will appear in the coming years.

Turning our focus to the type of data used in the publications, the overview in Table 2 shows that the publications have drawn on different kinds of data sources. Regarding the citizen panel data 19 have used standard survey questions, 27 have utilized survey experiments, 10 employ open text responses, and 7 have made use of time-series data. Regarding data from the Citizen lab, 3 publications have used lab experiments and 4 have been based on focus group interviews. These numbers illustrate some noteworthy discrepancies. First, articles published in Level 2 journals tend to use survey experiments. This finding underlines that studies with strong causal identification strategies, such as well-conducted survey experiments, have an advantage when it comes to getting published in broadly recognized journals. Second, among the published studies there are many more using data from the Citizen panel compared to the Citizen lab. This trend calls for further scrutiny and self-reflection by the researchers involved in DIGSSCORE. Again: Maybe there is a need for increasing the awareness of the opportunities provided by the Citizen lab? It seems that this facility is underutilized at the moment. It is also possible that DIGSSCORE has initiated what is in fact a fairly new research area for Norwegian social sciences, i.e. lab experiments. This means that coming years will include not only spreading information about the existence of the lab to scholars already competent in lab-methods, but also encouraging scholars to redirect their research

focuses to also include lab experiments. As can be seen in our description of the study programs below, this work has already begun.

Table 2: Number of articles employing different kinds of DIGSSCORE data

	Journal articles (level 2)	Journal articles (level 1 or not categorized)	Books/book chapters	PhD theses	Total
Survey question	2	9	7	1	19
Survey experiment	16	8	1	2	27
Open text	2	7	1		10
Longitudinal	2	2	1	2	7
Lab experiment	1	2			3
Focus group	1	2	1		4

3. Contributions to attracting external funding to the Faculty of Social Sciences and other research environments at University of Bergen

DIGSSCORE is mainly funded by the University of Bergen and Bergen Research Foundation. One of the goals of initiating DIGSSCORE has been to support the attraction of further external funding. It seems that DIGSSCORE has been instrumental for this purpose. Indeed, the core facility in the form of the Norwegian Citizen Panel and the Citizen Lab play a significant role in several projects located (fully or partly) at University Bergen (first and foremost the Faculty of Social Sciences), which strongly indicates its importance for developing – and implementing – competitive proposals. No less than 22 externally funded projects have collected data by the help of DIGSSCORE. Although many project proposals suggesting to use the DIGSSCORE facilities are not funded, the overall success rate tends to be quite good in comparative terms.

Interestingly, external funding at the Faculty of Social Science began to increase substantially after DIGSSCORE was established. It is unlikely that DIGSSCORE is responsible for all improvements in the figures, but it has certainly contributed to a fair share of external funds received by "local"

researchers. In that respect, it is important to note that DIGSSCORE has been (and still is) a crucial component for some of the projects, which have been granted external funding over the recent years. It is important for project proposals that DIGSSCORE signals institutional commitment and supports the feasibility of pursuing research ideas, which rely on novel data collection of high quality.

The Research Council of Norway explicitly mentioned the facilities and competences in connection to its selection of DIGSSCORE to host the Norwegian part of the European Social Survey (ESS). This survey is well-renowned for high-quality comparative data on attitudes towards society and politics in Europe. This circumstance means that the task of hosting ESS does not only secure external funding; it also signals recognition of the work already done and expectations about (or at least hope for) a long-term commitment.

Research projects relying heavily on DIGSSCORE have also been successful in connection to highly competitive FRIPRO calls. Funding has recently been secured for a large, collaborative project (TERMS), which seeks to examine the willingness of the majority population to include Muslim minorities in Western Europe, particularly in Norway, Sweden, Germany, and France. In addition, two Young Research Talents grants have been awarded to researches at University of Bergen, who use DIGSSCORE's facilities. One of them (PROLEG) explores how democratic institutions and decision-making bodies should organize decision-making procedures and implementation procedures in order to make them more legitimate in the eyes of the public. The other (IMEX) addresses how recently arrived asylum seekers have imagined and experienced Europe, and how members of local communities in Norway imagine and experience the arrival of the refugee crisis to Europe and to local communities in Norway. Finally, the citizen panel is used in a FRIPRO-funded project on individualized treatment of endometrial cancer.

DIGSSCORE has also contributed to the success of research proposals with other funding agencies. A cross-institutional project (involving researchers from University of Bergen) has received a grant from NORDFORSK to investigate to what degree Nordic democracies are resilient when terrorism appears to be threatening the safety of their citizens. In addition, two large-scale projects on regional democracy and the politics of inequality, which have strong association with DIGSSCORE and are headed by two young researchers, have secured funding from the Bergen Science Foundation.

