



PREVENTING HATE AGAINST REFUGEES AND MIGRANTS

Report of the survey with journalists

DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK CARRIED OUT IN
GREECE, ITALY AND SPAIN

UNIMI and USAL Team

(Italy & Spain)

30 September 2021



This project is funded by the European Union's Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme (2014-2020). REC-RRAC-RACI-AG-2019. Grant Agreement number 875217

<http://pharmproject.usal.es>

This report constitutes Deliverable 20, for Work Package 4 of the PHARM project.

September 2021

© 2021 – PHARM, Preventing Hate Against Refugees and Migrants, – GA number 875217.

General contact: pharm.project.eu@gmail.com

For more information type the e-mail address of the corresponding author

Information may be quoted provided the source is stated accurately and clearly.

This publication is also available via <https://pharmproject.usal.es/>

This project is funded by the European Union's Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme (2014-2020).
REC-RRAC-RACI-AG-2019. Grant Agreement number 875217

The content of this report represents the views of the author only and is his/her sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.

Copyright © Pharm Consortium, 2020

All rights reserved. No part of the report may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, and may not be quoted or cited, without prior permission in writing from the project coordinator.

The views expressed during the execution of the project, in whatever form and or by whatever medium, are the sole responsibility of the authors. The European Union is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

VERSION CONTROL SHEET

Deliverable number + title	D20. Public report of the results of the surveys
Prepared by	UNIMI and SPAIN Teams (Italy & Spain)
Work package number	4
Work package leader	Sergio Splendore
Dissemination level (PU, CO)	PU
Delivery date	29/09/2021
Submission date to EC	30/09/2021
Main authors	Sergio Splendore, Martín Oller, Diego Garusi, David Blanco-Herrero
Reviewers	Carlos Arcila Calderón, Patricia Sánchez-Holgado

REVISION HISTORY

Version	Date	Summary of changes	Initials	Changes marked
1	29.09.21	x	x	x

Table of content

<u>1. JOURNALISTS' PERCEPTIONS OF HATE SPEECH ABOUT MIGRANTS AND REFUGEES IN SOUTHERN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES</u>	6
1.1 METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH	7
1.1.1 POPULATION AND SAMPLING	7
1.1.2 THE QUESTIONNAIRE	8
1.1.3 PROCESS	9
1.2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	9
<u>2. ITALY REPORT</u>	11
2.1 BACKGROUND OF JOURNALISTS	11
2.2 ETHICS	11
2.3 SAFETY	12
2.4 INFLUENCE	12
2.5 TECHNOLOGY	13
<u>3. REPORT GREECE</u>	14
3.1 BACKGROUNDS OF JOURNALISTS	14
3.2 ETHICS	14
3.3 SAFETY	15
3.4 INFLUENCE	16
3.5 TECHNOLOGY	16
3.6 HATE SPEECH	17
<u>4. REPORT SPAIN</u>	19
4.1 BACKGROUND OF JOURNALISTS	19
4.2 ETHICS	19
4.3 SAFETY	20
4.4 INFLUENCE	21
4.5 TECHNOLOGY	22
4.6 HATE SPEECH	22
<u>5. REFERENCES</u>	26

1. Journalists' perceptions of hate speech about migrants and refugees in Southern European countries

Preventing Hate Against Refugees and Migrants (PHARM)¹ is a project that monitors hate speech against refugees and migrants in Greece, Italy, and Spain in order to understand it and counter it. The focus of the project is on social media, paying particular attention to the role of journalists as information and communication experts and relevant actor in the representation of migrants and refugees on the media and on the dissemination of images of migration that can influence that fight against hate speech.

Previous tasks of this project have focused on the perceptions of journalists specialized in migration about the coverage of migration and the importance of hate speech. These perceptions were studied in a qualitative way, using in-depth and reconstruction interviews, filling in the existing gap of knowledge about these issues, who had been previously tackled mostly from the perspective of the content (especially using content analysis), but which had not been enough research from the approach of the professionals behind it.

This study used 95 interviews with journalists specialized on migration, offering a deep understanding of the topic. However, it is necessary to complement this approach with a more quantitative and generalized one, in which the perceptions of larger samples of journalists can be studied, including also the visions of journalists outside of that specialized area, given that hate speech is a larger communicative and sociological problem that cannot be tackled only from one perspective.

That is why the second task of the Work Package 4, related to Understand and counter hate speech with the help of journalists, was a Probabilistic survey among journalists, trying to obtain information about their professional roles, the relevance of ethics in their profession and their views and experiences with hate speech.

The use of surveys for researching the perceptions of journalists regarding different topics is not novel in the academia, and this method has proven useful and fruitful in obtaining knowledge (see, for instance, Blanco-Herrero & Arcila-Calderón, 2019 or Fengler et al., 2015, as well as all the articles and works produced from the Worlds of Journalism Study, such as Hanitzsch, Hanusch, Ramaprasad & de Beer, 2019).

Despite the broad use of this technique, seldom studies have focused on what journalists from Southern Europe think about migration and hate speech. The few existing attempts do not come from Southern European countries (Obermaier, Hofbauer & Reinemann, 2018), and the transnational and comparative approach is even less common, which is why the project established

¹ PHARM is a European project funded by the European Union, within Rights, Equality and Citizenship programme REC-RRAC-RACI-AG-2019 (GA n. 875217).

the need to fill in this knowledge gap with a survey in the three countries present in the project: Spain, Italy and Greece.

