

# Evaluation of Counter Hate Speech Campaigns

Evaluation author: Ioli Campos, PhD

Commissioning organization: Minority Rights Group Europe



Co-funded by the European Union's Rights,  
Equality and Citizenship Programme (REC 2014 – 2020)

# Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

Project name: Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyber-hate against Roma REC-RRAC-ONLINE-AG-2017

Geographical coverage: Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia

Duration: June 2018-May 2020

Evaluation author: Ioli Campos, PhD

Commissioning organization: Minority Rights Group Europe

Co-funded by the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme of the European Union

First evaluation draft report completion date: 17 May 2019



This report was co-funded by the European Union's Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme (REC 2014-2020). The content of the report represents only the views of the Author and is her sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.



Co-funded by the European Union's Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme (REC 2014 – 2020)

# Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

## List of acronyms and abbreviations

CSOs – Civil Society Organisations

EU – European Union

FHI – Forum for Human Rights, the Czech Republic’s partner organization (Fórum pro lidská práva, z. s.)

FB – Facebook

HRI – Human Rights Institute, the Slovak’s partner organization (Institut ľudských prav)

MRGE – Minority Rights Group Europe

NGOs – Non-Governmental Organizations

RNV – Roma National Council, the Croatian partner’s organization (Romsko nacionalno vijeće)

TOR – Terms of Reference



# Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

## Table of Contents

List of acronyms and abbreviations .....	iii
Executive summary .....	v
Introduction .....	1
Description of the Project .....	2
Need and purpose of the evaluation .....	3
Approach and methodology .....	3
Findings .....	5
Projects.....	5
Bulgaria .....	5
Croatia.....	6
Czech Republic .....	8
Hungary.....	10
Slovakia .....	11
Outcomes and outputs .....	13
Conclusions .....	17
General recommendations .....	18
Annex 1: ToR provided by MRGE .....	20
Annex 2: Evaluation plan provided by evaluator .....	24
Evaluation plan of counter hate speech campaigns .....	24
Annex 2: Evaluator’s bio .....	29
Annex 3: Template provided for the pre-training country research on online anti-Roma hate speech provided by MRGE to each project partner.....	30
Annex 4: Campaignplan template provided by MRGE to each project partner .....	32
Annex 5: Template of the monitoring report from MRGE.....	35
Annex 6: Template provided for campaign final report provided by MRGE to each project partner.....	37
Annex 7: Template to gather data from the campaigns provided by MRGE to each project partner .....	39
Annex 8: Question guidelines for interviews with Project Partners elaborated and used by the Evaluator .....	40
Annex 9: Contact template for beneficiaries elaborated and used by the evaluator .....	41



# Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

## Executive Summary

This report is the result of an evaluation of five digital campaigns to counteract hate speech against Roma communities in five Eastern European countries. The campaigns are part of the project Freedom from Hate, coordinated by Minority Rights Group Europe (MRGE) and co-funded by the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme of the European Union. The project aims to increase positive and accurate narratives about Roma communities online and enhance understanding of effective ways of dealing with online hate speech. Each campaign was designed and implemented by each project partner, under MRGE coordination. Those partners were civil society organizations from Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovak. They had different levels of expertise regarding digital campaigning, but most were knowledgeable on the topic of Roma communities.

The purpose of this evaluation was to assess each campaign overall, review and extract key learning about the successes and challenges of each campaign, make recommendations based on those lessons learned, and elaborate a report to be used internally and externally to foster greater learning. Evaluation questions examined the processes, the campaign design and implementation, their dissemination and impact, risks, challenges and successes.

Although some campaigns obtained wider coverage and impact than others, most of them achieved the overall goals and specific objectives they set out at the beginning. Additionally, all partners were able to extract key learnings from this experience, having increased their organization's capacity of designing and implementing campaigns.

From the analysis of the whole process – including the instruments and methods used by the project coordinator, as well as the processes, outcomes and outputs produced by each project partner – there were several key learnings that inspired some recommendations that may be useful not only for the partners involved in this project but also for other CSOs and stakeholders interested in implementing a similar campaign. Those recommendations are:

- In a digital campaign with several partner countries involved, consider creating common materials and strategies to increase the campaign's implementation visibility, even if there is a local approach to it in terms of topics and dissemination.
- In a campaign that puts together partners from several countries, it is important to create strategies of interaction among partners during the whole process to increase learning among partners.
- Carefully research the topic before starting planning a campaign on hate speech.
- Use positive stories that create empathy among the target audience.
- Choose the medium your target audience is using the most and adapt your message to the language used by that medium.
- Fine-tune the linkage between the overall goal, the target, the outputs and the specific objectives; and while defining the objectives consider going beyond social media metrics.
- Consider the risk of a backlash to your campaign and while planning the campaign, also prepare a serious strategy as to how to react to negative comments.



## **Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma**

- Consider complementing social media analytics with other impact measures when defining the specific objectives.



# Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

## Introduction

*“Racism directed towards Roma is deeply rooted in Europe; it is persistent both historically and geographically; in many countries, it is systematic and accepted by virtually the whole society and is often accompanied by acts of violence.”*

Council of Europe in [Thematic report on combating anti-Gypsyism, hate speech and hate crime against Roma](#)

The programme Freedom from Hate is working with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in five Eastern European countries – Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia – to develop campaigns, which counteract hate speech against Roma communities living in those same countries. Some of the actions foreseen by the programme include training partner CSOs on countering hate speech online, testing strategies by implementing counter narrative campaigns, evaluating campaigns to identify best practices, roundtable discussion with CSOs and IT companies, producing YouTube videos about lessons learned, training of trainers session for CSOs and multiplier trainings for other activities.

The above-mentioned campaigns were held online from each project partner country, in the period January-May 2019. This evaluation started on 15 April 2019 and it ends 17 June 2019. The evaluation aim is to assess each campaign and extract key learnings and recommendations for future actions.

The programme coordinator is Minority Rights Group Europe and the programme is co-funded by the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme of the European Union. The following are the project partner CSOs:

- Amalipe Center za mezhdnetnicheski dialog i tolerantnost (Center for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance), based in Bulgaria.
- Institut ľudských prav (Human Rights Institute), based in Slovakia.
- Romedia Alapitvány, based in Hungary.
- Romsko nacionalno vijeće (The Roma National Council, RNC), based in Croatia.
- Fórum pro lidská práva, z. s. (Forum for Human Rights), based in Czech Republic.

The goals of this evaluation are to assess each partner’s campaign overall, to review and extract key learnings about the success and challenges of each campaign, to make recommendations based on the lessons learned from the campaigns. This evaluation report is to be used internally as well as publicly. In that sense, and according to the ToR, this report is to be widely disseminated amongst CSOs in the EU, to foster greater learning, in the second phase of the project.



# Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

## Description of the Project

As Roma are the largest minority in Europe, one of the starting points for the project Freedom from Hate was the general sentiment of anti-Gypsyism that is felt all around the continent, another important point that supported the creation of this project was the rise of hate speech in online platforms.

The project has several objectives as stated in the introduction and its planned duration as a whole is 24 months. One of those objectives, which is the focus of this evaluation in particular, was to develop and implement effective counter narrative campaigns targeting hate speech against Roma in Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia, and across Europe. Ultimately, 50,000 Internet users who follow perpetrators of hate speech could benefit from access to alternative narratives.

The expected results as defined in the abstract of selected proposals to the call REC-RRAC-ONLINE-AG-2017 were:

- Strengthen the capacity of CSOs in target countries to counter online hate speech against Roma through designing and implementing counter narrative campaigns.
- Increase the availability and dissemination of positive and accurate narratives about Roma communities online.
- Enhance the understanding of good practices in using balanced narratives to counter online hate speech among key stakeholders.

Among the five counter narrative campaigns, a minimum of 30 online products were expected as output.

To implement the project, the project coordinator (MRGE) started by asking the project partners to conduct a preliminary country research, assessing (1) the legal framework of hate speech in each country, (2) statistical data on cyber hate, (3) the main messages of hate perpetrators against Roma, (4) its audiences and (5) main platforms. This document was due to be prepared and delivered by September 2018. After that, in October, all partners gathered in person in a kick-off meeting which was followed by a four-day training held by a trainer of the Media Diversity Institute about digital campaigns and countering hate speech. This was the only moment when all project partners and the coordinator were physically together as a group. Next, the project coordinator organized monthly Skype meetings with all project partners.

Then, MRGE asked each project partner to identify and analyse one oppressive narrative in their country, considering ways of countering those messages. Then MRGE asked partners to plan the campaign strategy on that topic, following a set of guiding questions provided by the project coordinator. A template of that document is included as an annex of this report. Some of the points of that template included target, overall goal, specific objectives, message, messenger, channels of dissemination, content format, risk assessment, execution timeline, monitoring and evaluation.

Partners submitted their final campaign plans to MRGE during the month of December. Each project partner designed and then implemented its own campaign. Not all campaigns started at the same time, though. In some countries, the kick-off was delayed in order to stretch the end of some campaigns until the International Romani Day (8 April). Overall, the campaigns were implemented between January and May 2019.



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

In the middle of campaign implementation, MRG project staff undertook one monitoring visit to each country. Apart from monthly Skype meetings and the initial training there was hardly any contact among partners, especially in a horizontal perspective, according to most interviews.

This evaluation started on 15 April 2019, while some campaigns were still ongoing. By 17 May all campaigns had finished and all partners had produced one final report, except the Hungarian partner.

### Need and purpose of the evaluation

According to the ToR, MRGE wanted to see an increase in positive and accurate narratives about Roma communities online and enhance the understanding of effective ways of dealing with online hate speech. With the five campaigns reaching their final stage, MRGE launched a call for an independent evaluation of the results of those campaigns, looking for lessons learned and recommendations for future actions to be shared internally and publicly.

