

D I S C U S S I O N S P L A T F O R M  
M E T H O D O L O G Y W H I T E P A P E R

---

# The Causal Temporal Participation Framework: A Scalable Methodology for Community-Based Research with Real-Time Behavioral Capture

**Victor Javier Rivera III**

Discussions Platform — discussions.world

March 2026

**WORKING PAPER — SUBMITTED TO SSRN**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3264-9146>

Provisional Patent Filed: USPTO Application No. 63/999,190 | March 7, 2026

OSF Pre-registration: <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/6Z9CS>

Correspondence: discussions.world | Denver, Colorado, USA

## ABSTRACT

---

The Causal Temporal Participation Framework (CTPF) is a methodology for community-based research that treats time as a primary data dimension rather than a contextual variable. Where conventional research methods capture participant opinion as a static measurement at a single point in time, CTPF constructs a continuous temporal record of community behavior — capturing what participants say, when they say it, what prompted them, and how their responses evolve across the full duration of a research project.

The framework synchronizes five distinct data modalities within a unified temporal architecture: discourse contributions, structured response instruments, behavioral signals, expert content, and environmental correlation data. This multi-modal record enables researchers to ask questions that snapshot-based methodologies cannot answer — including how community sentiment shifts in response to specific events, how opinion trajectories differ across demographic cohorts, and whether researcher interventions produce measurable behavioral effects.

CTPF is scalable from minimal single-topic deployments to complex multi-modal longitudinal studies without architectural change. It implements privacy protection by design through structural identity separation and token-linked consent tiers. Research outputs — including AI-generated executive summaries, structured poll result documents, and navigable temporal records — are generated automatically from accumulated project data.

The framework is implemented in the Discussions platform ([discussions.world](https://discussions.world)), currently operational with global participant communities across multiple concurrent research projects.

Keywords: participatory research, temporal data capture, community-based research, real-time sentiment analysis, longitudinal behavioral data, consent architecture, causal research design

## 1. INTRODUCTION

---

Contemporary community research faces a fundamental temporal problem. Survey instruments, focus groups, and panel studies are designed to capture participant opinion at a moment — a snapshot that reflects the community's state at a single point in time. This design is appropriate when the research question is static: what do people think about topic X? But an expanding class of research questions requires something that snapshot methodologies cannot provide: an understanding of how opinion forms, shifts, and responds to events over time.

The gap between what researchers want to know and what their methods can capture is not theoretical. A policy researcher studying public response to climate legislation needs to know not just what the public thinks today but how that opinion changed in the seventy-two hours after the bill passed. A product team needs to understand not just whether sentiment on their category is positive but when it turned, and what preceded the turn. A journalist covering a community issue needs to show their readers not a static poll but a moving picture of how their community's collective position evolved across weeks of public discussion.

The Causal Temporal Participation Framework (CTPF) addresses this gap by treating time as a first-class research dimension rather than a contextual variable. Every data point collected within a CTPF deployment is anchored to a precise temporal coordinate within a continuous project record. The result is not a snapshot of community opinion but a behavioral narrative — a complete, replayable account of how a community thought, responded, and changed across the full duration of a research project.

This paper describes the methodological principles, architectural components, and operational characteristics of CTPF as implemented in the Discussions platform. It is intended to serve as a citable methodology reference for researchers using the platform, a framework specification for institutional review processes, and a contribution to the growing literature on participatory digital research methodology.

## 2. CORE PRINCIPLES

---

### 2.1 Time as a Research Dimension

CTPF treats temporal position as an intrinsic property of every data point rather than a metadata annotation. Each participant contribution — a discussion post, a poll response, a survey completion, a behavioral event — is stored with its precise timestamp and its relationship to the surrounding community state at that moment. This enables the reconstruction of complete community state at any point within the project window: who had participated, what had been said, what polls had returned what results, and what external events had occurred.