These countries have a similar socioeconomic situation –the three of them were strongly affected by the economic and debt crisis–, and, in journalistic terms, they all belong to what Hallin and Mancini (2004) defined as the Mediterranean or Polarized Pluralist Model. That is, they share a similar system, in which the weak professionalization should be mentioned as a key aspect for journalists. At the same time, they all share their condition of doorways to Europe, with the challenges this brings. And even though the attitudes towards immigrants seem to be significantly better among Spaniards than in the two other countries (European Commission, 2018; Pew Research Center, 2018), the rise of anti-immigration and far-right parties, as well as the growing registered cases of hate crimes against migrants and refugees in the three countries (OSCE, 2021), makes it relevant to study together and to compare the perceptions of journalists in the three countries.

1.1 Methodological approach

The team leading this study was the Italian one, based at the University of Milano, with support from the local teams of Greece and Spain. The goal of the study was to collect the surveys during the fieldwork of the International Network Worlds of Journalism Study (WJS - www.worldsofjournalism.org) during 2020, however, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this fieldwork was postponed, and the collection of surveys could be conducted in collaboration with this project only in Italy, whereas the fieldwork in Spain and Greece had to be independently led within the PHARM project.

1.1.1 Population and sampling

The first task of the team was to determine the population of journalists (professional and peripheral) of the three countries. During this stage it was important to pay attention to different editorial ranks, searching for all journalists who work for news outlets in each country. Knowing the total number of journalists was important for calculating our sample size, given that for an appropriate sampling it is important to offer a picture of the national media system (media and news outlets and organizations).

The sample was based on, firstly, nationally representative main samples of professional journalists, and, secondly, a supplemental sample of independent journalists (freelance, self-employed...). The final sample of journalists should roughly mirror the population with respect to their basic sociodemographic profiles.

The number of professional journalists interviewed in each country's main sample depends on three parameters: population size, confidence level, and the amount of acceptable sampling error. A common value for the confidence level is 95 percent, so this value should be used when calculating the sample size.

In order to meet the highest standards in social sciences research, national teams should ideally arrive at sample sizes with a maximum error margin of three percent. When this is not possible, a maximum error of five percent is still acceptable. The sample size can be conveniently calculated on the following website: <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>.

Thus, given a estimated population of around 50000 journalists in these three countries, the sample size with a 5% error was of 381, 593 for a 4% error, and 1045 for a 3% margin of error. The total sample size in the three countries was 398. This is below the expected sample size of around 1170 journalists; however, the impossibility of conducting the fieldwork in collaboration with the Worlds of Journalism Study, as expected, made it impossible to reach the predicted sample.

1.1.2 The questionnaire

The master questionnaire was first drafted in English, using questions from previous studies in the field, and using the findings of the interviews with journalists working on migration issues as a basis, we designed the master questionnaire in English. Each coordination team in Spain, Italy and Greece were then responsible for the translation of the questionnaire into the relevant local language. Accuracy and equivalence of translations were secured by systematic procedures, such as translation-backtranslation or by involving a multilingual team of researchers. As a general rule, functionally equivalent translation had priority over literal translation, so national teams had to use a questionnaire wording that best reflected the contents of the original questions.

The questionnaire was designed so that it included a set of mandatory questions that had to be asked in every language. In addition, national teams may or may not make use of optional questions and statements, while they are also free to add questions to the questionnaire. Any additional questions, however, should not impact on the content and answers to the mandatory questions. The variables corresponding to these additional questions were not considered for the analysis, studying only those variables that were present in all questionnaires, so that a comparison could be established.

The questionnaire had the following sections:

1. Questions about professional aspects and the career of the journalist, their background, and their newsrooms
2. Questions about issues that can be directly or indirectly connected with hate speech and its coverage, such as the importance of technology and ethics in the daily work, the factors that influence it or questions about safety.
3. Questions about the perspectives of the journalist about hate speech.
4. A set of sociodemographic questions.

The first and last sections included multiple choice and short answer questions, whereas the two central ones used five-point Likert scales to measure the

frequency –from Never to Always– or the level of agreement with different statements –From totally disagree to Totally agree–.

1.1.3 Process

The survey was distributed by the local members of each country using the Qualtrics software. The distribution started in June in Spain, in July in Greece and in August in Italy. And was closed in September in the three cases. The different dates are explained by two reasons: in the case of Spain and Greece, by the different time needed to complete the translation and to ensure the quality of the survey; and in the Italian case, in order to start the distribution together with the Worlds of Journalism Study fieldwork.

The distribution was disseminated reaching out to professional associations of journalists, trade unions and similar organizations, and to media of all types, so that they would share it among their networks; additionally, individual journalists were contacted. The contact in all these cases was made using email and, only as a complementary strategy in exceptional cases, using social media. When no answer was obtained, the team sent up to two reminders with around one month in-between. The response rate was very low both in Greece and Spain (less than 10%, not including the journalists contacted by other journalists or organizations in a snowball procedure), although significantly higher in the case of Italy, where the distribution was made within the Words of Journalism Study.

It must be mentioned that summer played a significant role, given that many journalists are out of their workplaces during July and/or August, making it harder in some cases to contact them, what demanded a longer period of collection during part of September. The collection of answers was closed before the last week of September for conducting the analysis of the answers; however, the questionnaires stayed open longer, so that it would be possible to still receive additionally answers that could increase the sample and that could be included in further publications. These answers are not expected in any case, to mean any significant change on the observations and conclusions mentioned in this report.

Finally, in order to simplify and accelerate the phase of analysis, all the questions had been designed with the same standardized structure, so that they could be included in SPSS files. Once the information of the 398 surveys was compiled, after removing those that were not valid, the analysis was conducted using mostly descriptive statistics.