Therefore, this evaluation's objective is to extract key lessons about the success and the challenges faced by each partner while developing their campaigns and issue recommendations to be used by project partners and to be disseminated publicly, among CSOs in the EU, to foster greater learning, in the second phase of the project.

### Approach and Methodology

This evaluation was built mostly on data generated, collected and shared by project partners and on interviews with project partner coordinators. Interviews of between 30 and 90 minutes were made with the following subjects (sometimes, communication continued through email with follow up questions):

- Andrea Spitalszky (project coordinator - MRG).
- Denitsa Ivanova (partner from Bulgaria - Amalipe).
- Marek Pivoda (partner from Czech Republic - Forum for Human Rights).
- Alena Krempaska and Peter Weisenbacher (partner from Slovakia - Human Rights Institute).
- Stephanie Heidinger (partner from Hungary - Romedia Foundation).
- David Orlovic and Sindirela Bobaric (partner from Croatia - Roma National Council, RNV).
- Interviews with two Slovakian beneficiaries of the campaigns.

The set of documents reviewed included:

- Initial country research made by each country partner, describing the context in each country (5).
- Campaign plans made by each partner (5).
- Monthly meeting minutes held by Skype between October and February (4).
- Monitoring visit reports (5).
- Informal communication through Slack.
- Campaign materials made by each project partner (30 individual pieces of content and over 30 links).
- Campaign reports from each partner (5).
- Analytic data generated during the campaign summarized in a spreadsheet created by MRGE.
- Other documents, such as reference guides on hate speech campaigns from the Council of Europe and the Counter Narratives website, for example.



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

Data was analysed through a triangulation of methods – comparing quantitative analytical data with a desk review of all documents, interviews, comments analysis, and so on. Table 2 enunciates the key questions that guided this evaluation. Most of those questions emanated from the ToR, and some were added subsequently. Questions are presented in connection with methods of analysis and sources of data.

Judgements and interpretation of findings and extraction of recommendations were based on a logical, critical and comparative analysis of the five county cases between themselves and with what is generally considered best practice, according to reference documents such as the ones that may be found at [www.counternarratives.org](http://www.counternarratives.org) and at [www.coe.int/en/web/no-hate-campaign](http://www.coe.int/en/web/no-hate-campaign).

The evaluation addressed equity in its design by interviewing all project partner coordinators and by asking all of them for beneficiary contacts for further interviews, without exceptions. Also, equity was addressed while assessing how campaigns themselves addressed issues of multiple discrimination (compare with the last row in Table 2).

### Limitations

Like all research, this also faced some limitations. One of them was the lack of knowledge from the evaluator of the five languages in which the campaigns were developed. For that reason, the evaluator depended on the project partner’s capacity and willingness to decode objects produced and to summarize the comments. That language constraint also limited the sampling procedure to gather information from beneficiaries, having their contacts been provided by project partners only. As this first draft is submitted, only two partners had shared contacts from beneficiaries.

Another limitation was the timeline, given that the delays in some campaign implementation overlapped with the start of this evaluation process. For example, in the Hungarian case, the campaign was still ongoing at the time of the interview and the final report had still not been handed over when this first draft was due.

*Table 1: Evaluation’s Key Questions and Data Extraction*

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Method	Source of Data
<b>1. Planning and design</b> - Were campaigns well formulated, realistic and achievable? / Were the goals, objectives and actions to be taken well defined, achievable and interconnected? - Were the deadlines respected? Was the planned timeline realistic? - Were there changes made to the initial plan? If yes, which ones and why?	Qualitative	Initial country research Campaign plans Monitoring reports Interviews with partners
<b>2. Content and strategy</b> - Which campaign materials and strategy elements proved to be the most successful in countering hate speech and which ones were less useful? Why? - Which messages were communicated to the target audiences? - How many online materials were produced?	Quantitative and qualitative	Data analytics Campaign materials Interviews with partners Interviews with beneficiaries
<b>3. Dissemination and outreach</b> - Did the campaigns counter online hate speech against the Roma successfully?	Qualitative and quantitative	Monitoring reports Interviews with partners



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did the outreach of the campaigns meet the expectations?</li> <li>- Which target audiences did the partner reach?</li> <li>- How successful the dissemination of the campaigns was at the national and international level?</li> <li>- Were the partners able to monitor the effectiveness of the campaigns during the implementation, and were they able to modify the original campaign plan and react swiftly to opportunities and problems?</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with beneficiaries</li> <li>Data analytics</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Results</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If there were any unplanned results (positive or negative) explain what these were and how they came about.</li> <li>- How did perpetrators of hate and their followers react to the campaigns? Were partners able to predict and mitigate against any reactions?</li> </ul>	Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with partners</li> <li>Campaign materials (comments)</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What problems did the partners encounter while conducting the campaigns and how did they cope with these problems?</li> <li>- Was there any risk or threat for the partner while conducting the campaign? How did the partner handle the situation and mitigate any future risks?</li> <li>- Did the campaigns manage to incorporate and convey messages concerning Roma women, Roma people with disabilities, those of different ages and other intersectional issues?</li> </ul>	Qualitative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with partners</li> <li>Meeting minutes</li> <li>Monitoring reports</li> </ul>

### Findings

Findings are organized by (1) processes description by country case and (2) outputs and outcomes by goals and objectives. Specific key learnings extracted by project partners are summarized at the end of each country profile, while general recommendations are at the end of this document.

### Projects

#### Bulgaria

##### Country background

Bulgaria has a Roma community of 300,000 – 800,000 individuals among a total population of 7 million people. The cases of hate speech against Roma people are on the rise in the country, according to the country research made by the project partner Amalipe. In fact, Roma people are the main target of racism and hatred in 92% of the cases, as stated by a nationally representative study made by the Open Society Institute, in May 2016. Amalipe states that there are three main topics of negative stereotypes towards Roma people in Bulgaria: those related to the idea of Roma people having a low level of education or lack of education; being unemployed and/or having criminal activities; and being different.

The country research also characterizes Bulgarian society as divided when it comes to the general uses and understandings of the Internet, with elderly people not seeing “online harassment as a ‘real’ problem” and younger people more sensitive to the topic. In any case, 92% of mobile users in Bulgaria use Facebook (FB) on their phones, this network being the most popular social media platform in the country, according to a study by Samsung.



# Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

## CSO's background

Amalipe is a leading Roma organization in Bulgaria, working for equal integration of Roma. They work with civil society and engage in advocacy among government institutions. They had no previous experience with digital campaigning, but they did have experience working with younger people.

## Campaign plan

Amalipe focused this campaign on the topic of Roma children and school integration because many schools in Bulgaria segregate Roma children. "The principals or the teachers think the Roma children will not graduate or are not clever or good enough", Amalipe explains in the campaign plan.

The main goal was to influence the general attitude towards Roma students and the perception that they do not graduate from school, that they do not want to study and are not good enough.

## Objects

They used six short videos, using emotion and involving peers talking to peers, mostly Roma children, but also non-Roma children who participated in a contest launched by Amalipe. Among all objects, the first and third were the most successful because they were made by young leaders in their schools, who had influence in their city and to whom other young people looked up to, according to the Amalipe staff Denitsa's interview.

## Campaign schedule

The campaign ran from 23 February 2019 to 8 April 2019.

## Implementation, dissemination and impact

At the start of November, Amalipe launched a student competition for short videos on hate and "happy" speech examples. The competition ended in January. Because the quality of videos was poor, Amalipe then worked with some of the students to improve their work. The campaign used the winning videos.

They purposefully delayed the start of the campaign so that its end would coincide with the International Romani Day on 8 April.

Amalipe used Youtube to upload the videos and then they asked CSOs and local municipalities to share their content through their FB group. They only had one FB group, and most views and engagements came from one external FB page from a partner that shared their content. Most comments were positive "probably because the content was mostly emotional, with children for children", considers Denitsa during the interview.

Another aspect that contributed to the visibility of the campaign was the attention of mass media that interviewed them.

### Key learnings

- **Involving young people in the campaign and having peer-to-peer communication contributed for the success of some objects.**
- **Objects that used emotion also proved to be the most engaging ones.**

## Croatia

### Country background



Co-funded by the European Union's Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme (REC 2014 – 2020)

## **Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma**

Croatia has the smallest Roma community among the five project partners, of 16,000 – 40,000 individuals, among a total population of over 4 million inhabitants. Also, only a quarter of the total population of Croatia has connection to the Internet, according to the country research written by the partner.

The partner identified two dominant forms of audience reactions to online hate speech. Most people either support or ignore that kind of message, according to RNV's observation. They also identified a third kind of reaction, less common, of rejection of that sort of hateful message, either by an attempt at explanation, or by a direct confrontation with the hate speech perpetrators.

Most messages containing hate speech in Croatia are found on the comments to the online news and on FB. The problem of hate speech in Croatia is usually against Serb people. Sometimes hate speech against Serbs is also linked with hate speech against Roma.

### **CSO's background**

Romsko Nacionalno Vijeće (The Roma National Council – RNV) is an umbrella organization for the protection and promotion of Roma minority rights, of their historical and cultural heritage as well as of their identity. They had no previous experience running a digital media campaign.

### **Campaign plan**

RNV chose to focus their campaign on the topic of social benefits among Roma people, due to a general belief that Roma in Croatia live out from social assistance and that they receive higher social benefits than other citizens who also receive social benefits. According to RNV, news media were largely to blame for the dissemination of this misconception as they reported on some cases of abuse by some individuals.

