

European Crime Prevention Award (ECPA)

Annex I

Approved by the EUCPN Management Board in 2018

Please complete the template in English in compliance with the ECPA criteria contained in the Rules and procedures for awarding and presenting the European Crime Prevention Award (Par.2 §3).

General information

1. Please specify your country.

Lithuania

2. Is this your country's ECPA entry or an additional project?

ECPA entry

3. What is the title of the project?

Play Your Role: Gamification against Hate Speech

4. Who is responsible for the project? Contact details.

Director of VŠĮ EDUKACINIAI PROJEKTAI (NGO Educational projects),

Gintarė Černikienė

gintarecernikiene@gmail.com

+37060489297

5. Start date of the project (dd/mm/yyyy)? Is the project still running (Yes/No)? If not, please provide the end date of the project.

No 2019-07-01 - 2021-06-30

6. Where can we find more information about the project? Please provide links to the project's website or online reports or publications (preferably in English).

Project website: <https://www.playyourrole.eu/>, organisation's website

<https://www.edupro.it/play-your-role-1>, partner's website:

<https://www.zaffiria.it/category/play-your-role/>.

7. Please give a **one page** description of the project (**Max. 600 words**)

The project focuses on overcoming cyber-bullying and hate speech on video game platforms, and reducing tolerance for hate speech among 11-19-year-olds. The particularly low recognition capacity of hate speech among children and the lack of education among teachers and other adults in this area do not adequately contribute to prevention. The aim of this project is to enable adults to educate children on bullying topics, using such an important environment of video games for young people of this age. The aim is that these and similar methods can contribute to the eradication of electronic bullying at the very foundation level, through education and the enhancement of adult competences. The aim of this project is not to punish and threaten but to offer an alternative: to encourage young people themselves to choose in what environment they want to spend time in. In October-November 2019, NGO Educational projects carried out a survey of 14-15 year-olds from 3 schools in Šiauliai (a total of 228 respondents) about hate speech in the digital space. 1/3 of them notice hate groups and aggressive language in gaming communities. Almost 30% believe that hate speech cannot be avoided in video games, that it is "normal". Most respondents also believe that bullying, hate speech doesn't affect them in their daily lives.

The aim of the project is to help young people in education and prevention to critically assess the nature of media messages in video games and recognise the language of hatred and its impact, while offering measures to ensure prevention. Objectives:

- Contrast hate speech online, enhancing video games and gamification as tools to reinforce positive behaviors in teenagers;
- Promote awareness and comprehension of xenophobic and racist online hate speech, through the creation of new pedagogical tools and the exploitation of video games, for teachers and youth workers, that consolidate empathy and critical thinking;
- Creation of new and creative online counter narratives in form of gaming activities.

Activities:

1. Creation of new pedagogical itineraries based on existing videogames;
2. Study of the phenomenon hate speech online in young video gamers communities;
3. Organization of a European-level hackathon for the creation of 4 new game proposals;
4. Implementation of an online platform and the organization of the new format

I. The project shall focus on prevention and/or reduction of everyday crime and fear of crime within the theme.

8. Which **crime prevention/ reduction mechanisms** were used in this project to contribute to crime prevention and/or the reduction of crime or the fear of crime? Multiple answers are possible.

Establishing and maintaining normative barriers to committing criminal acts

e.g. 'Offenders, we are watching you' campaigns

Reducing recruitment to criminal social environments and activities by eliminating or reducing the social and individual causes and processes that lead to criminality

e.g. social and financial support for disadvantaged families

Deterring potential perpetrators from committing crimes through the threat of punishment

e.g. decreasing the time between arrest and punishment

Disrupting criminal acts by stopping them before they are carried out

e.g. increasing police patrols in vulnerable areas

Protecting vulnerable targets by reducing opportunities and make it more demanding to carry out criminal acts

e.g. placing locks and cameras

Reducing the harmful consequences of criminal acts

e.g. initiatives to recover stolen goods

Reducing the rewards from criminal acts

e.g. restorative justice programmes

Incapacitating (or neutralising) perpetrators by denying them the ability (capacity) to carry out new criminal acts

e.g. imprisonment of key gang members

Encouraging desistance from crime and rehabilitating former offenders so they are able to settle back into a normal life

e.g. prison rehabilitation programs

Explain how this/these crime prevention mechanisms were used ((**Max. 300 words**))