1.2 Summary of findings

In the following pages a more specific and detailed analysis of the perceptions of Southern European journalists about hate speech and its interaction with journalism will be presented. Some brief findings that can be mentioned are the following:

1. Hate speech is not only an issue journalists write or talk about, but it is also perceived as the biggest threat for their security
2. There is a clear agreement around what should be considered ethical for journalists, which should be determined by professional standards regardless of situation and personal judgment. This shows that the fight against hate speech in the field of journalism could be supported by ethical norms.
3. The editorial policies and the managers and owners of the news outlet where the journalists work are very relevant source of influence for the journalists, so actions that could help reducing hate speech should also address these managerial and economic elements of journalism beside the professionals themselves.
4. However, raising awareness about hate speech among journalists is a very relevant issue, given that they consider hate speech (either against them or around the particular topic they are working with) to have a very limited influence on their work.
5. Social media are more or less commonly used by journalists as sources of news stories or to promote their work; however, they tend to consider that the presence of hate speech is greater in this medium.
6. Although only asked to Spanish journalists, racism and xenophobia is considered the most common reason behind hate speech, which supports the objective of the project of fight this particular type of hate.
7. Although there is no information about it in Italy, both Greek and Spanish journalists seem to believe that disinformation is used to spread hate speech, which is why this phenomenon should be also addressed in order to combat hate speech.

These findings help understanding the observations of the qualitative in-depth and reconstruction interviews with journalists specialized on migration issues. They also fill in the existing knowledge gap of surveys addressing what journalists in the South of Europe think about hate speech and its relevance for their work. Despite the relevant findings and the empirical and methodological advance that this study offers, some limitations must be mentioned. Among them, we should highlight the difficulties in reaching the expected sample size due to the postponing of the fieldwork in the Worlds of Journalism Study, which made it impossible to conduct it together with PHARM (except in Italy). Due to this setback we had to conduct non-probabilistic surveys, using a snowball technique, reducing its representativity. Despite these limitations, the distribution of the sociodemographic features of the respondents are adequate and balanced and represent appropriately the population of journalists in the three countries.

Keywords

Hate speech; journalists; journalistic profession; Spain; Greece; Italy; quantitative survey.

2. ITALY REPORT

2.1 Background of Journalists

In Italy, slightly more than half of 199 surveyed journalists are male (54%), in their mid-forties, hold a university degree in in one field related with journalism and have a long experience in this profession. Italian journalists are on average 52.33 years old (SD=16.876), being two-thirds in the range between 33 and 50 years old. The 53 percent of journalists have an experience between 10 and 25 years.

Two out of five journalists (41.5%) earn between 10000 and 35000 euros a year. There is a really worrying fact about it, since 30.1% earn between 1500 and 3000 euros per year.

2.2 Ethics

Italian journalists demonstrated a strong commitment to professional standards of ethics (M=4.03; SD=0.965) because most journalists in this country consider that their professional job always must be determined by professional standards regardless of situation and personal judgment (see Table 1). This agreement is supported by the general rejection of the idea that ethics in journalism is determined by professional standards unless extraordinary circumstances require disregarding them (M=2.98; SD=1.171) or that ethics depend on each specific situation (M=2.5; SD=1.217). The idea that ethics for journalists should be a matter of personal judgment is unanimously rejected in a clear way (M=1.91; SD=1.012).

Table 1. Ethical orientations of Italian journalists

Ethics orientations	N	Mean	SD
What is ethical for journalists should always be determined by professional standards regardless of situation and personal judgment	193	4.03	0.965
What is ethical for journalists should be determined by professional standards unless extraordinary circumstances require disregarding them	187	2.98	1.171
What is ethical for journalists should depend on each specific situation	193	2.50	1.217
What is ethical for journalists should be a matter of personal judgment	196	1.91	1.012

Question: These statements describe different approaches to journalistic ethical dilemmas. For each of them, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree: 5 (Strongly agree), 4

(Somewhat agree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 2 (Somewhat disagree) and 1 (Strongly disagree).

2.3 Safety

According to the Italian journalists, the profession of journalism is safety and the professional maintain high standard of security. Only sporadically journalists they receive demeaning or hateful speech directed them (M=2.17; SD=1.264) or some persons try to discredit their work (M=2.06; SD=1.181).

A clear example of the perception of safety by Italian journalists is the fact that the most serious actions that could threaten their safety have never been experienced, as arrests, detentions or imprisonment (M=1.02; SD=0.200), physical attacks (M=1.13; SD= 0.455) and sexual assault or sexual harassment (M=1.16; SD=0.624).

However, a negative data is that almost half of them (47.8%) did not receive support, being limited this help to the intervention of lawyers, police and judiciary - in very few cases to sympathizers or anonymous citizens-.

Table 2. Actions related to the safety as journalist experienced to the work according to Italian journalists

Actions	N	Mean	SD
Demeaning or hateful speech directed at you	199	2.17	1.264
Public discrediting of your work	199	2.06	1.181
Surveillance	180	1.58	1.051
Hacking or blocking of social media accounts or websites	197	1.23	0.673
Arrests, detentions or imprisonment	199	1.02	0.200
Legal actions against you because of your work	197	1.34	0.743
Stalking	198	1.25	0.738
Other threats or intimidation directed at you	200	1.54	0.912
Sexual assault or sexual harassment	198	1.16	0.624
Other physical attacks	197	1.13	0.455
Others	199	2.17	1.264

Question: These statements describe how often journalists experienced any of these actions related to their safety at work: 5 (Very often), 4 (Often), 3 (Sometimes), 2 (Rarely), or 1 (Never).

2.4 Influence

The principal sources of influence mentioned by the Italian journalists come from the managers and directors of the journalistic company where I work (M=4.11; SD=1.509), the editorial policy of their medium (M=4.1; SD=1.32) and “journalism ethics” (M=3.92; SD=1.243), (see Table 3). In general, the journalists of this country receive moderate influenced from most context factors, as time constraints (M=3.81; SD=1.454), the owners of the newspaper company where they work (M=3.78; SD=1.657), and the availability of resources for news gathering (M=3.68; SD=1.551).

