

C4i

Communication for Integration



A COMMON
METHODOLOGY TO
IDENTIFY RUMORS

DOC. 1

Funded
by the European Union
and the Council of Europe



EUROPEAN UNION

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Implemented
by the Council of Europe

April 2014

Doc.1 A COMMON METHODOLOGY TO IDENTIFY RUMOURS

Contents

_Toc382411411

1. The objective	2
2. Rumours, stereotypes and prejudices	3
3. The process to identify rumours	4
3.1. The target	4
3.2. Methodological tools	4
A. Organization 1-2 workshops.....	5
B. Making a Survey/interview.....	6
C. Analysis of existing information	8
4. The results	9
5. Calendar	9

Author: **Daniel de Torres**

Date: April 2014 - Version 1.0

This document has been produced in the context of the C4i-Communication for Integration project, a joint initiative from the Council of Europe and the European Commission under Grant Agreement HOME/2012/EIFX/CA/CFP/4190.

Administrator: **Lilia Kolombet**, Council of Europe

Project Coordinator: **Gemma Pinyol**, Council of Europe

Duration: 01-01-2014 – 30-06-2015

1. The objective

The purpose of this document is to provide methodological guidelines to identify the main rumours related to immigration and ethnic minorities in each c4i city.

Using a common methodology among all cities will allow us to compare the results and ensure a certain rigor in the process. This is not going to be an academic research, but the goal is to obtain enough relevant information to get a general idea of what are the main rumours at a specific time and context.

The process of identifying the rumours has also an indirect objective, which is to contact potential members of future anti-rumour networks in each city. The people who will convene to participate in this process may end up being part of the network.

2. Rumours, stereotypes and prejudices

C4i project aims to dismantle false rumours, but how do we described rumours? Rumours are statements about individuals, groups or events that spread from one person to another without demonstrating their veracity. Credibility is established not because there is direct evidence to support them but because there are many people who believe them.

What characterizes the rumours?

- Many people believe them
- They are based on ambiguous and untestable information
- They are transmitted to us by someone with credibility

Rumours, especially those related to immigrants and ethnic minorities, have a breeding ground that we must address: stereotypes and prejudices.

Stereotypes consist to attribute in a widely and exaggerated way a number of specific attributes (ways of being and behave) to all those who share a particular feature (same sex, nationality, religion, profession, etc.)

Stereotypes can have an empirical basis, but indiscriminate exaggeration and generalization to a whole set of individuals is what makes them stereotypes.

Prejudice is a logical derivation of negative stereotypes: I presume how is the 'other' and therefore also presuppose "what he's able to do to me", to the point to make me adopt a "preventive " attitude of hostility, suspicious or rejection that determine my willingness -attitude – and my behaviour towards the "other".

Unlike the stereotype, prejudice presents a combination of feelings or emotions. That is, prejudice is not a cold belief about other groups, but a belief based on emotions and feelings that largely have been transmitted to us within close relationships (family, friends, etc.)

3. The process to identify rumours

Before going into the details of the methodology and tools we propose, we must define which the target group is; the people we want to involve on this process. Since we cannot make a quantitative survey to hundreds or thousands of citizens, we must focus on consulting a limited number of people who can provide good knowledge about the rumours circulating among all the citizens.

3.1. The target

We need to reach people with diverse profiles and from different sectors who are in contact with citizens in their daily and professional life. We can separate between "internal" profiles (within municipal administration) and "externals".

The list we propose do not mean to be complete, it is a proposal to be taken into account. The idea is that there should be a great representation of most of these profiles:

- Internal: municipal staff from various departments (culture, education, diversity, safety, health, police etc.) employees working attending the public (municipal offices..) social workers, mediators etc. and politicians (from government and opposition if possible)
- External: representatives of social organizations, cultural, immigrant, sports, neighbours, local commerce and businesses, parents, youth etc.

In this sense we also should include some professionals from (public and private) schools, cultural centres (libraries, museums, music and theatre's centres etc.) sports facilities, health centres, etc.

3.2. Methodological tools

To identify the main rumours in each city we propose a methodology based on three different instruments:

- Organization of 1-2 workshops (25-40 people)
- Conducting a survey/interview (15-25 people)
- Review of existing documentation (when possible)

A. Organization 1-2 workshops

Organizing a workshop to identify rumours is an activity that has proved very useful and stimulating both for identifying the rumours and also to generate interest in the project among participants and encourage them to join the future antirumours network.

The idea is to mix different profiles (internal and external) in a session that may be about 2-3 hours (and depending on the circumstances of each city, can be two workshops, one internal and one internal-external to reach more people) and for which we propose the following structure and methodology:

1. Presentation of the project:

C4i project objectives, antirumours concept, the creation of the antirumours network, development of an awareness campaign, the European dimension of the project etc.

2. Explanation of the methodology of the workshop:

Participants are grouped into few working groups (6-8 people each)

The first thing each group will do is to select a spokesperson to take notes and later explain the results to the rest of the people.

3. The first question to work on each working group should be:

- a) What are the main rumours you have heard about immigrants and ethnic minorities
The spokesperson from each group must write down the list of rumours that come out and are the most relevant and shared (can be 4, 6, 8...)