That is the reason why RNV decided to target larger media organizations and other multipliers – like bloggers, youtubers, social media influencers, opinion makers, activists, artists, academics, and other public figures. RNV's campaign plan states: "It is our firm conviction that the campaign in order to be effective (according to different criteria) cannot be targeted at the general public. Changes in this conviction can only come about if we get partnership and support from some larger media organizations such as television with national frequency. That's why we have to focus into the narrative of anti-fake news, which is spread in our country against the Roma people".

### **Outputs**

The initial plan foreseen the creation of six infographics leading to textual websites and a video combining all infographics for usage in online discussions, blogs, online videos and such to be used by the multipliers, their main target.

With time, RNV realized the plan was limited and that they could do more. Therefore, they decided to produce three infographics, three videos and a meme. They also made a fourth and fifth in cooperation with national media. The first video used three monkeys with their eyes, ears and mouth covered, to present a general message about how it is generally wrong to not say anything and just remain silent. To make the second video, they collected a selection of hate speech examples, printed them on paper and then confronted people passing by on the street, filming them in the process of reading them. Some read in silence and reacted in more non-verbal ways, while others were verbal. Some said they could not read that aloud. According to the interview with RNV, most people were shocked and expressed the idea that this kind of message was not acceptable. On the



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

third video, they interviewed people with prejudices against Roma and they recorded their hateful reactions. Some of those reactions were along the lines: “I don’t like them” or “They have too many benefits”. The purpose of this last video was to raise awareness, given that many people in Croatia, according to RNV, still do not acknowledge that hate speech exists. The fourth video reproduces the concept of the second video but it was shot with professional journalists, on their request, to be shown on a national TV channel.

### Campaign schedule

The campaign ran from 28 March 2019 to 9 May 2019.

### Implementation, dissemination and impact

While shooting the videos, RNV staff made sure they always chose a sunny day and an open place with a police officer nearby just in case they needed protection. Apart from the shooting crew, they also had one more member that would always be nearby, not perceived as part of their team, and who could intervene in case of need.

They used their social media channels to disseminate the objects (FB, Instagram, and Youtube) as well as national news media channels.

The first three videos caught journalists’ attention and one of the coordinators of the project within RNV was invited to speak at a TV program of the biggest national channel. Two major national newspapers also covered their work, one of whom published a major article about the whole campaign on hate speech. TV journalists then invited RNV to produce a similar video with them to present on their own channel. So they shot something similar to the second video again, but with professional cameras and those videos were distributed through the news media channels. The objects that got by far the greatest reach and engagement were the ones distributed through those external channels. These attracted tens of thousands of views and hundreds of engagement actions. The infographics had the least impact.

Croatia’s ombudsman also reacted to the campaign, showing support and using its own public information tools to publicize it.

The biggest achievement of this campaign was the fact that RNV actually was able to create public debate around a rarely discussed issue.

#### Key learnings

- **“Video creation takes plenty of time, skills and technological resources; but the videos were attractive for media and others”.**
- **“We should plan for getting more media attention than the anticipated one”.**
- **To obtain good results, local partners with knowledge may help.**
- **To reach the general public “we need to reach out to much stronger players, like institutions, and the media”.**
- **“We increased our capacity and we intend to continue working in this field”.**
- **A mid-term meeting could have helped cooperation among partners.**

Czech Republic

### Country background



Co-funded by the European Union’s Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme (REC 2014 – 2020)

## **Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma**

Czech Republic has a Roma community of 150,000 – 200,000 individuals, among a total population a little over 10 million. Among the general population, 75% perceive cohabitation with Roma people as problematic, according to research on cohabitation with Roma people, conducted in 2017, and quoted in the country research prepared by Forum for Human Rights. Statistics of hate crimes against Roma people varied from 13 to 27, in 2017. As far as cyber hate, the data is scarce to non-existent when it concerns cyber hate against Roma in particular.

### **CSO's background**

Fórum pro lidská práva, z. s. (Forum for Human Rights-FHI) is a CSO based in Czech Republic, focused on international human rights litigation and advocacy in Central Europe. Some of the cases represented by its lawyers include strategic cases aimed at fighting discrimination against Roma. They had not much prior experience with designing and implementing digital campaigns.

### **Campaign plan**

Forum for Human Rights focused their campaign on the topic of social benefits and they decided to counteract the stereotype about how Roma people misuse them, including housing support, focusing on two types of target group. One group includes stakeholders such as other NGOs, activists, Roma organizations; the other group includes the general public who reads and/or comments on FB pages related to the Roma in a negative way.

The overall goal of the campaign was to provide facts to debunk hoaxes, myths and other misprinted articles and messages. To do that, their initial strategy included several mechanisms, including actively engaging into conversation in online discussions, producing positive comments that would include links to infographics (as described next) and to a FB page created specifically for this campaign.

### **Objects**

Four short texts with pictures explaining the counter narrative plus three infographics were created. FHI produced the three stories, with the help of local activists who identified and interviewed the subjects. They were not able, though this was initially planned, to include pictures of the subjects, as the interviewees did not want to be recognized, fearing hateful comments.

### **Campaign schedule**

The campaign ran from the 13 January 2019 to the 8 April 2019.

### **Implementation, dissemination and impact**

FHI created a new FB page to disseminate the objects. Although part of the initial plan included engaging into online discussions, during the initial two months that the campaign took place, there were not many ongoing discussions on these topics, according to Marek Pivoda's interview. However, soon the people in charge of the campaign realized that they lacked human resources to be on top of ongoing discussions all day long. They also recognized it was important to react almost immediately, but to do that they needed more people and more resources. FHI tried to connect comments to the informative objects they had produced. While reacting to people's comments, they tried to react in a personal way, using names. They create credible but fictitious names for themselves to pass the impression that they were not acting anonymously. In one case, the comments they got on one of the stories (about a disabled Roma young boy who was struggling to find dignified accommodation) question the authenticity of the pictures used (questioning if the boy was really disabled).



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

Most engagement came from people living in urban areas, between 35 and 50 years old, which coincided with the demographic characteristics of the people that most often are perpetrators of hate speech in Czech Republic, according to their own analysis. To their knowledge, the campaign had no impact outside FB and no impact at an international level.

There were not many extreme hateful comments, but FHI found many comments with stereotypes, indicating hate. During dissemination, they realized that positive stories about real people generated more engagement, with more reactions and responses that were more positive.

FHI intended to have some of the infographics disseminated through the news, but they were not able to do so. Another challenge was the fact that many people reached out to them asking for help with their housing situation, but they were not prepared to provide solutions. “That was not the purpose of the campaign”, Marek Pivoda explained in the interview.

### Key learnings

- **“It was good that we focused just on FB – having everything in one place helps.”**
- **“Short, positive stories about real people generate more engagement and more positive reactions as well as stories that start with a problem that Roma people had in common with the audience, like affordable housing.”**
- **“It is important to be able to react almost immediately to comments. To do that we needed more people.”**
- **“It is good to use real names and address people individually in comments to avoid the sense of anonymity even though those may be fictitious to protect us.”**

## Hungary

### Country background

Hungary has the largest Roma community among the five project partners, of 300,000 – 1 million individuals, in a total population of almost 10 million. While “anti-Gypsyism is woven into the fabric of the country’s society” like in other project partner countries, in Hungary xenophobia has been further instigated by the hegemony of white Christian nationalism, the country research explains. Additionally, with neo-fascism on the rise, many Roma people now fear that phenomena like ethnic cleansing may occur, the country research adds. Roma people are perceived as one more group that is inferior to the “great Hungarians”, like other minorities too.

The media landscape in Hungary was significantly altered around 2010 and 2011, with the creation of laws that put conventional media outlets under the control of Fidesz, the Hungarian Civic Alliance. “A lot of the materials they share with their audiences are unmistakably intolerant of Roma”, the country research explains. On cyberspace, most hate speech is propagated through FB and comments on forums and news portals, as described in a study made in 2016 by “Community Manager”.

### CSO’s background

Romedia Alapítvány is a regional media organization in Hungary, run by Roma people. They have experience with media campaigns using photography and video to promote awareness and understanding about the Roma community. They had no prior experience with digital media content creation in particular, nor with large-scale projects involving several country partners.



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

### Campaign plan

This campaign focused on counteracting the oppressive and biased view that Roma youth are inferior and/or less capable than the majority of other Hungarians, as this stereotype often leads to discrimination, hostile behavior and even segregation at schools. The target was non-Roma parents that negatively view Roma children and Roma families. The goal was to lessen the literal and figurative distance between non-Roma and Roma Hungarians, specifically the youth, through a video/photography campaign. With non-Roma parents, the goal is to counteracting their prejudices and to transmit the idea of how their views pass to their children.

### Objects

Four objects using photography of both Roma and non-Roma children were created. These objects contained short messages about school attendance and cyberbullying towards Roma children. One video gathering all four photographs was still being created as this evaluation took place.

### Campaign schedule

#### Implementation, dissemination and impact

To disseminate the objects, Romedia created a new Instagram account that they now plan to maintain and keep. Objects were also disseminated through their FB page. They used paid advertising on FB (2/3) and on Instagram (1/3). They were not able to have other organizations sharing their content: they informed their closest partners, but they did not ask them to share.

On FB they were able to attract a bigger audience, mostly composed of their usual followers – people from big cities. On Instagram they registered the most exponential audience growth. They got a few comments and there were hardly any negative comments. Most comments focused on the design of the products, rather than the messages themselves.

For the video dissemination, they were intending to ask a Roma influencer to help them with the dissemination. Nevertheless, as this evaluation took place,

#### Key learnings

- “We need to cultivate a specific social media plan for each medium.”