The measures used in the project operate at several levels of prevention:

- 1) Primary prevention. The measures help to develop favourable video game habits by developing critical thinking and enabling adults (teachers, parents) to engage in hate speech (targeting other races, nationalities, religions, etc.), e-bullying prevention activities, helping to protect potential targets – more sensitive children – before they start playing;

- 2) Secondary prevention. Reduces tolerance for hate speech when it already occurs, encourages young people to detect and report the occurrence and bullying of hate speech;
- 3) Third prevention. Helps to create a safe environment for young people affected by bullying and guarantees protection against repeated psychological violence.
- 4) 15 tools have already been developed with the content of training and education for teachers, youth workers;
- 5) 1 hackathon was organized;
- 6) 4 short video games have been created, one of which is "Cyber Troll Invasion" – in Lithuanian;
- 7) investigation of hate speech in video games (published in <https://www.edupro.lt/gamification-against-hate-speech>, <https://www.facebook.com/EdukaciniaiProjektai/posts/5045621825511045> on social networks);
- 8) 5) There is an online platform (<https://www.playyourrole.eu/>) where all tools for education and video games can be found.

II. The project shall have been evaluated and have achieved most or all of its objectives. For more information on evaluation, click [here](#)

9. What were the reasons for setting up the project? Was this context analysed before the project was initiated and in what way (How, and by whom? Which data were used)? In what way did this analysis inform the set-up of the project? (**Max. 150 words**)

With the implementation of the Code of Conduct, since May 2016 many important platforms have committed themselves to fight the spread of such content in Europe. The results of the "2nd monitoring exercise of the implementation of the Code of Conduct" show a fourfold increase in the notifications of hate speech online being the main grounds for reporting Xenophobia (17.8 %), which includes anti-migrant hatred, has been reported, together with anti-Muslim hatred (17.7 %), as the most recurrent ground of hate speech, followed by ethnic origin (15.8 %). Intrinsically woven with the world of social media is the field of video games, still marginally studied in relation to hate speech. Nowadays video games represent one of the most influential media in popular culture: at European level the 97% of teenagers (12-17) (40% of which are girls) plays or has played video games.

10. What were the objective(s) of the project? Please, if applicable, distinguish between main and secondary objectives. (**Max. 150 words**)

Objectives:

1. Contrast hate speech online, enhancing video games and gamification as tools to reinforce positive behaviors in teenagers;
2. Promote awareness and comprehension of xenophobic and racist online hate speech, through the creation of new pedagogical tools and the exploitation of video games, for teachers and youth workers, that consolidate empathy and critical thinking;
3. Creation of new and creative online counter narratives in form of gaming activities.

11. Has there been a process evaluation?¹ Who conducted the evaluation (internally or externally?) and what were the main results? Which indicators were used to measure the process? Did you make changes accordingly? **(max. 300 words)**

An external evaluator has been hired for an independent evaluation of the project. The project coordinator in Italy recommended and appointed Daphne Bavelier, a professor at the University of Geneva, one of the most experienced experts in video games and neuroscience in the world, to assess the project. Dr. Bavelier has been approached for her experience and attitude to the potential of games for "serious" purposes, beyond entertainment alone. The evaluator participated in 2 international meetings and has access to all project documents and results, communicated with all project stakeholders, monitored project implementation process. It carried out its first interim evaluation after the first year of the project and is preparing a final written evaluation report. The final report will look at how far the objectives have been achieved, how problems have been addressed, how effectively the project has been managed at all and whether the dissemination of information has been effective.