For the interest of this project, it is important highlight that, despite strong disagreement among respondents according to the standard deviation, the influences that come from the hate speech directed them (M=2.66; SD=2.186) and the level of hate speech on the subject they are dealing with (M=2.7; SD=2.15) are perceived by journalists as the least decisive for their work.

Table 3. Potential sources of influence for the work of Italian journalists

Influences	N	Mean	SD
Colleagues and peers from the environment where I work	189	3.41	1.653
The editors-in-chief and editorial superiors of the medium where I work	189	3.72	1.543
The managers and directors of the journalistic company where I work	188	4.11	1.509
The owners of the newspaper company where I work	190	3.78	1.657
The editorial policy of the medium where I work	191	4.10	1.320
Advertising issues (relationship with advertisers, etc.)	190	3.25	1.825
Profit expectations	180	3.46	1.880
Research and audience data (ratings, web metrics, etc.)	186	3.48	1.584
The availability of resources for news gathering	185	3.68	1.551
Time constraints	190	3.81	1.454
Journalistic ethics	186	3.92	1.243
Self-censorship	176	3.16	1.747
My personal beliefs and values	189	3.60	1.206
Hate speech directed at me	179	2.60	2.186
The level of existing hate speech on the subject I am dealing with	176	2.70	2.150

Question: These statements expose the list of potential sources of influence that each of these elements has in your work as a journalist: 1 (No influence), 2 (Slight influence), 3 (Moderate influence), 4 (Strong influence) and 5 (Extreme influence).

2.5 Technology

Italian journalists, in a similar way that their Spanish colleagues, are not familiar with new technologies and the digitization process of the journalism. The current use of the most advanced technological tools applied to journalism is not a reality; especially, the technologies that monitor and analyze information on the characteristics and behaviors of online audiences, such as metrics on the duration of readings or the content with the most visits (M=2.28; SD=1.32) (see Table 4). They even make use on rare occasions of social networks to promote the content produced for other platforms (M=2.65; SD=1.38).

Journalists only use sometimes the social media with the intention of discover potentially newsworthy events, information or opinion for stories or sources (M=3.53; SD=1.157).

Table 4. Use of the following technologies for journalistic reasons by Italian journalists

Technologies	N	Mean	SD
Technologies that monitor and analyze information on the characteristics and behaviors of online audiences, such as metrics on the duration of readings or the content with the most visits (<i>Chartbeat, Parse.ly, Google Analytics, etc.</i>)	196	2.28	1.320

Social media with the intention of discovering potentially newsworthy events, information or opinion for stories or sources	196	3.53	1.157
Social networks to promote the content produced for other platforms	193	2.65	1.380

Question: These statements describe the use of the following technologies for journalistic reasons in your work as a journalist: 5 (Many times), 4 (Several times), 3 (Sometimes), 2 (Rarely), and 1 (Never).

3. REPORT GREECE

3.1 Backgrounds of Journalists

The sample of Greek journalists reached 61 answers. 70% of them were men, and 30% were women. They were in average 48.15 years old (SD=9.350), with a broad experience (M=23.15; SD=9.802). 55.7% of the journalists work on a specific field, while 44.3% of them work indistinctly in multiple fields. Regarding their position in the news outlet where they work, 47.5% have no operational or strategic authority (no directive role), 17.9% have an intermediate management role (operative authority) and 18.0% have a management role (strategic authority).

These journalists work mostly for online media (30.5%), followed by television broadcasters (18.6%), newspapers (16.9%) and radio stations (13.6%). The least frequent types of media were magazines (3.4% of the journalists), news agencies (10.2%). These media have predominantly a national (50.8%) or regional (32.2%) dimension, with local and international media being less present (8.5% each). These media are mostly private (64.4%) companies, with 20.3% of the surveyed journalists working for publicly owned companies.

The surveyed journalists are located slightly on the left of the political spectrum (M=4.33; SD=2.276). A majority of them hold some kind of university graduation, being a bachelor's degree or equivalent the most common (42.0%), and a master's (22.0%), although 24% have just secondary education. Furthermore, 74% of the journalists claim to have completed studies in the field of journalism or communication. Finally, it should be noted that more than half of the journalists (54%) earn less than 1000 euro per month.

3.2 Ethics

Addressing now the perception of Greek journalists about who should determine journalistic ethics, a majority agreed that (M=3.80; SD=1.005) what is ethical for journalists should always be determined by professional standards regardless of situation and personal judgment (see Table 5). The level of agreement decreased (M=3.18; SD=1.127) around the idea that ethics in journalism should be determined by professional standards unless extraordinary circumstances require disregarding them. The least common alternative for Greek journalists (M=1.97; SD=1.082) was the option of ethics depending on

each specific situation. Finally, there is also an important disagreement with the idea of ethics being a matter of personal judgment ($M=2.25$; $SD=1.168$).

Table 5. Ethical orientations of Greek journalists

Ethics orientations	N	Mean	SD
What is ethical for journalists should always be determined by professional standards regardless of situation and personal judgment	60	3.80	1.005
What is ethical for journalists should be determined by professional standards unless extraordinary circumstances require disregarding them	60	3.18	1.127
What is ethical for journalists should depend on each specific situation	59	1.97	1.082
What is ethical for journalists should be a matter of personal judgment	59	2.25	1.168

Question: These statements describe different approaches to journalistic ethical dilemmas. For each of them, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree: 5 (Strongly agree), 4 (Somewhat agree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 2 (Somewhat disagree) and 1 (Strongly disagree).