### Slovakia

#### Country background

Slovakia has a Roma community of 100,000 – 400,000 individuals, of a total population of 5.4 million people. The vast majority of people aged 18-39 years old (86%) are very tolerant to “alternative media” that often spread conspiracy, hate and xenophobia, according to a study with 1,083 respondents, from Institut for Public Affairs. The reason presented by these respondents to justify such position is mostly freedom of speech. About the same percentage of respondents say that they have experienced online hate. 66% agree with the statement that Roma people should be given lower social assistance en bloc, according to the same study, quoted by the country research document produced by Human Rights Institute.

#### CSO's background



## **Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma**

Institut ľudských práv (Human Rights Institute-HRI) is a CSO based in Slovakia that works to promote human rights through online and offline campaigns, having significant experience tackling online hate speech, including on issues about housing and Roma communities. They did not have much experience with the use of Instagram, which ended up being the channel they most used for this campaign in particular.

### **Campaign Plan**

The campaign focused on the topic of fake news, related with the Roma community, and targeted multipliers such as social media influencers, bloggers, vloggers, youtubers, commentators, activists, NGO members and online content creators and administrators, as well as public intellectuals, academics and journalists. The choice to focus on that target group rather than the general public was related to cost/efficiency, according to HRI campaign plan.

The goal was to motivate the target groups to become the campaign's content multipliers.

### **Objects**

HRI created six memes, using picture collage and humour. For example, object number one showed four pictures of buildings, with the sentences: "These are black (illegal) buildings. These are home of families". Peter, from HRI, explains in one an email: "in the upper part are photos of the most famous illegal buildings done by oligarchs (some from stolen money), in the lower part is one of the most famous Roma minority settlements usually called 'black', because they are technically illegal but in reality it is not the fault of the people living there as they were moved during communism (and it is explained in the attached text) and also because of racist feelings the adjective 'black' is used".

Additionally, they created one infographic. Also, on their website, they had text with background information on the issues that each meme was calling the attention for.

### **Campaign schedule**

The campaign run from the 22<sup>nd</sup> of February 2019 to the 23<sup>rd</sup> of April 2019.

### **Implementation, dissemination and impact**

The start of the campaign coincided with the first round of presidential elections and Roma issues was not a big topic of discussion at that time. Later on, the political discussion on the country slowed down and the campaign got more attention.

Memes were first distributed through a newly created Instagram account and FB and website content provided background information.

The campaign was "widely" shared and HRI was not able to track all shares, due to the lack of people working in this project. Most comments were positive. To HRI's surprise, the audience reacted very well to the memes. Initially, HRI was concerned that some people could not understand the use of humour in a campaign about Roma. But that does not seem to have been a problem. The campaign seems to have "attracted the public without being rude, vulgar or using any other 'dirty tricks'", considers one of the beneficiaries of the campaign – Milan Kuruc, leader of the civic organization Pracujuca chudob. The perception of beneficiaries on the campaign's national impact varies. Milan Kuruc disagrees that "such a small campaign can have a measurable impact on the



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

whole country” while Zusana Varhanikova, coordinator of the organization Povedzme nie, believes that the campaign actually had a good impact as it contributed to shifting the discussion.

### Key learnings

- “We learned how to simplify complex messages and adapt them to the memes’ language.”
- “We learned that not only young people (usually associated with the use of Instagram) were following these simplified messages, but all kinds of people.”
- HRI feels that having focused on an ongoing topic of discussion, like fake news, instead of bringing something that was not at the core of the current social debate, like racial equality or minority rights, helped increasing engagement. And they ended up addressing those issues indirectly. “We cannot change the current framework, but we can use it”.
- Likewise, HRI learned that it is better to accept and use the common practices that people have on social media in terms of behaviour and language, rather going against them.

### Outcomes and Outputs

Outcomes and outputs are summarized in Table 3 (outreach analytics by country and object) and Table 4 (impact matrix by country).



Table 2: Outreach in terms of data analytics by country and object

Case	Bulgaria				Croatia		Czech				Hungary		Slovak		
Channels used for dissemination	FB page; FB group; Youtube				FP page; Youtube channel; Instagram; external TV program; external News Portal; external FB; page; external webportal		FB				FB; Instagram; Twitter		FB; Instagram		
	Reach	Engagement			Reach	Engagement	Reach	Engagement			Reach	Engagement	Reach	Engagement	
	Views	Likes	Shares	Com.	Views	React.+Com.+Shar.	Reach	Eng.	Shares	Comments	Views	Likes+Com.	Reach	Likes	Shares
<b>Object 1</b>	2631	143	43	50	1609	219	8787	1089	22		9699	568	64397	142	84
<b>Object 2</b>	118	31	7		6165	345	5127	237	3		16336	1792	37045	79	19
<b>Object 3</b>	543	48	9		1820	188	10862	1066	31	138	13096	1117	92700	751	104
<b>Object 4</b>	60	20	2	1	98	5	5915	393	11	58	6315	609	76484	218	219
<b>Object 5</b>		41	6		179	13	5335	370	9	29	N/A	N/A	46998	143	97
<b>Object 6</b>		20	2		72	2	1023	119	4	0			27537	513	177
<b>Object 7</b>					1010	48	6015	715	5	2					
<b>Object 8</b>					51293	540									
<b>Object 9</b>					30573	284									
<b>Total of all objects</b>	<b>3352</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>92819</b>	<b>1644</b>	<b>43064</b>	<b>3989</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>45446</b>	<b>4086</b>	<b>345161</b>	<b>1846</b>	<b>700</b>

Table 3: Campaign's impact matrix

Partner	Goal as defined by each partner	Specific objective as defined by each partner	Impact indicator
Center for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance (Amalipe), Bulgaria	1. To influence the general attitude towards Roma students and the perception that they do not graduate school; that they do not want to study and are not good enough.	1.1. Produce 6 short videos 1.2. Reaching at least 1000 views	<b>Unclear/Achieved</b> Goal 1. is unclear as there are no specific measures to assess if the general attitude towards Roma student was influenced or not. Objective 1.1. was achieved; objective 1.2. was surpassed (total reach was 3352).
Roma National Council, Croatia	2. To motivate the target groups to be the multipliers of the content produced through the Project.	2.1. Bring at least some part of the produced content to the websites created in connection with the infographics and containing all the important information on the topic presented in a way to be recognized and accepted by uninformed or insufficiently informed general public.	<b>Achieved</b> The target group was the main distributor of the content produced, so goal 2 was achieved – from the total 92,819 views and 1,644 engagement actions, 81,866 views and 824 engagement actions were obtained in external news media pages. Objective 2.1. was also achieved as national media spread the message among general public.
FORUM for Human Rights, Czech Republic	3. To counter negative stereotypes and myths concerning housing support and Roma people living in excluded areas.	3.1. Reach 5,000 people online with counter narrative content	<b>Achieved</b> Goal 3 was achieved given that objects produced contained that message. Objective 3.1. was surpassed given that over 43 thousand people were reached online.
Romedia Foundation, Hungary	4.1. To promote the idea of an inclusive, tolerant and democratic European society, lessening the distance between non-Roma and Roma Hungarians, specifically the youth, through an online video/photography campaign. 4.2. To raise awareness about the potential that what happens online has to affect offline reality; in particular the consequences for the Roma community, including children enrolled in all levels of education. 4.3. To raise awareness among a non-Roma Hungarian population about how prejudices become discriminatory practices, and how their thoughts and actions are transmitted to their children. 4.4. To raise awareness among Roma audience about the hate speech they experience online, and	4.1.1. Reach 8,000 members of both of our target groups on all of our dissemination channels for the short film (3,000) and still images (5,000), and of that total, our online 'products' should be engaged with 4,000 (1,250 and 3,750) of those who were exposed to them	<b>Unclear/Achieved</b> The connection between goals and objectives is not clear enough. Some goals are complex and abstract and objectives do not show how those issues are measured. Goal 4.1. was partly achieved – the campaign materials promoted the ideas mentioned; however it was not clear how and if those materials actually lessened the distance between Roma and non-Roma Hungarians. Objects also were designed in alignment with goal 4.2. so it may be considered that goal 4.2. was fulfilled. Although materials were also aligned with goal 4.3., given its complex scope and the simplicity of the materials produced, it is not clear if that goal was achieved or not. Goals 4.4. and 4.5. achievements is also unclear given that data provided did not make a distinction between Roma and non-Roma audience. At the time that this first draft report was finished, objective 4.1.1 was achieved partly, given that there was still not data on the video. Measures for still images and had surpassed the objective.

## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

	<p>the offline abuse that comes as a result of it, and how these issues are manifestations of a society-wide problem.</p> <p>4.5. To raise awareness among both groups about the value of interethnic communication and of a more integrated Hungary, through media literacy.</p>		
Human Rights Institute, Slovakia	<p>5. To motivate the target groups to be the multipliers of the content.</p>	<p>5.1. Generate some traffic to the websites created in connection with the infographics and containing all the important information on the topic presented in a way to be digested by (uninformed) public.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Achieved</b></p> <p>Goal 5 seems to have been achieved as the campaign was shared 700 times. Even though among all those shares we suppose that at least part of the target group was sharing; no exact measure indicates who was sharing, therefore one cannot know for sure if the target group was indeed sharing or not. Objective 5.1. was achieved as memes on Instagram generated traffic to texts on FB.</p>

Table 4: Overall project Impact Matrix

Overall objective	Expected results	Objects to be produced	Impact indicator
<p>1. Strengthen the capacity of CSOs to implement effective counter narrative campaigns targeting hate speech against Roma</p> <p>2. Identify and share best practices with other CSOs, activists and IT companies, in Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia, and across Europe.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthened capacity of CSOs in target countries to counter online hate speech against Roma through designing and implementing counter-narrative campaigns</li> <li>Increased availability and dissemination of positive and accurate narratives about Roma communities online</li> <li>Enhanced understanding of good practices in using balanced narratives to counter online hate speech among key stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5 counter narrative campaigns, min 30 online products</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Achieved</b></p> <p>The first objective was definitely achieved. Most partners did not have experience with digital campaigns or with some parts of digital campaigns (in the Slovakian case, they did have experience with digital campaigning, but they chose one medium they were not familiar with yet – Instagram). In all five cases, partners did increase their knowledge and skills about digital campaign designing and implementation.</p> <p>As for the second objective it is still too soon to make a final conclusion given that there are still other parts of the project which are ongoing and which may contribute to achieving that goal in particular, namely the elaboration of the five Youtube videos on lessons learned and the dissemination of this evaluation report.</p> <p>Even so, all three expected results have already been achieved.</p> <p>All partners were able to enunciate several relevant lessons learned and some of them were able to actually generate relevant impact with their campaigns.</p> <p>The total amount of objects was achieved. Although one of the partners produced less than the required six objects, other partners produced more than that, contributing to a total sum of 34 objects produced in the five countries where the campaigns were held.</p>



## Conclusions

This report summarizes the evaluation of five digital campaigns that counteracted hate speech against Roma. The campaigns were part of the project Freedom from Hate, coordinated by MRGE and implemented by five CSOs in Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovak. From the evaluation of each campaign, the main conclusion to highlight is that the Project Freedom from Hate has already achieved most of its objectives, and expected results, although it is only to be finished next year. That is due to the fact that most digital campaigns achieved successfully their own goals and objectives, in some cases surpassing them. Regardless of how successful they were, all project partners were able to extract key learnings and some have even stated their willingness to continue working with these tools and on these topics.

The campaign's process provides some valuable key learnings for future similar actions, such as the importance of starting with a background research, even though one might be already knowledgeable and skilled in the topics and processes. The impact of certain objects in comparison to others among the same audience, also indicate some good practices in terms of object design. Some good examples were the creation and use of memes on Instagram, positive stories with certain characteristics that generated empathy among the audience, and the collaboration with national media to reach the general public. Campaigns that targeted multipliers had by far a wider outreach than the others did.

Two major challenges faced by project partners were the lack of knowledge on designing and implementing digital campaigns, and the lack of resources to manage the campaigns during the stage of implementation. However, in the Croatian case, for example the lack of resources and knowledge did not prevent their campaign having a strong impact in the country.

Each campaign had a similar budget but the outreach was uneven.

While analysing the campaign design, the coherence between overall goals, target audience and specific objectives is not always clear. On the other hand, while most campaigns achieved their objectives, that result should be examined with some caution as some of those objectives may be criticized for not being ambitious enough to start with, when analysed in articulation with the overall goal. Also, in some cases, one can argue if the specific objectives as defined by most partners really measured the overall goal that they had established, given that in most cases the specific objectives only foresaw quantitative metrics that do not show the true impact of the campaigns or assess how they reach the defined target. In other words, it is not clear how relevant the defined objectives are to measure impact.

One challenge faced by the project coordinator was related with the difficulty MRGE felt (and partners also corroborated) in generating more horizontal communication and cooperation. Therefore, recommendations include some tips on how that difficulty may be overcome. Indeed, one challenge but also one advantage of this project was its geographical coverage.

## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

### General Recommendations

With hate speech on the rise in Europe and worldwide, other CSOs and stakeholders may want to review this project in search of good practices. This section extracts and elaborates on general key learnings and challenges to issue recommendations for future actions.

**In a digital campaign with several partner countries involved, consider creating common materials and strategies to increase the campaign's implementation visibility, even if there is a local approach to it in terms of topics and dissemination.** Apart from partner cooperation on the backstage of the campaign, you may want to consider the added value of also operating as a team for the outside. For example, partners of this project could have produced common materials for the campaign, such as a slogan, logo, hashtag, and so on. Those “brand identity” tools could have contributed to increase people's perception on the significance and reach of the campaign. Also, while the campaigns were designed in regard to national topics, disseminated nationally, and each in its own language, digital media does not have boundaries, and sometimes a local topic can be spread globally, and that global attention then impacts on the local.

**In a campaign that puts together partners from several countries, it is important to create strategies of interaction among partners during the whole process to increase learning among partners.** In this project there was one initial meeting where partners met all in person, and then interaction proceeded through Skype monthly meetings. Maybe one more meeting in the middle of the process (after planning, before implementing) could help increase the sharing of experiences among partners, in time to still incorporate the lessons learned in their own campaigns. Also, given the fact that partners were not cooperating outside those formal meetings, the project coordinator could also consider implementing some other mechanisms to foster horizontal communication.

**Carefully research the topic before starting to plan a campaign on hate speech.** In this case, the project coordinator asked each project partner to conduct a country research, even though each partner was already familiar with the national situation. That research served as the basis of the definition of each campaign's topic and audience. This preparatory work contributed to each project partner being in tune with the society's preoccupations and to tailor the campaign to current practical issues.

**Use positive stories that create empathy among the target audience.** Stories that generated more reactions that are positive and engagement were positive stories, containing emotions, using peer-to-peer communication, and using a topic close to the audience as a starting point. The topic close to the audience can be either a common problem between the self and the other or an ongoing societal issue that concerns all. An example of a common problem between the self and the other is affordable housing - this is not only a problem for Roma, but also for the general population. So starting the campaign with the focus on housing for all generated the sense of “it is true/this is also my problem” – or an ongoing societal issue. An example of an ongoing societal issue concern for all is fake news – this is a problem in several fields, including when it comes to information about Roma people.

**Choose the medium your target audience is using the most and adapt your message to the language used by that medium.** Medium usage varies by country and context. For example, Twitter is heavily used in the United States in the political sphere, but not so much in some European countries. Instagram is one of the fastest growing social media now and is mostly used by young people. Messages are very short, with pictures, and often include humour. In the Slovakian case, they were using Instagram



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

with humorous messages, although the campaign addressed serious issues, in order to get the target's audience attention. Once they got people's attention, they offered links to other media, like FB, where they provided longer texts with more information. This strategy provided good results.

**Fine-tune the linkage between the overall goal, the target, the outputs and the specific objectives; and while defining the objectives, consider going beyond social media metrics.** Overall, the campaigns reached the specific objectives that project partners had defined. However, in most cases, one can argue if the specific objectives as defined by most partners really measured the overall goal they had established, given that in most cases the specific objectives only foresaw quantitative metrics that do not show the true impact of the campaigns among the target audience. In other words, how relevant were the defined objectives to measure impact?

**Consider the risk of a backlash to your campaign and while planning the campaign, also prepare a serious strategy as to how to react to negative comments.** Once your campaign gets some traction, it will probably generate many comments. In the middle of all reactions you may get some hateful comments. Make sure you are prepared to manage such comments. Consider all options. They all have pros and cons. For example, deleting may lead to people reacting against what may be perceived by some as censorship; but it can also put an end to a vicious conversation. Engaging may have a positive or a negative effect according to how the interaction proceeds. Ignoring may help contribute to the comment being more quickly forgotten if nobody else is engaging with it, but it can also leave discussion out of hand if other people are reinforcing the initial hateful comment. If the comment does not respect the rules of that media, you may also consider reporting the person. What you need to bear in mind is that whatever you decide to do you should be on top of whatever comments are being made about your campaign, not react instantly (without a rational consideration of the possible effects), but be prepared logistically to be able to interact quickly so that the discussion stops escalating. Also, if you do decide to interact, you may consider trying to deal with the issue privately. There are several manuals and toolkits that already provide some practical tips on how to deal with negative comments and trolls that you may want to study while preparing your campaign.

**Consider complementing social media analytics with other impact measures when defining the specific objectives.** While likes and shares may be an easy way of providing metrics to donors, what can we really learn from the number of likes and shares in terms of the impact that a campaign had on the target audience? How one can effectively assess media effects has been an ongoing discussion in the field of communication sciences for almost as long as communication sciences have existed. And until now, there are no bullet proof formulas. However, while digital campaigns only include metrics about likes and shares, one can ask how we can actually know how the message got to its audience. One way of overcoming the lack of information provided by just the numbers of a like or a share would be to hold focus groups or interviews or even questionnaires with the general population, trying to assess how the campaigns actually reached them and how have people retained the message. When, campaigns get traditional media attention and start being discussed in other forums than the ones created by project partners, we also have an indication that the campaign is having some impact outside. But if a CSO only disseminates the campaign in its own already existing FB page and the objective only includes an amount of views among that audience, we cannot really conclude that the campaign reached the general public, even though metrics are being fulfilled.



# Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

## Annex 1: ToR provided by MRGE

### Evaluation of counter hate speech campaigns – Terms of Reference and call for Expressions of Interest

Project name: Freedom From Hate

Duration: June 2018 – May 2020

Deadline for application: 31 March 2019 23:59 CET

#### 1. Background of the project

This project tests and evaluates effective counter narrative campaigns targeting online hate speech against Roma communities in Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia. The programme works with civil society organizations (CSOs) in the target countries to develop effective campaigns to challenge online hate speech. From this programme, we want to see an increase in positive and accurate narratives about Roma communities online and enhance the understanding of effective ways of dealing with online hate speech.

Among its activities are:

- Training partner CSOs on countering hate speech online
- Testing strategies by implementing counternarrative campaigns
- Evaluating campaigns to identify best practices
- Roundtable discussion with CSOs and IT companies
- Lessons learned YouTube videos
- Training of trainers session for CSOs
- Multiplier trainings for other activists

Our Partners:

[Amalipe Center za mezhduetnicheski dialog i tolerantnost](#) (Center for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance), based in Bulgaria, is a leading Roma organization working for equal integration of Roma. The organization plays a central role organising the Roma civil movement and advocates for Roma integration to government institutions.