These projects demonstrate that research proposals depending on data collection through DIGSSCORE are both internally and externally competitive. On a critical note, however, most of the extra funding tends to go to research related to one of the seven departments at the Faculty of Social Sciences, namely, Department of Comparative Politics. Initiatives to support a greater dispersion and/or increasing the number of cross-disciplinary projects might be fruitful. Moreover, the Citizen lab tends to play a less prominent part in most of the funded projects compared to the Citizen panel. Again, this imbalance signals that a stronger emphasis on the potential of lab experiments (sometimes in synergy with other approaches) is warranted. If the ideas about different kinds of panels (bureaucrats, politicians, etc.) are successfully implemented, the relevance for more researchers will increase, and this expansion is likely to help attract further external funding. From our correspondence with DIGSSCORE, it is our perception that the implementation of further such panels has already begun.

The original goal was to have half of the data collection costs funded by external sources. DIGSSCORE has even achieved to cover a larger share than expected, which illustrates the success regarding third party funding. Moreover, the fact that DIGSSCORE in 2019 has been involved as partner in three Horizon 2020 applications and a number of the additional grant proposals shows that the researchers are continuously committed to the task of attracting external funding. This ongoing focus on large-scale research proposals – combined with the previous track record – indicates that DIGSSCORE will keep being an important component in attracting external funding if it is continued. In this respect, the core facility is a valuable, local data source (and research environment) for a large number of researchers at University of Bergen, particular social scientists with an interest in public opinion data based on surveys and experiments, but with a potential also for other scholars.

4. Recruitment of PhDs and Post Docs

While DIGSSCORE is unable to announce and recruit senior-, PhD- or Post Doc positions by itself, it facilitates recruitment and career development for such positions for instance by allowing use of its data. So far, 6 PhD theses have used data from DIGSSCORE; three at University of Bergen and three internationally. Of the three PhDs produced at University of Bergen, two were affiliated with the Department of Comparative Politics and one at the Department of Information Science and Media Studies. The topics for the PhD theses covered not only survey and electoral

research, but also issues related to climate change mitigation policies, journalism and judicial issues.

Currently there are 14 PhD candidates and 10 Post Docs using DIGSSCORE data. In addition, of three Trond Mohn Foundation grants awarded to researchers at the Faculty of Social Science, two were granted to projects based on DIGSSCORE. The DIGSSCORE infrastructure has furthermore employed three research assistants since its start, of which two have moved on to a PhD position at the Faculty of Social Science and Faculty of Humanities, respectively, and both working on DIGSSCORE-related projects. The last research assistant is currently applying for a PhD. All in all, 11 out of 14 PhD candidates and 8 out of 10 Post Docs are affiliated with the Faculty of Social Science. The PhD positions are located only at two units: 7 at the Department of Comparative Politics and 4 at NORCE. The Post Docs are also distributed between the same two units, with 8 candidates at the Department of Comparative Politics and 2 at NORCE. DIGSSCORE also has its own scholarship for master students at departments affiliated with DIGSSCORE wishing to use or generate data from DIGSSCORE. During the project period, 7 scholarships have been awarded.

We would like to raise awareness of one type of challenge that seem to be present for PhDs and Post Docs who have their positions financed by the Faculty of Social Science at University of Bergen. According to the current regulations the lab is free to use if the experiments are internally financed, but if externally financed project is involved, the costs are pretty high. Hence, the present regulations seem to create disincentives for using the lab for collaboration with external researchers in Norway and abroad. At the same time, it is difficult to get specific faculty funding for experiments. It seems valuable to evaluate this going forward so as to encourage young scholars at University of Bergen to collaborate with the best in the field, and at the same time have reasonable faculty funding for the data collection.

There is some gender imbalance in the current Post Doc and PhD positions: while 8 of 11 Post Docs are males, 10 of 14 PhD candidates are females. While these positions are obviously outside the influence of DIGSSCORE, there is also a gender imbalance in the positions that are decided by DIGSSCORE: only 1 of the 7 master scholarships was male. Given the underrepresentation of women in survey and electoral research, DIGSSCORE has had a goal of increasing the female share of the research field, focusing on this in invitations to seminars and appointments that are under their control.

As for nationalities, 9 out of 11 PhDs and 4 out of 7 Post Docs are Norwegian. The non-Norwegian PhDs are from Sweden and Netherlands, respectively, while the non-Norwegian Post Docs are from USA, North Macedonia, Switzerland and Italy, which should provide a good environment for cross-national collaboration. Similarly, the mix in the candidates' background should also allow for interesting interdisciplinary collaborations, with 6 PhD candidates from political science, 3 from media science and 2 from economics. The Post Doc positions are distributed across 5 from political science, 2 from media science and 1 from economics.

Based on this, it seems fair to conclude that the DIGSSCORE infrastructure has contributed significantly to the recruitment of PhD and Post Doc positions at the Faculty of Social Science: as many as 17 PhD positions (including completed and current positions) and 8 Post Doc positions during 4 years. However, the recruitment positions are divided only between two units, and as yet DIGSSCORE has not achieve an equal recruitment across departments. In particular, given that the Department of Economics, the Department of Administration and Organization and the Department of Information Science and Media Studies all use the DIGSSCORE infrastructure in their courses, it is surprising that the Citizen lab and Citizen panel have not been more attractive also for projects in these departments. It would have been interesting to see applications that did not receive funding in order to assess the background of these applicants as well, but such information has not been available to this evaluating committee.