3.3 Safety

Although the majority of journalists in Greece do not claim to have been victims of unsafety situations or attacks of any kind, there are some worrying observations. Such as the important presence of demeaning or hateful speech directed at them ($M=2.98$; $SD=1.033$) as well as public discrediting of their work ($M=2.77$; $SD=1.320$), surveillance ($M=2.31$; $SD=1.207$) or other forms of threats and intimidations ($M=2.20$; $SD=1.108$) (see Table 6). Strongest forms of unsafety, such as sexual harassment or assault ($M=1.35$; $SD=0.860$), other physical attacks ($M=1.22$; $SD=0.640$) or arrests or imprisonment ($M=1.17$; $SD=0.642$), are less common, but they are still to be taken seriously. New forms of violence, such as being hacked, have a moderately worrying presence ($M=1.87$; $SD=1.255$).

It should be noted that 67.2% of those journalists reporting to have suffered any form of unsafety did not receive any kind of support from their employers.

Table 6. Actions related to the safety as journalist experienced to the work according to Greek journalists

Actions	N	Mean	SD
Demeaning or hateful speech directed at you	60	2.98	1.033
Public discrediting of your work	60	2.77	1.320
Surveillance	59	2.31	1.207
Hacking or blocking of social media accounts or websites	60	1.87	1.255
Arrests, detentions, or imprisonment	60	1.17	0.642
Legal actions against you because of your work	60	1.68	1.000
Stalking	59	1.93	2.20
Other threats or intimidation directed at you	61	2.20	1.108
Sexual assault or sexual harassment	60	1.35	0.860

Other physical attacks	60	1.22	0.640
Others	10	1.00	0.000

Question: These statements describe how often journalists experienced any of these actions related to their safety at work: 5 (Very often), 4 (Often), 3 (Sometimes), 2 (Rarely), or 1 (Never).

3.4 Influence

From the different factors mentioned in the survey to Greek journalists as potential sources of influence in their work, journalistic ethics was considered the most relevant (M=4.06; SD=1.056), followed by the personal beliefs and values (M=3.81; SD=1.299) and the owners of the company where they work (M=3.36; SD=1.382) (see Table 7). It is relevant to highlight how, beside the owners, there is a strong influence coming from the managers and directors of the news outlet where the journalists works (M=3.13; SD=1.331) and the editorial lines of the news outlet (M=3.12; SD=1.409).

It is worth mentioning the influence that hate speech has on the journalistic work. Thus, although not the most influential, hate speech aimed at the journalist (M=2.67; SD=1.368) and the level of hate speech around the issue the journalist is dealing with (M=2.65; SD=1.297), have some significant influence that can not be overlooked.

Table 7. Potential sources of influence for the work of Greek journalists

Influences	N	Mean	SD
Colleagues and peers from the environment where I work	53	2.57	1.101
The editors-in-chief and editorial superiors of the medium where I work	53	2.96	1.255
The managers and directors of the journalistic company where I work	53	3.13	1.331
The owners of the newspaper company where I work	50	3.36	1.382
The editorial policy of the medium where I work	52	3.12	1.409
Advertising issues (relationship with advertisers, etc.)	48	2.33	1.294
Profit expectations	49	2.55	1.430
Research and audience data (ratings, web metrics, etc.)	52	2.44	1.259
The availability of resources for news gathering	53	2.81	1.401
Time constraints	53	3.08	1.222
Journalistic ethics	52	4.06	1.056
Self-censorship	51	2.98	1.288
My personal beliefs and values	52	3.81	1.299
Hate speech directed at me	52	2.67	1.368
The level of existing hate speech on the subject I am dealing with	52	2.65	1.297

Question: These statements expose the list of potential sources of influence that each of these elements has in your work as a journalist: 1 (No influence), 2 (Slight influence), 3 (Moderate influence), 4 (Strong influence) and 5 (Extreme influence).

3.5 Technology

Regarding technology, Greek journalists do not seem to be familiar with new technologies. They tend to use social media with a journalistic intention of discovering news stories (M=3.75; SD=1.064) or to promote their work (M=3.48; SD=1.196). However, the use metrics and technologies monitoring and

analyzing their interaction with the audiences are still seldom used (M=2.46; SD=1.320)

Table 8. Use of the following technologies for journalistic reasons by Greek journalists

Technologies	N	Mean	SD
Technologies that monitor and analyze information on the characteristics and behaviors of online audiences, such as metrics on the duration of readings or the content with the most visits (<i>Chartbeat, Parse.ly, Google Analytics, etc.</i>)	52	2.46	1.320
Social media with the intention of discovering potentially newsworthy events, information or opinion for stories or sources	52	3.75	1.064
Social networks to promote the content produced for other platforms	52	3.48	1.196

Question: These statements describe the use of the following technologies for journalistic reasons in your work as a journalist: 5 (Many times), 4 (Several times), 3 (Sometimes), 2 (Rarely), and 1 (Never).

3.6 Hate Speech

Greek journalists agree when blaming social media for the phenomenon of hate speech against refugees and migrants (M=4.20; SD=1.020). After them, at a relevant distance, it is digital media the most commonly blamed for this phenomenon (M=3.67; SD=1.029). And then, once again at a certain distance, television (M=3.18; SD=0.950). On the other side, interpersonal communication via digital platforms (such as WhatsApp) was regarded as the one with the least presence of this phenomenon (M=2.73; SD=1.396), followed by face-to-face interpersonal communication (M=3.06; SD=1.219), and then traditional media such press (M=3.06; SD=0.827) and radio (M=3.10; SD=0.909).

Table 9. Presence that Greek journalists believe has hate speech directed at migrants and refugees in the following media

	N	Mean	SD
Social media	49	4.20	1.020
Digital media	49	3.67	1.029
Printed media	49	3.06	0.827
Radio	50	3.10	0.909
Television	49	3.18	0.950
Interpersonal communication (using digital tools such as WhatsApp)	49	2.73	1.396
Interpersonal communication (face-to-face)	50	3.06	1.219
Other media	9	2.11	1.691

Question: These statements describe the presence you believe that hate speech directed at migrants and refugees has in the following media: 5 (Very strong presence), 4 (Strong presence), 3 (Moderate presence), 2 (Scarce presence), and 1 (No presence).