[Institút ľudských práv](#) (Human Rights Institute), based in Slovakia, works to promote human rights through online and offline campaigns. The organisation has significant experience in tackling online hate speech, including an online campaign on housing issues for marginalised Roma communities.

[Romedica Alapitvány](#), in Hungary, is a regional media organisation run by Roma people. Romedia runs media campaigns to promote awareness and understanding of the Roma community. A recent project involved delivering filmmaking and journalism training for Roma women



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

[Romsko nacionalno vijeće](#) (The Roma National Council, RNC), based in Croatia, is an umbrella organization for the protection and promotion of Roma minority rights. The RNC promotes inclusion of Roma while protecting their historical and cultural heritage and promoting their identity.

[Fórum pro lidská práva, z. s.](#) (Forum for Human Rights), based in Czech Republic, focuses on international human rights litigation and advocacy in Central Europe. Its lawyers represent several strategic cases in the Czech Republic aimed at fighting discrimination against Roma.

Between January and March 2019, our Partners will run online campaigns in their respective countries to counter cyber hate speech against the Roma. MRGE is hiring an independent external consultant who will work with MRGE and partner CSOs to evaluate each campaign.

### 2. Evaluation Objectives

The objectives of the evaluation are:

- A. To assess each Partner's campaign overall
- B. To review and extract key learnings about the success and challenges of each campaign
- C. To make recommendations based on the lessons learned from the campaigns
- D. To author a report on Lessons Learned and Recommendations from the impacts and outcomes of the campaigns. The report will be used, both for internal evaluation and will also be made available publicly and widely disseminated amongst civil society organisations in the EU, to foster greater learning, in the second phase of the project.

### 3. Methodology and key evaluation questions

The evaluation will build on the data collected by Partners while conducting the campaign which will be supplemented with interviews with partner CSOs, feedback from final beneficiary communities and additional research.

Key evaluation questions:

- Were campaigns well formulated, realistic and achievable?
- Did the campaigns counter online hate speech against the Roma successfully?
- Were the partners able to monitor the effectiveness of the campaigns, during the implementation and were they able to modify the original campaign plan and react swiftly to opportunities and problems?
- Which campaign materials and strategy elements proved to be the most successful in countering hate speech and which ones were less useful? Why?
- Which target audiences did the Partner reach?
- Which messages were communicated to these target audiences?
- What problems did the partners encounter while conducting the campaigns and how did they cope with these problems?
- Did the campaigns manage to incorporate and convey messages concerning Roma women, Roma people with disabilities, those of different ages and other intersectional issues?



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

- Was there any risk or threat for the Partner while conducting the campaign? How did the Partner handle the situation and mitigated any future risks?
- If there were any unplanned results (positive or negative) explain what these were and how they came about.
- How perpetrators of hate and their followers reacted to the campaigns? Were partners able to predict and mitigate against any reactions?
- How successful the dissemination of the campaigns was at the national and international level?

### 4. Key deliverables

#### 1. Evaluation workplan in English

2. Draft evaluation report (min 10 pages, max 15 pages excluding annexes – including 1-2 page executive summary).
3. Final evaluation report that incorporates and responds to feedback from partners and MRG where warranted.

Based on MRGE's prior experience, we anticipate that the following tasks will be needed but we are open to suggestion for alternative methodologies:

- Read all project materials and partners' campaign plans, review feedback from project partners, data analytics.
- Speak to partners' project staff (interviews can be arranged by Skype, no travel is needed).
- Speak to a group of beneficiaries convened by the partners regarding the campaign and its fit with community values and priorities.
- Independently seek data concerning Roma hate to ascertain pick up of these campaigns and their interaction with hate speech and neutral communities in at least one project country.

### 5. Experience and Expertise required

- \* Extensive knowledge and experience of working on minority rights, hate speech and online campaigns.
- \* Experience working with Roma communities.
- \* Good knowledge of the Central and Eastern European region.
- \* Experience of comparable evaluations and strong track record of evaluations carried out on projects with similar elements.
- \* Ability to speak, read and write in English.

The evaluator will need to be independent of MRG, its partners and donors and will need to demonstrate that no perceived or actual conflict of interests would arise during the evaluation.

### 6. Report submission, timetable and budget



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

The evaluation should be carried out in April and early May 2019. A draft evaluation report should be submitted no later than 12 May 2019. MRGE and partners will submit comments within 15 working days and the final full detailed report responding to all comments must be submitted by 9 June 2019 in English.

The budget for this piece of work, which includes any costs related to the work, is in the region of €1,400.

### 7. How to apply

If you are interested in being considered for this opportunity, please send the following to: [andrea.spitalszky@mrgmail.org](mailto:andrea.spitalszky@mrgmail.org) by 31 March 2019 23:59 CET.

- \* Brief (max 3 page) CV of the evaluator or all evaluation team members
- \* Cover letter – indicating relevant experience and knowledge and how you meet the task /candidate requirements
- \* Workplan including methodology, timetable, budget for the evaluation and availability (max. 3 pages)
- \* At least one, but if possible two, similar completed evaluation reports.
- \* The names and contact details of 2 references who can speak to the evaluator's or the team's relevant experience and suitability.
- \* A list of individuals and organizations with which you have/have had relationships which might compromise your perceived independence/might mean a potential conflict of interest arises and the nature of the relationship.

MRG will endeavour to shortlist potentially strong candidates right after the application deadline and may need to speak to strong candidates in the week commencing 1 April 2019. We hope to have made an appointment by mid April.



# Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

## Annex 2: Evaluation Plan provided by Evaluator

### Evaluation Plan of Counter Hate Speech Campaigns

Prepared by Ioli Campos to Minority Rights Group Europe

#### 1. Introduction

This document establishes the goals, collection methods and proposed structure for the draft report to evaluate a campaign implemented in five Eastern European countries to counter hate speech against Roma people. The campaigns were implemented between January and April 2019, under the coordination of the Minority Rights Group Europe (MRG) and they were co-funded by the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme of the European Union. The programme worked with civil society organizations (CSOs) in Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia.

This plan elaborates on the published ToR, the submitted candidate's proposal and the kick-off meeting undertaken by Skype on the 17<sup>th</sup> of April 2019 with MRG.

##### 1.1. What is being evaluated

Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyber-hate against Roma REC-RRAC-ONLINE-AG-2017 – campaigns in five countries

##### 1.2. Stakeholders

- MRG, partner coordinator
- Amalipe Center za mezhdnetnicheski dialog i tolerantnost (Center for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance), partner based in Bulgaria.
- Institut ľudských prav (Human Rights Institute), partner based in Slovakia.
- Rómedia Alapítvány, partner based in Hungary.
- Rómsko nacionalno vijeće (The Roma National Council, RNC), partner based in Croatia.
- Fórum pro lidská práva, z. s. (Forum for Human Rights), partner based in Czech Republic.

##### 1.3. Need for the evaluation

According to the ToR, MRG wanted to see an increase in positive and accurate narratives about Roma communities online and enhance the understanding of effective ways of dealing with online hate speech. With the campaigns reaching their final stage, MRG created a call for an independent evaluation of the results of those campaigns, looking for lessons learned and recommendations for future actions to be shared internally and publicly.

##### 1.4. Goals of the evaluation

The objectives of the evaluation, as defined by the ToR, are:

- a) To assess each Partner's campaign overall.
- b) To review and extract key learnings about the success and challenges of each campaign.
- c) To make recommendations based on the lessons learned from the campaigns.



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

d) To foster greater learning among civil society organizations in the EU.

### 1.5. Evaluation Output

A report summarizing the evaluation results, highlighting the Lessons Learned and Recommendations to be used both for internal evaluation and to be made available publicly and widely disseminated amongst civil society organizations in the EU.

## 2. Methodology

This evaluation will combine quantitative and qualitative methods to assess the campaigns, building on data collected, selected and shared by the partners and on interviews with partners and beneficiaries, as well as on other information the consultant may search independently, such as news articles and others, as detailed in point 2.2.

The procedure will start by a desk review of the various documents sent and online data produced by the campaigns. The next step will involve a round of interviews with partners and some beneficiaries. Finally, all data will be analysed and interpreted, according to the goals and questions defined for this evaluation and a draft report will be produced.

Preceding the development of the final report, the first draft will be shared with MRG and its partners for review and validation. A final report will incorporate and respond to the feedback provided.