5. Contribution to new study programs

Given that DIGSSCORE is an infrastructure for research and data collection, its contribution to new study programs will necessarily depend on teaching resources provided from the departments. Still, in 2017 DIGSSCORE offered its own PhD course "DIGSSCORE900 Survey experiments: Design and data analysis" given by Mike Tomz, Stanford University. The course was fully subscribed and attended by candidates from all over Europe and the United States, and is also offered in 2020. DIGSSCORE is one of three organizers of the Barcelona-Gothenburg-Bergen Annual Workshop in Experimental Political Science, which is a research conference bringing together strong European social science experimentalists every year. In order to facilitate for younger scholars to participate and develop skills in experimental research, the course in experimental methods is organized by DIGSSCORE when the workshop takes place in Bergen.

At the master's level, the course "SAMPOL324 Political engagement: practical, empirical research" at the Department of Comparative Politics was offered for the first time in the spring semester of 2017. The course is taught in DIGSSCORE's own facilities, with the students using the "Citizen lab" to carry out lab experiments. The course has a limit of 15 students, and has mainly been fully subscribed: the participation 2017-2020 was 15, 12, 12 and 18 students, respectively.

In addition, the course "ECON370 Experimental economics" at the Department of Economy uses the Citizen lab to carry out experiments. While the teaching and guidance of BA and MA students has functioned fairly well in the Citizen lab, feedback from the course holders to us points to challenges due to technical aspects (ICT systems, payment routines, data base access), which has affected the quality of the courses. Similar concerns were raised regarding students writing MA theses in experimental economics, which calls for continued dialogue around this between course holders and DIGSSCORE.

The course "MEVI102 Media use: Theories and methods" at the Department of Information Science and Media Studies employs the lab for education. This course has a large number of students every year (between 80 and 90), and with 32 computers the students are divided into three groups, with each student participating in three 3 lectures a 2x45 minutes. The feedback from the course holders is that the lab has worked very good compared to other lecture rooms and computer rooms at University of Bergen, due to its fast computers, the easiness of gathering many students in the same room at the same time as offering a computer and a work desk, and its TV-screens in addition to the teaching screen. The experience is also that the students appreciate learning about the practice of research through the lab.

Other courses offered in collaboration with or based on DIGSSCORE include AORG321 "Quantitative methods" at the Department of Administration and Organization Theory and GHIG923 "Quantitative methods: Survey construction and measurement" at the Faculty of Psychology. A simplified version of the Citizen panel data set is also regularly used for teaching in the course "MET102 Methods in social science". In terms of contributing to new study programs, DIGSSCORE can therefore be considered quite successful: both the courses DIGSSCORE900 and SAMPOL324 is a direct result of it, and several courses are using the lab or data set for teaching. Moreover, the use of DIGSSCORE for teaching is fairly well distributed

across the departments of the Faculty of Social Sciences, although there is obvious room for improvement, since neither geography, social anthropology nor sociology offer any courses associated with DIGSSCORE.

DIGSSCORE furthermore supplements the existing educational program for young researchers and master students at the Faculty of Social Science through an active and inclusive research environment. This includes a weekly seminar for master students, PhD students and Post Docs about topics relevant to the DIGSSCORE network, as well as an annual seminar. While the recruitment of PhDs and Post Docs is accounted for above, DIGSSCORE also has a high success rate in terms of producing master theses: since its start, as many as 24 master theses have used its data. The research issues span a wide variety of topics, ranging from political trust and political behaviour to climate change and terrorism. The majority of the master theses have been delivered at the Department of Comparative Politics (10) and Department of Economics (6).

Korrigering av avsnitt side 11 i DIGSSCORE evalueringsrapporten

I rapporten side 11, avsnitt som starter med "Currently there are 14 PhD candidates and 10 Post Docs using DIGSSCORE data." står det:

"All in all, 11 out of 14 PhD candidates and 8 out of 10 Post Docs are affiliated with the Faculty of Social Science. The PhD positions are located only at two units: 7 at the Department of Comparative Politics and 4 at NORCE. The Post Docs are also distributed between the same two units, with 8 candidates at the Department of Comparative Politics and 2 at NORCE."

Eter en faktasjekk foreslår DIGSSCORE et revidert avsnitt som en mer presis beskrivelse:

"All in all, 11 out of 14 PhD candidates and 8 out of 10 Post Docs are affiliated with the Faculty of Social Science. The PhD positions are located at three units: 6 at the Department of Comparative Politics, 2 at the Department of Economics and 3 at the Department of Information Science and Media Studies. The Post Docs at the Social Science Faculty are located at the same three units, with 5 at the Department of comparative politics, 1 from the Department of Economics and 2 at the Department of Information Science and Media studies. In addition, there are two other PhD-candidates located in Bergen, at other faculties (Faculty of Humanities and Faculty of Psychology), and two other postdocs located in Bergen (at the Faculty of Psychology and NORCE)."