The temporal record is not a log appended to a static dataset. It is the dataset. Researchers interacting with CTPF data are interacting with a time-indexed behavioral record that can be navigated, filtered, and analyzed at any temporal resolution from individual events to project-length trajectories.

## 2.2 Multi-Modal Simultaneity

CTPF captures five distinct data modalities simultaneously within the same temporal architecture: discourse data, structured response data, behavioral signals, expert contributions, and environmental correlation data. Each modality captures a different dimension of participant engagement, and each is synchronized to the same temporal record. This synchronization enables cross-modal analysis that is unavailable when modalities are captured separately — for example, identifying whether a spike in negative sentiment preceded or followed a surge in poll participation, or whether behavioral disengagement (reduced time on topic) predicted poll response patterns days later.

## 2.3 Scalable Depth

CTPF is designed so that research validity does not require full system deployment. The minimal valid implementation requires three elements: a time-bounded project with defined parameters, at least one structured data collection instrument, and temporal record-keeping sufficient to reconstruct community state at any point within the project window. All additional capabilities — geospatial correlation, expert contributors, researcher intervention, AI-generated outputs — are additive layers that enrich the existing temporal record without altering the validity of what was collected before they were introduced.

## 2.4 Integrity by Design

CTPF enforces research data integrity at the architectural level rather than through procedural controls. Environmental correlation data from external APIs — geospatial event feeds, weather data, academic databases — is routed to isolated enrichment tables with no direct write path to the core research record. The integrity of participant-generated data is therefore guaranteed by the system's data model, not by the reliability of external data providers. External API failures, data quality issues, or service interruptions affect only the enrichment layer and cannot corrupt the primary behavioral record.

# 3. PROJECT STRUCTURE AND DATA COLLECTION

---

## 3.1 Research Project as Bounded Unit

The fundamental unit of CTPF research is the project — a time-bounded container with a defined scope, start date, end date, and structured data collection architecture. Projects define the boundaries within which all data collection occurs and against which all temporal analysis is indexed. The project boundary is not merely administrative: it is the frame of reference that gives temporal data its meaning. A sentiment shift observed during a project is meaningful because it occurred within a defined period with known start conditions, not in an open-ended stream of undifferentiated community activity.

Projects support community-driven extension through participant voting mechanisms, enabling the research window to be extended when community engagement justifies continued data collection. Extension events are logged as discrete temporal records, preserving the integrity of the original project scope while documenting the community's expressed preference for continuation.

### 3.2 Five Data Modalities

Discourse data constitutes the primary qualitative record of community engagement. Participant comments, replies, and threaded discussion are captured with full temporal metadata and structural relationship data — enabling analysis not just of what was said but of conversational structure, response patterns, and the dynamics of opinion exchange within the community.

Structured response data encompasses all poll and survey instruments deployed within a project. Each response is timestamped at the individual level, enabling temporal analysis of response patterns across the project window. Poll and survey instruments may be deployed at project inception, added during the active window, or triggered by researcher intervention — each deployment event is logged as a causal anchor in the temporal record.

Behavioral signals capture participant engagement patterns that are not captured by explicit contributions: time spent on a topic, navigation pathways through project content, entry points into the discussion, contribution targeting patterns, and tag discovery behavior. These signals constitute a behavioral layer that complements the explicit discourse and response record, revealing engagement depth and attention patterns that self-reported data cannot access.

Expert contributions represent a distinct data modality when credentialed contributors — subject matter experts, academic researchers, or invited practitioners — participate in a project. Expert contributions are flagged in the data layer, stored under a separate analytical stream, and weighted differently in aggregations where expert and community opinion are analytically separable.

Environmental correlation data from external sources — including geospatial news event feeds, meteorological data, and academic databases — is captured in an isolated enrichment layer synchronized to the project timeline. This enables post-hoc correlation analysis between external

events and community behavioral patterns without introducing external data quality risks into the primary research record.