### 2.1. Evaluation questions and data collection

Evaluation Question	Data Collection Method	Source of Data
<b>1. Planning and design</b> - Were campaigns well formulated, realistic and achievable? / Were the goals, objectives and actions to be taken well defined, achievable and interconnected? - Were the deadlines respected? Was the planned timeline realistic? -Were there changes made to the initial plan? If yes, which ones and why?	Qualitative	Initial country research Campaign Plans Monitoring Reports Interviews with partners
<b>2. Content and strategy</b> - Which campaign materials and strategy elements proved to be the most successful in countering hate speech and which ones were less useful? Why? - Which messages were communicated to the target audiences? - How many online materials were produced?	Quantitative and qualitative	Data analytics Campaign materials Interviews with partners Interviews with beneficiaries
<b>3. Dissemination and outreach</b> - Did the campaigns counter online hate speech against the Roma successfully? - Did the outreach of the campaigns met the expectations? - Which target audiences did the Partner reach? - How successful the dissemination of the campaigns was at the national and international level? - Were the partners able to monitor the effectiveness of the campaigns, during the implementation and were they able to modify the original campaign plan and react swiftly to opportunities and problems?	Qualitative and quantitative	Monitoring reports Interviews with partners Interviews with beneficiaries Data analytics
<b>4. Results</b> - If there were any unplanned results (positive or negative) explain what these were and how they came about.	Qualitative	Interviews with partners



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

- How perpetrators of hate and their followers reacted to the campaigns? Were partners able to predict and mitigate against any reactions?		Campaign materials (comments)
<b>5. Challenges</b> - What problems did the partners encounter while conducting the campaigns and how did they cope with these problems? - Was there any risk or threat for the Partner while conducting the campaign? How did the Partner handle the situation and mitigated any future risks? - Did the campaigns manage to incorporate and convey messages concerning Roma women, Roma people with disabilities, those of different ages and other intersectional issues?	Qualitative	Interviews with partners Meeting minutes Monitoring reports

### 2.2. Sample Data

#### 2.2.1. Interviews were conducted with the following

- Andrea Spitalszky (project coordinator - MRG).
- Denitsa Ivanova (partner from Bulgaria - Amalipe).
- Tereza Bártová and/or Marek Pivoda (partner from Czech Republic - Forum for Human Rights).
- Alena Krempaska and/or Peter Weisenbacher (partner from Slovakia - Human Rights Institute).
- Stephanie Heidinger (partner from Hungary - Romedia Foundation).
- David Orlovic and Sindirela Bobaric (partner from Croatia - Roma National Council, RNV).
- Beneficiaries of the campaigns selected by the partners.

#### 2.2.2. Documents to be reviewed

- Initial country research made by each country partner, describing the context in each country (five documents received).
- Campaign plan of each partner (five documents received).
- Monthly meeting minutes held by Skype between October and February (four documents received).
- Monitoring visit to each country reports (five documents received).
- Informal communication through Slack (access granted).
- Campaign materials (still to be send by each partner).
- Analytic data generated during the campaign and other materials summarizing eventual in traditional media as well as a overall analysis of comments (still to be requested to each project partner).

### 2.3. Data analysis and interpretation

To assess the success of each partner campaign given that each partner defined its own goals and objectives for each campaign, the following matrix will guide the evaluation process along with the study of the country context. The matrix may be adapted and complemented with a comparison with what the project coordinator defined as success at the beginning of the project.

Partner	Goal as defined by each partner	Specific objective as defined by each partner	Impact indicator
Center for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance (Amalipe), Bulgaria	1. To influence the general attitude towards Roma students and the allegation that they do not graduate school; that they do not want to study and are not good enough.	1.1. Produce 6 short videos 1.2. Reaching at least 1000 views	Achieved/ Not Achieved/ Unclear + Justification and Description



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

FORUM for Human Rights, Czech Republic	2. To counter negative stereotypes and myths concerning housing support and Roma people living in excluded areas.	2.1. Reach 5, 000 people online with counter narrative content	Achieved/ Not Achieved/ Unclear + Justification and Description
Human Rights Institute, Slovakia	3. To motivate the target groups to be the multipliers of the content.	3.1. Generate some traffic to the websites created in connection with the infographics and containing all the important information on the topic presented in a way to be digested by (uninformed) public.	Achieved/ Not Achieved/ Unclear + Justification and Description
Roma National Council, Croatia	4. To motivate the target groups to be the multipliers of the content produced through the Project.	4.1. Bring at least some part of the produced content to the websites created in connection with the infographics and containing all the important information on the topic presented in a way to be recognized and accepted by uninformed or insufficiently informed general public.	Achieved/ Not Achieved/ Unclear + Justification and Description
Romedia Foundation, Hungary	5.1. To promote the idea of an inclusive, tolerant and democratic European society, lessening the distance between non-Romani and Romani Hungarians, specifically the youth, through an online video/photography campaign. 5.2. To raise awareness about the potential that what happens online has to affect offline reality; in particular the consequences for the Roma community, including children enrolled in all levels of education. 5.3. To raise awareness among a non-Roma Hungarian population about how prejudices become discriminatory practices, and how their thoughts and actions are transmitted to their children. 5.4. To raise awareness among Roma audience about the hate speech they experience online, and the offline abuse that comes as a result of it, and how that are manifestations of a society-wide problem. 5.5. To raise awareness among both groups about the value of interethnic communication and of a more integrated Hungary, through media literacy.	5.1.1. Reach 8,000 members of both of our target groups on all of our dissemination channels for the short film (3,000) and still images (5,000), and of that total, our online 'products' should be engaged with 4,000 (1,250 and 3,750) of those who were exposed to them	Achieved/ Not Achieved/ Unclear + Justification and Description



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

Overall success will also be assessed in terms of how these campaigns contributed for the achievement of the overarching initial goals and expected results defined in the broader project abstract, as enunciated in the following matrix:

Overall objective	Expected results	Objects to be produced	Impact indicator
<p><b>3.</b> Strengthen the capacity of CSOs to implement effective counter narrative campaigns targeting hate speech against Roma</p> <p><b>4.</b> Identify and share best practices with other CSOs, activists and IT companies, in Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia, and across Europe.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Strengthened capacity of CSOs in target countries to counter online hate speech against Roma through designing and implementing counter-narrative campaigns</li> <li>● Increased availability and dissemination of positive and accurate narratives about Roma communities online</li> <li>● Enhanced understanding of good practices in using balanced narratives to counter online hate speech among key stakeholders</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 5 counter narrative campaigns, min 30 online products</li> </ul>	<p>Achieved/ Not Achieved/ Unclear + Justification and Description</p>

**To review and extract key learnings about the success and challenges of each campaign**, quantitative data and qualitative data will be examined in terms of extracting examples of good practices and difficulties.

**To make recommendations based on the lessons learned from the campaigns**, an interpretation of the previous analysis will be done, comparing to recognized good practices of other similar campaigns.

**To make the report internally and publicly useful**, respectively, a document with a maximum of 15 pages, excluding annexes, including 1-2 page executive summary.

### 3. Results presentation

#### Proposed template for the Draft Report

- a) Summary
- b) Introduction
- c) Campaigns' assessment
  - Summary of each country context and campaign plan
  - Results' Matrix
- d) Overall key learnings
- e) Overall challenges
- f) Overall recommendations for future actions
- g) One-page summary of the report for easier public dissemination

April 19, 2019



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

### Annex 2: Evaluator's Bio

Ioli Campos has a doctorate degree within the program Digital Media from The University of Texas at Austin / Portugal Colab; a Masters in journalism from Nova University of Lisbon and a Post-graduation diploma on Human Rights and Democratization from Coimbra University. She has extensive work experience as a journalist, having worked for news media in Portugal, Spain and the United States of America, while covering various societal issues around the globe. Her investigative reporting feature work on topics of human rights and environment has been awarded several times.

Currently, Ioli Campos is an assistant professor at Autonomia University of Lisbon, where she teaches journalism writing, cross-media and media framing. She is also the research coordinator of the new media literacies section at iNova Media Lab. Her academic work has been published in peer-reviewed journals and it has been presented at top international conferences of the area, such as ICA.

As an international consultant on media and human rights, Ioli Campos has worked with the NSC from the Council of Europe and the Europe Foundation, on issues about the information crisis, hate speech, digital campaigning and storytelling for CSOs, among others.



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

### Annex 3: Template provided for the pre-training country research on online anti-Roma hate speech provided by MRGE to each project partner

1. Definition of hate speech
  - 1.1. Is hate speech defined by law in your country?
  - 1.2. If yes, what is the legal definition?
  - 1.3. If hate speech is not defined by law, is there any other definition commonly used in your country (for example, public policy briefs, national strategies etc.)?
  - 1.4. Is hate speech punishable under the national legislation?
  - 1.5. If yes, how is it regulated by the law?
  - 1.6. If your organisation work/has worked on hate speech what definition do/have you use(d)?
  - 1.7. Is there any specific legislation on cyber hate speech?
2. Perpetrators of cyberhate
  - 2.1. Is there any available statistical data on perpetrators of cyberhate?
  - 2.2. What is the most common profile of the perpetrators (gender, age, education, profession, political affiliation etc.)?
3. Messages
  - 3.1. What are the main messages of the perpetrators about the Roma? Please cite some of these messages in the briefing?
  - 3.2. What are those presumed characteristics of the Roma, which perpetrators most often refer to?
  - 3.3. What stereotypes and prejudices appear most often in these messages?
4. Audiences
  - 4.1. Which are the most typical audiences of the perpetrators?
  - 4.2. What characteristics does the audience have (gender, age, education, profession, political affiliation etc.)?
  - 4.3. How does the audience react to perpetrators' messages? Do they accept the messages, or do they reject them?
5. Platforms
  - 5.1. Which are the most commonly used social networks to disseminate hate speech against the Roma?
  - 5.2. Has any of the posts/comments which amounted to hate speech been reported to the moderators/owners of the social network/website?
  - 5.3. Has there been any reaction on behalf of the moderator/owner? If yes, what was the reaction (for example, deleting the post/comment, disabling the user etc.)?
  - 5.4. Which are the most well-known hate sites in your country? Please describe more in detail those ones on which hate speech against Roma is most common. (Which group runs it? Was it established particularly to disseminate hate speech? Is hate speech on this site directed also to any other groups like migrants, religious minorities, women, LGBT people etc.)?
  - 5.5. Are there any organisations which monitor cyber hate speech in your country? If yes, please describe their work (how do they monitor cyber hate? what steps do they take against perpetrators? do they publish any data on their work?)
6. Existing counter narrative initiatives



## **Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma**

- 6.1. Is there any offline or online initiative in your country to counter hate speech against Roma?  
If yes, please describe it.
- 6.2. Who initiated and runs it?
- 6.3. Which tools and measures are used in the initiative to counter hate speech against Roma?
- 6.4. Who is the main target group of the initiative?
- 6.5. Which are the positive and negative outcomes of the initiative?



**Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma**

Annex 4: Campaign plan's template provided by MRGE to each project partner

**Counter/alternative narrative strategy template**

Follow the three steps to design your counter/alternative strategy.

**STEP 1** Choose an oppressive narrative that you identified during the pre-training research and that you would like to counter.

**STEP 2** Analyse the hateful message that you chose.

Why can this message be considered oppressive for the Roma?

Is the message based on any fact?

Is the message a simple expression of opinion or does it incite hatred against the Roma?

Does the message have the potential to reach a big audience?

**STEP 3** Based on your analysis, elaborate your own counter/alternative narrative strategy

What would be the most efficient way to counter the identified hate speech? Why?

How could you discredit and demystify the hateful message?

How would you include in a message what you are standing for?

Can you bolster your messages with facts (statistics, research findings etc.), humour, emotions or positive examples?

Could you rephrase the message to target a different audience?



# Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

## Campaign plan template

Careful planning of the campaign is of utmost importance. Go through the following steps and using the key campaign elements, elaborate your own draft campaign plan. Rely on the findings of your pre-training research about perpetrators, messages, platforms, audiences etc. Get inspired by already existing campaigns and use those elements which you think would be the most efficient in your country. You can use the tools and tips from the <http://www.counternarratives.org/> website to design your own campaign.

**STEP 1** Based on the findings of your pre-training research, define which would be the target group of your campaign (be as specific as possible).

**STEP 2** What are you trying to achieve? Define the goals and the objectives of your campaign. Set something achievable and of which you can evaluate the impact. (Goals are the end, the result, and are quite broad: e.g. to persuade people not to join far-right extremist groups.; Objectives are the means to the end, are specific and tangible: e.g. reach 1,000 people online at risk of radicalisation with counterspeech content, and conduct two workshops on countering extremist propaganda)

**STEP 3** Based on your counter/alternative narrative strategy which you drafted, define the most important messages that you would like to send to the target audience. What do you think would influence them most (for example, facts, emotions, positivity, or satire/humour)?

**STEP 4** Based on the messages and the target audience that you have identified, who is the messenger/voice in your campaign? The messenger delivering the messages to your target audience should be one whom the audience is likely to trust, be inspired by, or listen to.

**STEP 5** Choose the platforms which you would like to use for your campaign. Which one is most often used by your target audience? Which one offers you the best possibilities to reach out to your target audience or to disseminate your message?



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

**STEP 6** What is your dissemination strategy in your campaign plan? Through which channels/platforms are you planning to disseminate your message?

**STEP 7** Based on the target audience and your dissemination strategy, identify the format of your content. What tools would you like to use in your campaign (text, audio, infographics, videos, images, cartoons etc.)? Which one would be apt to reach out to the target audience and in the meantime, could be efficiently disseminated online?

**STEP 8** Make a risk assessment before you launch the campaign. Can your campaign backfire? Would your campaign bring about negative effects alongside positive ones? if so, how do they balance? Which are the critical factors which could endanger the implementation of your campaign?

**STEP 9** Elaborate a timeline for the campaign. Remember that you have to launch at least 6 online products over a three-month period. Some of them will be created before the campaign, while others during the campaign responding to how earlier materials were received.

**STEP 10** Draft your monitoring and evaluation plan. Which data are you planning to collect for the monitoring and evaluation of your campaign (for example, how many people have seen your material, has there been any positive reaction to the campaign from the target or other audience etc.)? The impact is what matters; think of the many ways you can use to assess it.



**Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma**

**Annex 5: Template of the monitoring report from MRGE**

**MONITORING VISIT**

Date:

Partner organisation:

Present:

When was the campaign launched?

What type of materials were produced? (*ask Partners to show them to you and explain the content of each material, attach them to this report as an annex on a separate sheet*)

Did the materials proved to be appropriate for the purpose of the campaign or does the partner think that they should have chosen another format? Why?

On which platforms were the materials disseminated? (*you can include the link of their website/FB/Twitter/Instagram etc. where materials were shared*)

Which online platform proved to be the most appropriate to disseminate the materials and why? Which one was less successful?

What outreach did the materials have? How many shares/likes/comments did they receive? (*please include numbers if it's possible*). Does the partner think that by the end of the campaign they will reach the target set in the original campaign plan?



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

What positive and negative comments did the partner receive for the disseminated materials? (*you could cite a couple of them in the report if it's possible*)

Did the partner need to change the materials depending on the audience's reaction? If so, how?

How does the partner plan to achieve wider audience?

Was there any security concern around the campaign? If so, how the partner tried to mitigate risks?

What timeline does the partner have for the rest of the campaign? Did they need to modify it compared to the original timeline included in the campaign plan? If so, why? (*when will the rest of the materials be published? when will they finish the campaign? etc.*)

Other comments



**Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter  
cyberhate against Roma**

Annex 6: Template provided for Campaign Final Report provided by  
MRGE to each project partner

**COUNTER-NARRATIVE CAMPAIGNS**

Report

This report aims to summarise the campaign and the six materials which your organisation created throughout the online counter-narrative campaign. Please fill in the form and provide information about all 6 materials which you created for the campaign.

**Section 1**

**Information about the campaign**

Please indicate the start and end date of your campaign. If there was any delay compared to your campaign plan, please explain why it happened.

Which campaign material out of the six proved to be the most successful and why?

**Section 2**

**Information about the materials**

Below please provide information about each material that you created for the campaign by answering the questions.

**Material No. 1**

Date of launch

Website, social media, other online space where it was launched (please copy the link here)



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

Short description of the material (what was it about? what issues did it mean to tackle?). If there was any brief text on it/related to it, please translate it to English.

What was the total reach and total engagement for this material? Please indicate how many shares it had on FB/Twitter/YouTube and if it was a video, how many views it had on FB/Twitter/YouTube. (*You can copy information here from the sheet that Marco created*)

Please mention some positive and negative comments/feedback/reaction to the material?

Any other comment about the material

**Material No. 2, 3, 4...**

*The same fields*



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

### Annex 7: Template to gather data from the campaigns provided by MRGE to each project partner

Here are the topics from the shared spreadsheet template created online by MRGE to gather data generated from all campaigns. Each partner filled in its own table sheet, following this common structure:

- Summary
- Original link
- Publication date
- Total reach from partners insights
- Total engagement from partners insights
- Shares from FB/Twitter/Youtube
- Views (for videos only) from FB/Twitter/Youtube



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

### Annex 8: Question guidelines for interviews with Project Partners elaborated and used by the Evaluator

Evaluation Question
<p><b>1. Planning and design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Were campaigns well formulated, realistic and achievable? / Were the goals, objectives and actions to be taken well defined, achievable and interconnected?</li> <li>- Were the deadlines respected? Was the planned timeline realistic?</li> <li>- Were there changes made to the initial plan? If yes, which ones and why?</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Content and strategy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Which campaign materials and strategy elements proved to be the most successful in countering hate speech and which ones were less useful? Why?</li> <li>- Which messages were communicated to the target audiences?</li> <li>- How many online materials were produced?</li> </ul>
<p><b>3. Dissemination and outreach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Did the campaigns counter online hate speech against the Roma successfully?</li> <li>- Did the outreach of the campaigns met the expectations?</li> <li>- Which target audiences did the Partner reach?</li> <li>- How successful the dissemination of the campaigns was at the national and international level?</li> <li>- Were the partners able to monitor the effectiveness of the campaigns, during the implementation and were they able to modify the original campaign plan and react swiftly to opportunities and problems?</li> </ul>
<p><b>4. Results</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If there were any unplanned results (positive or negative) explain what these were and how they came about.</li> <li>- How perpetrators of hate and their followers reacted to the campaigns? Were partners able to predict and mitigate against any reactions?</li> </ul>
<p><b>5. Challenges</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What problems did the partners encounter while conducting the campaigns and how did they cope with these problems?</li> <li>- Was there any risk or threat for the Partner while conducting the campaign? How did the Partner handle the situation and mitigated any future risks?</li> <li>- Did the campaigns manage to incorporate and convey messages concerning Roma women, Roma people with disabilities, those of different ages and other intersectional issues?</li> </ul>
<p><b>Lessons Learned / Bigger challenges / Recommendations for future actions</b></p>

Ask for beneficiaries' contacts; confirm links to objects.



## Freedom from hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma

### Annex 9: Contact template for beneficiaries elaborated and used by the evaluator

(beneficiaries were contacted by email and FB instant message)

Dear -----name-----,

My name is Ioli Campos and I am reaching out to you on behalf of MRGE. I was hired by them to make the final evaluation of the campaigns held within the project Freedom From Hate: Empowering civil society to counter cyberhate against Roma' (REC-RRACONLINE-AG-2017). --Person's name--, from -- Institution's name---, in charge of the campaign in ---country---, gave me your contact as one of the beneficiaries of that campaign.

I would like to ask you if you would be available to answer me a few questions about the impact of the campaign. It can be either by skype or email, whichever is more convenient to you. I thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. Here are the questions:

1. Could you please start by describing in which capacity have you interacted with the campaign?
2. Do you think that the campaign was well formulated and implemented? Could you point out the aspects that, in your opinion, were the most successful and the ones that needed more work to be done?
3. Do you think the campaign was effective?
4. From the knowledge you had of this campaign, who do you think was the main target reached?
5. What impact do you think that this campaign had in your country?

Kind regards,