Regarding the groups considered to be responsible for the propagation of hate speech against migrants and refugees, social media users are the most commonly blamed (M=4.28; SD=0.991), followed by politicians and political parties (M=4.18; SD=1.044) and the Greek government and public institutions (M=4.02; SD=1.116). It is surprising to see how radical and extremist groups are not among the most mentioned ones (M=3.90; SD=1.313), and even journalists themselves are considered to have a greater responsibility on this issue (M=3.92; SD=1.027).

Table 10. Degree of relevance that Greek journalists believe the following groups have in the propagation of hate speech directed at migrants and refugees

	N	MEDIA	SD
Politicians and political parties	50	4.18	1.044
The Government and Greek public institutions	50	4.02	1.116
Governments of other countries	50	3.64	1.064
NGOs	50	3.52	1.233
Journalists and the media	50	3.92	1.027
Social network users	50	4.28	0.991
Radical and extremist groups	50	3.90	1.313
Citizens in general	50	3.84	1.017
Other groups	7	2.43	1.813

Question: These statements describe the degree of relevance you believe the following groups to have in the spread of hate speech directed at migrants and refugees: 5 (Very relevant), 4 (Rather relevant), 3 (Moderately relevant), 2 (Little relevant), and 1 (Not relevant).

Finally, disinformation seems to be clearly connected to hate speech ($M=4.24$; $SD=1.061$). In fact, 82% of the journalists considered disinformation to be very or rather relevant in the spread of hate speech against migrants and refugees, showing the interaction between these two phenomena.

4. REPORT SPAIN

4.1 Background of Journalists

In Spain, two thirds (62.5%) of the 115 surveyed Spanish journalists are male, in their forties, with a long experience in journalism and hold a specialty in the journalism field. From them, 30.3% do not have an operational or strategic authority, 37.1% of them have a middle managerial role (operating authority), and 32.6% have a managerial role (strategic authority). Almost two thirds (61.4%) work indistinctly on different subjects or themes (generalists).

Spanish journalists are mainly reporters and editors (22.6%); editor-in-chief, coordinators and directors (12.8%), freelancers (7%), correspondents and delegates (4,4%), among others. Of these journalists, 24.8 percent work in local media, 27,5 percent in regional, 24.8 percent in national, and 22,9 percent in transnational according to the scope of media. Related to the type of media, 20.8 percent work in written media (newspapers and magazines), 5.7 percent in TV, 7.5 in radio, 10.4 percent in news agencies and 35.8 percent in digital media.

On average, the surveyed Spanish journalists are 48.38 years old (SD=12.253). 43.7% of them have between 20 and 30 years of professional experience, and almost a fifth (18.2%) have less than ten years. They are well educated because 50 percent hold a bachelor's degree, 34 percent a master's and 9.6 percent a PhD. Only 6.4 percent of journalists have only secondary studies. Furthermore, the large majority (93.6%) had completed a specialization and training in journalism. The 86.8 percent have a left-central political tendency. Finally, almost three quarters (73.9%) earn between 500 and 2500 euros a month and 19.6 percent more than 2500 euros a month.

4.2 Ethics

Spanish journalists demonstrated a strong commitment to professional standards of ethics. Almost unanimously (M=4.60; SD=1.288) they agreed that what is ethical for journalists should always be determined by professional standards regardless of situation and personal judgment (see Table 11). This agreement stays strong enough (M=3.96; SD=1.203) with the idea that ethics in journalism is determined by professional standards unless extraordinary circumstances require disregarding them. Journalists are most hesitant (M=3.52; SD=1.337) when mentioning that ethics depend on each specific situation. Finally, a general disagreement can be found among Spanish journalist regarding to the idea of ethics being a matter of personal judgment (M=2.87; SD=0.973).

Table 11. Ethical orientations of Spanish journalists

Ethics orientations	N	Mean	SD
What is ethical for journalists should always be determined by professional standards regardless of situation and personal judgment	115	4.60	1.288
What is ethical for journalists should be determined by professional standards unless extraordinary circumstances require disregarding them	115	3.96	1.203
What is ethical for journalists should depend on each specific situation	115	3.52	1.337
What is ethical for journalists should be a matter of personal judgment	115	2.87	0.973

Question: These statements describe different approaches to journalistic ethical dilemmas. For each of them, please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree: 5 (Strongly agree), 4 (Somewhat agree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 2 (Somewhat disagree) and 1 (Strongly disagree).

4.3 Safety

According to the surveyed journalists, journalism in Spain is safety and the standard of security are high. Although in an unusual way, they perceive only certain levels of demeaning or hateful speech directed at them (M=2.37; SD=1.08), public discrediting (M=2.5; SD=1.103) and surveillance (M=2.16; SD=1.259) (see Table 12).

A clear example of the perception of safety by Spanish journalists is the fact that the most serious actions that could threaten their safety have been very rarely experienced, such as arrests, detentions or imprisonment (M=1.04; SD=0.245) and sexual assault or sexual harassment (M=1.1; SD=0.406).

However, it cannot be ignored that there have been cases specified by some journalists concerning to make their job difficult, invisibility, family harassment, insults, intimidation by members of certain parties (eg: Vox, Frente Polisario), political pressure, discredited through false and unfounded rumors, aggression and violence and harassment by the police.

A negative data to which it is added that six out of ten (58.7%) did not receive help. Of the percentage of journalists who did receive some help on a personal, moral and emotional level, this came from colleagues and their own media; journalistic sector and other media; family and friends; legal support; police; labor union and professional associations, and public support.