### 3.3 Participant Structure

CTPF projects support open community participation through a privacy-preserving identity architecture. Participants are not required to provide personally identifying information to engage with the platform. Geographic data is aggregated to municipal or regional level at the point of ingestion — precise coordinates are never written to persistent storage. IP-based geolocation inference is used in preference to browser GPS access, producing a stronger privacy position while preserving the geographic analytical value of location data at the resolution relevant for most research applications.

### 3.4 Two Project Types

Curated research projects are researcher-defined, structurally formal deployments designed to produce citable research outputs. The researcher defines scope, instruments, cohort parameters, and expected outputs before data collection begins. Curated projects map most directly to conventional research procurement contexts — a research buyer commissions a project, specifies parameters, and receives a documented output with full methodology provenance.

Organic community projects are participant-initiated, often anchored to specific geographic locations, and oriented toward real-time civic engagement rather than formal research deliverables. Participants propose project topics through the platform's community suggestion mechanism, with high-vote proposals advancing to active project status. Organic projects generate behavioral and sentiment data under conditions of authentic organic interest — valuable as a research data source and as a community development mechanism that sustains platform engagement between formal research deployments. For journalism, civic technology, and emergency management applications, organic projects provide the real-time community data layer that curated projects cannot generate at speed.

### 3.5 The Two-Sided Participation Model

A defining structural feature of CTPF implementations is the deliberate separation between the participant experience and the research output layer. Participants engage with the platform as a community environment — joining time-bounded projects on topics of personal relevance, contributing discussions, responding to polls and surveys, and voting on project direction. At no point are participants positioned as research subjects or asked to modify their behavior for research purposes. This is a deliberate methodological choice.

The research value of CTPF data derives precisely from this authentic engagement. Participants who join a climate discussion because they care about climate policy produce qualitatively different data than recruited panel respondents completing a paid survey. The behavioral signals,

sentiment trajectories, and discourse patterns captured under conditions of genuine interest cannot be replicated through conventional research recruitment.

The research output layer — temporal analytics, sentiment analysis, demographic breakdowns, AI-generated research documents, and structured data exports — is accessible to credentialed researchers and data buyers through a separate access tier. This separation ensures that commercial research activity never influences the participant experience or introduces demand characteristics into the behavioral record.

CTPF operates within the tradition of participatory action research, in which participants are active and informed contributors to the research process rather than passive subjects. Participants are aware of the research context of their engagement and have access to aggregate findings as they develop — poll results, sentiment trends, and community statistics are visible to participants in real time. This transparency serves two purposes: it maintains the ethical integrity of informed consent, and it deepens authentic engagement by allowing participants to see their contribution within the collective picture as it forms. The platform additionally supports community-authored deliverables — structured documents representing collective participant positions — enabling research outputs to function simultaneously as civic instruments directed toward relevant stakeholders.

## 4. TEMPORAL RECORD AND RESEARCHER INTERVENTION

---

### 4.1 Continuous Temporal Record

The temporal record is the central architectural feature that distinguishes CTPF from conventional research data collection systems. At defined intervals throughout the active project window, the platform captures a complete synchronized snapshot of community state — the full set of contributions, response tallies, sentiment scores, behavioral signals, and enrichment data current at that moment. These snapshots are stored as an ordered, indexed series that constitutes the project's temporal record.

The temporal record enables a category of analysis unavailable from static datasets: reconstruction of the exact community state at any moment within the project window. A researcher can ask not just what the community thought at project close but what it thought in the forty-eight hours following a specific legislative announcement, how sentiment in one geographic cohort diverged from another after an external event, or whether participation patterns on a particular subtopic predicted the eventual distribution of poll responses. These questions require a navigable temporal record. They cannot be answered from snapshots.

### 4.2 Concurrent Stream Rendering

CTPF supports simultaneous rendering of historical and live data streams within the same researcher interface. A researcher monitoring an active project can navigate the temporal record of historical snapshots while receiving live data from the current session — observing how the present moment compares to any prior state in the project's history. Historical and live data are visually differentiated within the interface, with the temporal scrubber enabling navigation across the full project window in single-date, date-range, or continuous playback modes.