Project Quantitative Indicators:

- 1) traffic of visitors on the project website;
- 2) reviews on social networks;
- 3) number of awareness-raising activities;
- 4) the number of participants in project activities;
- 5) number of games created (during the hackathon) and download statistics;
- 6) number of prepared pedagogical tools and distribution statistics;
- 7) analysis of the attendance of Internet dissemination tools.

¹ **Process evaluation:** Also called *implementation evaluation*, or *monitoring*, this process documents **how the activities were implemented** in order to determine any deviations from the original planning. It facilitates finding explanations for when the results of the intervention are not as expected.

Qualitative indicators:

- 1) the level of motivation of participants in the research;
- 2) how widely the results of the project have been shared;
- 3) qualitative evaluation of the users of results;
- 4) the persons involved (heads of school administrations, other education specialists, representatives of self-government, etc.) diversity.

The external evaluator have been conducting interviews and written interviews with the target groups and relevant stakeholders. The different activities of the project have been evaluated using the evaluation questionnaire submitted by the European Commission.

12. Has there been an outcome² or impact³ evaluation? Who conducted the evaluation (internally or externally?), which data and evaluation method were used and what were the main results? Which indicators were used to measure the impact? (**Max. 300 words**)

After the end of the project, NGO Educational projects is planning to work with teachers who participated in the project, analyse how they adapt their knowledge to work with students, regularly carry out research on the basis of a questionnaire developed during the project and assess how students evaluate hate speech on video game platforms, or strengthen their ability to recognize hate manifestations and report to administrators. Such impact measurements are foreseen 3 and 6 months after the end of the project activities.

The evaluation of results and impacts is inseparable from the evaluation of the process and therefore some indicators overlap with the above process evaluation indicators. One of the tasks of external project evaluation is also to determine the impact of the project on participants before the project is completed. Special surveys will help to identify how teachers and pupils who participated in the activities assess the works of the project, and how they plan to use them in lessons and other activities.

² **Outcome evaluation:** Measures the **direct effect** (i.e., extent of the changes) **of the intervention on the target group, population, or geographic area**. The information produced by the outcome evaluation determines at what level the **objectives were achieved**.

³ **Impact evaluation:** Measures **long-term effects** of the intervention on the target group, as well as **indirect effects** on the broader community. The information produced by the impact evaluation determines at what level the **ultimate goals** of the intervention were achieved.

III. The project shall, as far as possible, be innovative, involving new methods or new approaches.

13. How is the project innovative in its methods and/or approaches? (**Max. 150 words**)

Unlike other preventive measures in crime prevention, the products developed in the project do not seek to discourage, replace threatening activities. On the contrary - they seek to encourage better understanding and critical thinking, assess the situation on digital platforms adequately and develop individual abilities of children and teachers, promote the joy of cognition, interest, enhance motivation to create leisure space as they would like. Teachers are empowered to act in the environment well known to children – video games – which promotes a sense of equivalence between different generations, reduces exclusion, and increases the self-confidence of educators. The project appeals to the awareness of game developers to create games not only for leisure, but also to develop learning and social skills. Teachers are encouraged to use games as a powerful pedagogical tool and change the perception of video games as just a means of spending time.

IV. The project shall be based on cooperation between partners, where possible.

14. Which partners or stakeholders were involved in the project and what was their involvement? (**Max. 200 words**)

Partners:

SOCIETA COOPERATIVA SOCIALE ZAFFIRIA (Bologna, Italy), project coordinator;

COSPE - COOPERAZIONE PER LO SVILUPPO DEI PAESA EMERGENTI ONLUS (Florence, Italy)

UNIVERSIDADE DO ALGARVE (Faro, Portugal)

JFF - Jugend Film Fernsehen e-V. (Berlin, Germany)

Fundacja Nowoczesna Polska (Warsaw, Poland)

OWN AND DEVENIR (Paris, France)

Each partner is responsible for implementing the project in their own countries, and the activities mentioned in the application are implemented in each country for the same results.