Table 12. Actions related to the safety as journalist experienced to the work according to Spanish journalists

Actions	N	Mean	SD
Demeaning or hateful speech directed at you	115	2.37	1.08
Public discrediting of your work	115	2.50	1.103
Surveillance	114	2.16	1.259
Hacking or blocking of social media accounts or websites	115	1.52	0.841

Arrests, detentions or imprisonment	114	1.04	0.245
Legal actions against you because of your work	115	1.23	0.547
Stalking	115	1.58	0.917
Other threats or intimidation directed at you	115	1.69	0.882
Sexual assault or sexual harassment	115	1.1	0.406
Other physical attacks	114	1.16	0.433
Others	29	1.45	0.827

Question: These statements describe how often journalists experienced any of these actions related to their safety at work: 5 (Very often), 4 (Often), 3 (Sometimes), 2 (Rarely), or 1 (Never).

4.4 Influence

Spanish Journalists are moderate influenced by a variety of context factors. The principal source of influences mentioned by the surveyed was “journalism ethics” (M=4.07; SD=1.270), which fared on top of the list (see Table 13). Likewise, most respondents admitted to be influenced mainly by internal influences by editors-in-chief and editorial superiors of the medium where they work (M=3.48; SD=1.356), time constraints (M=3.35; SD=1.320), availability of resources for news gathering (M=3.34; SD=1.316), colleagues and peers from the environment where they work (M=3.28; SD=1.082), and editorial policy of their medium (M=3.26; SD=1.438).

Journalists found their work slightly constrained by self-censorship (M=2.44; SD=1.263), owners of their media (M=2.48; SD=1.406), and profit expectations (M=2.52; SD=1.299). For the study that concerns us, it is especially relevant that the influences that come from the hate speech directed them (M=1.66; SD=1.166)

The level of hate speech on the subject they are dealing with (M=2.41; SD=1.442) are perceived by journalists as the least decisive for their work.

Table 13. Potential sources of influence for the work of Spanish journalists

Influences	N	Media	SD
Colleagues and peers from the environment where I work	98	3.28	1.082
The editors-in-chief and editorial superiors of the medium where I work	93	3.48	1.356
The managers and directors of the journalistic company where I work	88	2.86	1.456
The owners of the newspaper company where I work	88	2.48	1.406
The editorial policy of the medium where I work	95	3.26	1.438
Advertising issues (relationship with advertisers, etc.)	93	2.61	1.360
Profit expectations	93	2.52	1.299
Research and audience data (ratings, web metrics, etc.)	96	3.02	1.369
The availability of resources for news gathering	98	3.34	1.316
Time constraints	99	3.35	1.320
Journalistic ethics	98	4.07	1.270
Self-censorship	99	2.44	1.263
My personal beliefs and values	100	2.99	1.259
Hate speech directed at me	97	1.66	1.163
The level of existing hate speech on the subject I am dealing with	98	2.41	1.442

Question: These statements expose the list of potential sources of influence that each of these elements has in your work as a journalist: 1 (No influence), 2 (Slight influence), 3 (Moderate influence), 4 (Strong influence) and 5 (Extreme influence).

4.5 Technology

Spanish journalists are not completely familiar with new technologies and the digitization process of the journalistic profession. Hence, the use of the most advanced tools applied to journalism is not entirely appropriate and common; especially, the technologies that monitor and analyze information on the characteristics and behaviors of online audiences, such as metrics on the duration of readings or the content with the most visits (M=2.92). In addition, the data provided by the SD reflects the technological gap regarding digital literacy of journalists, with the greatest divergence being found between the survey responses in this regard (SD=1.4906) (see Table 14).

Journalists are more familiar with social media, using it tools with the intention of discover potentially newsworthy events, information or opinion for stories or sources (M=3.95; SD=1.052). Something that allows them to maintain a more active attitude, when using these social networks to promote the content produced for other platforms (M=3.63; SD=1.382).

Table 14. Use of the following technologies for journalistic reasons by Spanish journalists

Technologies	N	Media	SD
Technologies that monitor and analyze information on the characteristics and behaviors of online audiences, such as metrics on the duration of readings or the content with the most visits (<i>Chartbeat, Parse.ly, Google Analytics, etc.</i>)	99	2.92	1.496
Social media with the intention of discovering potentially newsworthy events, information or opinion for stories or sources	101	3.95	1.052
Social networks to promote the content produced for other platforms	99	3.63	1.382

Question: These statements describe the use of the following technologies for journalistic reasons in your work as a journalist: 5 (Many times), 4 (Several times), 3 (Sometimes), 2 (Rarely), and 1 (Never).

4.6 Hate Speech

Among Spanish journalists there is a generalized and consensual idea that racism and xenophobia (M=4.25; SD=1.053) and ideology (M=4.07; SD=1.098) are the types of discrimination most outstanding in the production of hate speech; although, the discrimination based on sex or gender (M=3.97; SD=1.144) maintain a similar level. They offer a moderate importance to the production of hate speech based on the discrimination about sexual orientation or gender identity (M=3.86; SD=1.175), religious beliefs or practices (M=3.77; SD= 1.157), aporophobia (M=3.68; SD=1.252), and antigypsyism (M=3.64; SD=1.267). However, journalist consider that hate speech about people with disabilities (M=2.98; SD=1.263) and with illness (M=2.8; SD=1.267) has little importance.