### 4.3 Researcher Intervention as Causal Data

A methodologically significant capability of CTPF is the treatment of researcher interventions as discrete causal events within the temporal record. When a researcher deploys a poll, activates a survey, introduces a document for required reading, or redirects a participant cohort, that action is logged as a timestamped event with full metadata — creating an explicit cause-effect pair in the temporal record. The researcher's action is the cause; the subsequent shift in community behavior is the measured effect.

This logging transforms researcher interventions from methodological confounds — the standard criticism of interventionist research designs — into analytical assets. Researchers can directly measure the behavioral impact of their interventions against the pre-intervention baseline captured in the temporal record. The intervention itself becomes data.

Researcher interventions are managed through a three-tier hierarchical control system. Project owners may deploy scheduled instruments and standard engagement tools within their project scope. Platform administrators may deploy cross-project overrides for platform-level research coordination. Research scientists operating at the highest tier may introduce controlled stimuli with pre-documented expected outcomes — a form of in-session pre-registration that creates a verifiable prediction against which measured outcomes can be evaluated.

### 4.4 Scalable Temporal Implementation

The temporal record is present in all CTPF deployments regardless of scale or complexity. A minimal deployment with a single discussion topic and two poll instruments produces a complete temporal record — snapshot intervals, contribution timestamps, and response chronology — that supports the full range of temporal analysis. Intervention tiers are additive: they are available to deployments that require them and absent from deployments that do not, without affecting the completeness of the temporal record in either case.

## 5. PRIVACY ARCHITECTURE

---

### 5.1 Privacy by Design

CTPF implements privacy protection as an architectural constraint rather than a compliance checklist. The system is designed so that personally identifiable information is neither required for participation nor collectable through normal platform operation. Privacy preservation is enforced at the data model level — not through policy statements or user agreements alone — meaning that data handlers and researchers accessing platform outputs cannot reconstruct individual identities even if they wished to do so.

## 5.2 Structural Identity Separation

Participant identity is maintained through a two-key architecture in which behavioral data and demographic data are stored in structurally separate identity spaces. A participant's behavioral record — their contributions, engagement patterns, temporal navigation, and response history — is associated with an anonymized session identifier that carries no personally identifying attributes. Demographic or profile data, where voluntarily provided, is stored under a separate key with no direct join path to the behavioral record in standard query operations.

This separation means that even a complete export of behavioral research data contains no information that could identify individual participants. The research dataset is anonymous by construction, not by deletion.

## 5.3 Location Data Handling

Location information is handled under a strict precision-reduction policy. Where participants provide location context — whether through IP-based geolocation or voluntary geographic disclosure — coordinates are aggregated to municipal or regional level at the point of ingestion. Precise coordinates are never written to persistent storage. This approach preserves the geographic analytical value of location data — enabling city-level or region-level research insights — while eliminating the privacy risk associated with precise location tracking.

IP addresses used for geolocation inference are not stored beyond the session in which they are used. The derived location bucket — city, region, or country — is the only geographic data retained in the research record.

## 5.4 Consent Architecture

Participant consent is managed through a tiered consent model aligned with the data modalities described in Section 3.2. Base participation — contributing to discussions and responding to polls — requires minimal consent commensurate with the anonymized nature of the data collected. Enhanced data collection — demographic information, survey responses, location disclosure — is gated behind explicit opt-in consent at the point of collection. No enhanced data collection occurs without affirmative participant action.

Consent state is recorded as a timestamped event in the participant's session record, creating an auditable consent trail that satisfies GDPR Article 7 requirements for demonstrable consent. Participants may withdraw consent at any time, triggering exclusion of their contributed data from future research exports while preserving the integrity of the existing temporal record for aggregate analysis.