4. More questions:

- b) Do you consider that these rumours are false, true, exaggerations or distortions of reality, and why do you think so?
- c) For those rumours you consider are not true, what are the arguments, data or explanations that you could bring to someone who believes they are?

5. Spokespersons from each working group explain their answers to the rest of the groups

- a) The facilitator/s of the workshop collect the responses of each group and compare the results to make a single list of the main and most shared rumours identified
This will be the main outcome of the workshop as it is the main purpose of it.
- b) The answers to the second question about the arguments and data that groups have identified to counter false rumours are shared. Although this issue will be addressed later in the project is important to use this workshop to advance it.

6. Open debate among the participants on the results of the workshop
7. Facilitators of the workshop highlights the main findings and announced that from now the project will focus on creating the antirumours network and collect data and arguments to counter rumours and define a raising-awareness campaign.

They should ask attendees who are interested in receiving information on the project and maybe joining the future antirumours network and campaign, to sign and provide their details in a list.

8. Those responsible for the workshop should prepare a short report (based on a template that will be sent) with the main results of the workshop (or workshops if cities organize more than one)

B. Making a Survey/interview

In order to have the opinion of a minimum number of people of various profiles, it is important to complement the workshop with a survey/interview of key people.

The target is the one we have already defined and we can decide according to people who have not attended the workshop: if no one has come from the education sector, we can decide to conduct some surveys to 2-3 teachers, same with people from the health, sport, culture sectors etc. Surveys should also be done to some social city leaders and technical staff of the municipality.

In some cases it may be that some people who answered the questionnaire also participate in the workshop. But it is most desirable not to do that in order to gather information from a larger number of people.

The target could be 15-25 people (mix of “internal” and “external”)

The survey can be done by email or also can be done as a face-to-face interview.

Proposed questionnaire:

We could choose a closed questionnaire with several questions with rating answers or an open one with few qualitative questions. We prefer the second option, however it is more complex to manage and compare, so it is important to clarify that the answers should be synthetic (for example with a maximum of about 75 words each answer)

This is a proposal of questions and each city may decide to add more questions or to do little changes to them, but we need this information and we need to compare it among cities. Cities should create their own document with the questionnaire and they should send it to us before starting.

1. Introduction: Brief description of the project
2. Respondent details (name, age, email, department / organization, ...)
3. Proposed questions:
 - a) What do you think of the level of coexistence among citizens with diverse cultural or ethnic origin in your city?
 - b) What are the main rumours you have heard from citizens regarding immigrants or ethnic minorities in your city?

For each rumour, please answer the following questions:

- Can you provide more details about the topic of the rumour (for example about the impact of immigrants to the labour market, to social benefits, health system, education, social housing, values or identity like gender issues etc.)
- Can you provide some examples of the arguments people are using to justify this rumour? (for example if people thinks: “immigrants are getting our jobs”, what are the examples, knowledge, personal experiences or sources of information they have in order to justify this belief?)
- Is this rumour targeting any specific group? (like a concrete nationality, ethnic or religious minority, etc.)
- Is there any area or population group where this rumour is specially spread and shared? (like among a similar age group, or specific districts/neighbourhood etc.)

7

Example: Have you ever heard expressions like “migrants abuse of social benefits (scholarships, economic help, access to social housing, etc.)”?

Yes, many times

Yes, sometimes

No, never.

If yes, could you please elaborate:

- Which arguments/examples are used to justify this opinion?
- This opinion, is related to any specific group (regarding nationality, sex, age, etc.)?

- This opinion, is mainly sustained by specific groups (elderly people, youth people, nationals, foreigners, social services users, etc.)?
- Have you ever tried to argue against this opinion? If yes, which argument have you used?

4. Finally we can ask them permission to send more information on the project and to invite them to a public presentation or an event to create the antirumours network of the city.

C. Analysis of existing information

In some cities (or maybe at provincial, regional or state level) there may exist some studies, reports, surveys etc. focusing on issues like citizen's problems or worries, or what do they think of some social issues like or whatever the topic. On those reports we maybe could find some indirect information about rumours and stereotypes of citizens regarding immigrants or ethnic minorities. This could be just complementary information to the one we got from the workshop and interviews. In case any city has this kind of information it's worth to count with it, as it may be useful also to compare the city rumours with citizen's perceptions at state level.

In this case, cities shall provide the references of the study / survey and a summary of the results concerning the main stereotypes / rumours identified.

4. The results

Cities will send to the project leader and campaign's consultant the results of this process to identify the main rumours.

The report with the results will be very synthetic and should include:

- Results of the workshop:
 - Number and profile of participants
 - Summary of the responses to the questions raised
 - General comment on the development of the workshop, the interest shown by participants, assessing their involvement etc.

- Results of the questionnaires:
 - Number and profile of interviewees
 - A copy of all the questionnaires
 - Summary of responses (main rumours identified)
 - General comment on the process

- Main rumours

9

Cities should send a one-page paper with the list of the main rumours identified through the process (between 5-10 rumours)

5. Calendar

Cities must perform this process during the second half of March and April.



C4i - COMMUNICATION FOR INTEGRATION

Funded
by the European Union
and the Council of Europe



EUROPEAN UNION

COUNCIL OF EUROPE



CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Implemented
by the Council of Europe