V. The project shall be capable of replication in other Member States.

15. How and by whom is the project funded? (**Max. 150 words**)

Project is partially (80%) funded by EC „Rights, Equality and Citizenship“ programme. The rest is partners' contribution.

16. What were the costs of the project in terms of finances, material and human resources? (**Max. 150 words**)

The project is partly funded by the European Commission's Rights, Equality and Citizenship programme. The total value of the project is EUR 414004,40, of which the programme finances EUR 331203,52 (80%). 20% of the value of the project is co-financed by all partners.

The planned budget for NGO Educational projects is 24328.59 EUR

Of which:

Salary –7147,00 EUR;

Travel/mission expenses –4540,00 EUR;

Expenditure on goods and services –11050,00 EUR

Other (indirect) expenses –1591.59 EUR.

17. Has a cost-benefit analysis⁴ been carried out? If so, describe the analysis, including how and by whom it was carried out and list the main findings of the analysis. (**Max. 150 words**)

The cost-benefit analysis has been carried out by the representatives of the financing authority before the idea of the project has been approved and when the final financial and operational reports are received. As the measures have been financed and a detailed estimate of the justification for the costs has been provided, the positive assessment indicates that the costs for the project activities have been properly planned and justified. Following the preparation of the interim report, it was noted that the results achieved correspond to those planned in the project application and that, therefore, by the time this project is implemented, the costs correspond to the benefits obtained. The final report will be submitted to the financing body for evaluation of the final results of the project and the impact achieved.

18. Are there adjustments to be made to the project to ensure a successful replication in another Member State?

⁴ **Cost-benefit analysis:** A type of economic evaluation that compares the direct and indirect cost of the resources employed in the intervention, with the equivalent economic value of the benefits.

Materials are provided in English, manuals, descriptions are provided to all products (4 serious games, urban game) created in the project in order to alleviate the process of replicating, using the outputs successfully in different European countries. Partners are ready to consult in using the material any interested parties.

19. How is the project relevant for other Member States? Please explain the European dimension of your project.

A real European dimension is provided with the exchange of the 7 European partners of the project and the proposal of activities at European level. All have a solid network around Europe on which to build, enabling a wide dissemination of the project and its materials creating a real European impact. The expertise and national specificity of the partners have been taken into account in the proposal of the pedagogical itineraries and in their adaptation to the general European context. The collaboration among professionals coming from different countries have enabled to give a multi-faceted picture, giving the opportunity to learn from each other and to develop together new ideas that are relevant throughout Europe. The research has involved a relevant number of young Europeans to have a wider and more complete vision of hate speech online and the world of videogames. The project has used the potential of the European independent videogames industry, with its culture of start-ups, digital creativity and social innovation. Choosing mostly independent and little known products which are more related to topic of the project, creating interesting and alternative materials for educators and youth operators that can refer to the European cultural and artistic tradition, as well as to its values of tolerance and mutual respect. The educational material produced is therefore exploitable and relevant in large geographical contexts. Attention has been given to the linguistic plurality: English has been the language of communication and in which all materials will be made available, as well as the 6 languages of the project (French, German, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish and Portuguese) to ensure an effective wide use and dissemination.

Please provide a short general description of the project (abstract for inclusion in the conference booklet – **max. 150 words**).

The project focuses on overcoming cyber-bullying and hate speech on video game platforms, and reducing tolerance for hate speech among 11-19-year-olds. The particularly low recognition capacity of hate speech among children and the lack of education among teachers and other adults in this area do not adequately contribute to prevention. The aim of this project is to enable adults to educate children on bullying topics, using such an important environment of video games for young people of this age. The aim is that these and similar

methods can contribute to the eradication of electronic bullying at the very foundation level, through education and the enhancement of adult competences. The aim of this project is not to punish and threaten but to offer an alternative: to encourage young people themselves to choose in what environment they want to spend time in.