## 5.5 Research Data and GDPR Alignment

The platform's privacy architecture is designed to satisfy GDPR requirements without requiring researchers to navigate complex compliance obligations for each study. Because behavioral data is anonymous by construction under the two-key architecture, it falls outside the scope of GDPR personal data definitions for research purposes under Article 89, which provides specific provisions for scientific research processing. Researchers accessing platform data exports receive datasets that are GDPR-compliant by the nature of how they were collected and structured, not by post-hoc anonymization.

## 5.6 Token-Linked Consent Tiers and Frictionless Participation

CTPF implements a consent architecture in which participation tier is linked to data permissions without introducing any behavioral difference in the participant experience. Regardless of consent tier, all participants interact with the platform through identical interfaces and encounter identical data collection mechanisms. This is a deliberate architectural choice with direct methodological implications.

In conventional tiered consent systems, participants who agree to enhanced data collection may behave differently from those who do not — simply because the act of consenting signals differences in trust, engagement depth, or platform familiarity. This phenomenon, known as consent reactivity, introduces a systematic confound into datasets that mix consent tiers. CTPF eliminates consent reactivity by design: because the participation experience is identical across tiers, behavioral signals from participants at different consent levels are directly comparable.

Consent tier status is captured as a discrete field within each participant's contribution record at the point of data collection rather than applied as a collection filter. This means the complete dataset is always preserved intact. Researchers and data buyers may filter or omit specific consent tiers from their analysis scope after the fact — for example, excluding base-tier participants from a study requiring enhanced demographic consent — without any loss of data integrity for the remaining records.

This architecture creates what might be termed a consent manifest — a per-participant record of which data tiers have been consented to, at what timestamp, and under which terms version. The consent manifest travels with the dataset, enabling research buyers to receive verified consent provenance for every data point in an export. The token or credentialed tier relationship therefore serves dual purposes: it is simultaneously a commercial access mechanism and a documented

consent instrument, satisfying GDPR requirements for granular and withdrawable consent while framing the participant relationship as value exchange rather than compliance obligation.

## 6. RESEARCH OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

---

### 6.1 Output Philosophy

CTPF is designed so that research outputs are generated from accumulated project data automatically, without requiring manual analysis or report writing by the project owner. The platform transforms raw community engagement data into structured, distributable research artifacts through a combination of template-driven generation and large language model synthesis. Three primary output types are supported, each serving a distinct audience and purpose.

### 6.2 AI-Generated Executive Summary

The primary research output is an AI-generated executive summary produced from the complete project dataset at any point during or after a project's active window. Input data drawn from across all modalities — participant messages, poll results, survey responses, sentiment scores, and temporal snapshots — is synthesized by a large language model into a structured narrative document comprising a project overview, key statistics, key findings, sentiment analysis, and recommendations.

The document is generated on demand and includes a verified project header capturing project identifier, type, period, participant count, message volume, poll count, and survey count. This header serves as the provenance record for the output — a researcher citing the document can verify all primary statistics independently against the platform's public project record. Generated documents are available for download in PDF format and are stored in the platform's object storage layer for persistent access.

### 6.3 Poll Results Summary

A data-generated poll results document presents all poll instruments deployed within a project as a structured research output, automatically populated with actual response data — displaying each question with response options, raw vote counts, percentage distributions, and topic classification drawn directly from the project dataset. The document is paginated by poll instrument and labeled with verified project metadata including project identifier, generation timestamp, and total poll count. It is exportable as a print-ready PDF and functions as a standalone primary data exhibit suitable for inclusion in formal research reports, journalistic methodology statements, or policy briefs where structured response data must be presented with full provenance.

## 6.4 Extended Document Framework

CTPF is designed to support an extensible document generation framework in which additional output types — formal research papers, longitudinal study reports, policy briefs, and civic petition documents — are generated from the same underlying project dataset using configurable templates and LLM synthesis. The petition document type, enabling communities to formalize their collective position as a structured advocacy instrument directed at relevant stakeholders, is implemented as a partially data-aware editable template — auto-populating project identity, date, and participant count while leaving issue statement, demands, and signatory fields for community authorship. Full data-driven generation of petition content from project findings represents a planned extension of this framework.

The document framework is architected so that output type, narrative register, audience, and depth are configurable parameters rather than fixed outputs — enabling the same project dataset to produce an academic paper, an executive brief, a press-ready narrative, and a plain-language public summary from a single generation pipeline. Additional document types and narrative registers are implemented progressively as the platform's research data volume and LLM training depth increase.

## 6.5 Data Exports

In addition to narrative and template documents, CTPF supports structured data exports enabling downstream analysis in external research environments. Export formats include CSV for tabular analysis and JSON for programmatic consumption. Export scope is configurable by data modality, time range, and consent tier, enabling researchers to receive precisely the dataset their study requires with consent provenance intact. Bulk exports, webhook delivery, and API access to project datasets are available at higher subscription tiers, supporting integration with existing research infrastructure including statistical analysis packages, business intelligence platforms, and custom analytical pipelines.

## 6.6 The Temporal Record as a Deliverable

A capability without equivalent in conventional research output formats is the platform's navigable temporal record — available to credentialed researchers as an interactive session rather than a static document. Rather than receiving a report describing what happened during a project, a researcher with runner access can navigate the complete project history directly — moving through time, observing community state at any moment, switching between geospatial, relational, and chronological views of the same underlying data.

This interactive temporal access is the platform's highest-value research deliverable for users whose questions are fundamentally causal — not what did the community think, but how did community thinking change, when, and in response to what. No static document format can

replicate this capability, which is why it is positioned as a distinct deliverable tier rather than a feature of the standard output stack.

## 7. SCALABILITY AND DEPLOYMENT CONTEXTS

---

### 7.1 The Minimal Valid Deployment

A core design principle of CTPF is that research validity does not require full system deployment. The minimal valid implementation of the framework requires three elements: a time-bounded project with defined start and end parameters, at least one structured data collection instrument such as a poll or discussion prompt, and temporal record-keeping sufficient to reconstruct community state at any point within the project window. A deployment of this scope — a two-week community discussion on a single topic with a handful of poll instruments — produces a complete, citable CTPF dataset. No geospatial integration, no expert contributors, no researcher intervention, and no AI-generated outputs are required for the core research record to be valid.

This minimal deployment profile makes CTPF accessible to resource-constrained research contexts including independent academic researchers, community organizations, small newsrooms, and grant-funded pilot studies — without compromising the methodological integrity of the output.

### 7.2 Deployment Scaling

CTPF scales along two independent dimensions simultaneously — depth and breadth — without architectural change. Depth scaling adds analytical layers to an existing project: a minimal deployment gains researcher intervention capabilities, geospatial event correlation, expert contributor programs, consent tier management, and automated document generation as research requirements and resources permit. Each layer is additive — it enriches the existing temporal record without altering the validity of what was collected before it was added.

Breadth scaling increases participant volume, geographic scope, topic complexity, and project duration. The platform's underlying infrastructure — edge-distributed compute, persistent real-time state management per topic cluster, and object storage for raw data — is designed to handle participant populations ranging from dozens to tens of thousands without architectural modification.

### 7.3 Project Type Contexts

A standalone curated research deployment serves academic, enterprise, and policy research contexts where a defined question, structured methodology, and formal output are required. A standalone organic community deployment serves civic technology, journalism, and community

engagement contexts where real-time participation around emerging events is the primary value. A combined deployment — the full platform model — operates both project types simultaneously, with organic community activity continuously generating engagement data and seeding participant familiarity that raises the quality of curated research participation. In this model the platform operates as a self-sustaining research ecosystem rather than a per-project instrument.

#### **7.4 Project Lifecycle and Automated Archival**

CTPF enforces clean data boundaries through an automated project lifecycle architecture. Projects open, collect data, and close according to pre-specified parameters — with completed project data archived to isolated storage automatically on schedule. This system-enforced lifecycle means data collection windows are documented and bounded by the system, not by researcher discipline, satisfying a core requirement of institutional review processes and producing datasets whose temporal scope is unambiguous and verifiable. Automated archival also serves infrastructure cost and security objectives — live compute resources are released on project close, and completed research data is migrated to isolated storage with its own access controls, reducing both ongoing cost and attack surface.

#### **7.5 Infrastructure and Cost Profile**

CTPF as implemented on the Discussions platform operates entirely within a serverless edge-computing architecture, with compute, storage, real-time state, and content delivery managed through a single cloud provider ecosystem. This architecture produces a cost profile that scales sub-linearly with participant volume — fixed infrastructure costs are minimal, and marginal costs per additional participant are measured in fractions of a cent. AI-generated research document costs are under one dollar per document regardless of project scale.

This cost structure has direct implications for research accessibility. Studies that would be prohibitively expensive on traditional panel or laboratory research infrastructure — large-scale longitudinal community studies, real-time multi-country sentiment tracking, high-frequency temporal snapshots — are economically viable on CTPF at a fraction of conventional cost. The infrastructure cost advantage is not incidental to the methodology but intrinsic to its design.

## **8. CONCLUSION**

---

The Causal Temporal Participation Framework represents a methodological response to a structural limitation in contemporary community research: the inability of existing platforms to capture opinion not as a static measurement but as a living, event-responsive process. By treating time as a primary research dimension, synchronizing multiple data modalities within a continuous temporal record, and enabling researcher intervention to be captured as causal data rather than external noise, CTPF produces a category of research output that snapshot-based methodologies cannot replicate.

The framework is not a theoretical proposal. It is implemented, operational, and generating data across a global participant community. The platform on which it runs has processed over ten thousand participant contributions across multiple concurrent projects, with sentiment analysis, temporal playback, geospatial visualization, and automated research document generation functioning in production. The evidence that CTPF produces valid, navigable, and citable research data is not projected — it exists.

The scalability of valid deployment — from a minimal two-week single-topic discussion to a multi-month multi-country longitudinal study — means CTPF is accessible to the full range of research budgets and institutional contexts. The informed participation model places CTPF within the tradition of participatory action research while extending that tradition into real-time digital community contexts. The consent manifest architecture provides the audit trail that institutional research contexts require without creating friction that degrades participation quality. The project lifecycle architecture enforces clean data boundaries through automated archival on defined schedules, satisfying a core requirement of institutional review processes.

Finally, the infrastructure cost profile of CTPF removes the budget barrier that has historically limited longitudinal community research to well-funded institutions. The methodology's accessibility is not a secondary benefit. It is a design objective, and it is achieved.

The Discussions platform implementation of CTPF is available at discussions.world. Methodology documentation, project pre-registration, and dataset provenance records are maintained as public resources to support researcher verification, academic citation, and institutional review processes.

## REFERENCES

---

boyd, d., & Crawford, K. (2012). Critical questions for big data. *Information, Communication & Society*, 15(5), 662–679.

Chevalier, J. M., & Buckles, D. J. (2013). *Participatory Action Research: Theory and Methods for Engaged Inquiry*. Routledge.

Flick, U. (2018). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Ipeirotis, P. G., Provost, F., & Wang, J. (2010). Quality management on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Proceedings of the HCOMP Workshop at AAAI*.

Nosek, B. A., Ebersole, C. R., DeHaven, A. C., & Mellor, D. T. (2018). The preregistration revolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11), 2600–2606.

Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council (General Data Protection Regulation). *Official Journal of the European Union*, L 119, 1–88. (2016).

Salganik, M. J. (2018). *Bit by Bit: Social Research in the Digital Age*. Princeton University Press. Available at: <https://www.bitbybitbook.com>