Table 15. Importance of the following types of discrimination in the production of hate speech according to Spanish journalists

Types of discrimination	N	MEDIA	SD
Antisemitism	100	3.45	1.184
Aporophobia	99	3.68	1.252
Discrimination based on religious beliefs or practices	101	3.77	1.157
Discrimination against people with disabilities	100	2.98	1.263
Discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity	101	3.86	1.175
Racism / Xenophobia	101	4.25	1.053
Discrimination based on ideology	101	4.07	1.098
Discrimination based on sex / gender	101	3.97	1.144
Generational discrimination	98	3.11	1.234
Discrimination based on illness	100	2.80	1.295
Anti gypsyism	100	3.64	1.267

Question: These statements describe the relevant you consider the following types of discrimination to have in the production of hate speech: 5 (Very relevant), 4 Rather relevant), 3 (Moderately relevant), 2 (Little relevant), and 1 (Not relevant).

In Spain, journalist believe that hate speech directed at migrants and refugees is mainly produced by interpersonal communication - through messaging services as *WhatsApp*, *Messenger*, *Telegram*, etc. (M=4.04; SD=1.176). Although, it is also true, they consider that hate speech is quite presence in the interpersonal communication through face-to-face conversations (M=3.38; SD=1.175) and native digital media (M=3.07; SD=1.153) (see Table 16).

Regarding traditional mass media, the TV allows a greater presence of hate speech in its programming (M=3.31; SD=1.180). Both news agencies (M=2.2; SD=1.035) and magazines (M=2.1; SD= 1.035) are considered by journalists as the least propagating media of hate speech.

Table 16. Presence that Spanish journalists believe has hate speech directed at migrants and refugees in the following media

	N	MEDIA	SD
Newspaper (<i>El País</i> , <i>ABC</i> , <i>La Nueva España</i> , etc.)	91	2.90	1.116
Magazines (<i>Jara y Sedal</i> , <i>Pronto</i> , <i>Fotogramas</i> , etc.)	87	2.10	1.035
Television (<i>Antena 3</i> , <i>Telecinco</i> , <i>Telemadrid</i> , etc.)	91	3.31	1.180
Radio (<i>RNE</i> , <i>COPE</i> , <i>Onda Madrid</i> , etc.)	90	3.01	1.204
News agency (<i>EFE</i> , <i>Europa Press</i> , <i>ICAL</i> , etc.)	91	2.20	.945
Native digital media (<i>El Confidencial</i> , <i>eldiario.es</i> , <i>El Independiente</i> , etc.)	91	3.07	1.153
Telecommunications (communication and advertising agencies, professional association, etc.)	89	2.29	1.014
Interpersonal communication through messaging services (<i>WhatsApp</i> , <i>Messenger</i> , <i>Telegram</i> , etc.)	92	4.04	1.176
Interpersonal communication through face-to-face conversations	92	3.38	1.175
Other media	16	2.38	1.857

Question: These statements describe the presence you believe that hate speech directed at migrants and refugees has in the following media: 5 (Very strong presence), 4 (Strong presence), 3 (Moderate presence), 2 (Scarce presence), and 1 (No presence).

Social networks that act as the main broadcasters of hate speech against migrants and refugees are *Twitter* (M=4.26; SD=0.92), *Facebook* (M=4.09; SD=0.979) and *WhatsApp* (M=4.08; SD=1.134). In all these social networks the presence of hate speech against these groups of people is very common.

In the other extreme, journalists estimate that in *TikTok* (M=2.99; SD=1.127) and *LinkedIn* (M=2.07; SD=0.904) the presence of hate speech focused on migrants and refugees is scarce. In the last case, the main reason is because it is a professional social network, focused on the job market.

Table 17. Presence that Spanish journalists believe that migrant and refugee directed hate speech has on the following social networks

Social Media	N	MEDIA	SD
<i>Facebook</i>	92	4.09	0.979
<i>Twitter</i>	93	4.26	0.92
<i>Instagram</i>	90	3.21	1.213
<i>YouTube</i>	89	3.44	1.055
<i>LinkedIn</i>	91	2.07	0.904
<i>Telegram</i>	82	3.26	1.294
<i>TikTok</i>	84	2.99	1.125
<i>WhatsApp</i>	90	4.08	1.134
Other social networks	9	1.44	0.726

Question: These statements describe the presence you believe that migrant and refugee directed hate speech has on the following social networks: 5 (Very strong presence), 4 (Strong presence), 3 (Moderate presence), 2 (Scarce presence), and 1 (No presence).

According to Spanish journalists, the main groups that favor the propagation of hate speech directed at migrants and refugees are radical and extremist groups (M=4.81; SD=0.495), social network users (M=4.51; SD=0.791), politicians and political parties (M=4.44; SD=0.729), and, at a somewhat lower level, the companies that manage social networks (M=3.94; SD=1.019).

In the other extreme, the group with a little relevance respect to the propagation and spread of hate speech about people in mobility are NGOs (M=2.26; SD=1.326) and big companies (M=2.82; SD=1.179).

Table 18. Degree of relevance that Spanish journalists believe the following groups have in the propagation of hate speech directed at migrants and refugees

	N	MEDIA	SD
Politicians and political parties	93	4.44	0.729
The Government and Spanish public institutions	93	3.33	1.322
Governments of other countries	93	3.75	1.028
NGOs	93	2.26	1.326
Big companies	93	2.82	1.179
Lobbies and pressure groups	92	3.64	1.263
Journalists and the media	93	3.71	1.119
The companies that manage social networks	93	3.94	1.019
Social network users	92	4.51	0.791

Radical and extremist groups	93	4.81	0.495
Citizens in general	92	3.52	0.955
Other groups	9	2.22	1.716

Question: These statements describe the degree of relevance you believe the following groups to have in the spread of hate speech directed at migrants and refugees: 5 (Very relevant), 4 (Rather relevant), 3 (Moderately relevant), 2 (Little relevant), and 1 (Not relevant).

To end the battery of questions focused on the phenomenon of hate speech, journalists were asked about the degree of responsibility that misinformation has in the spread of hate speech against migrants and refugees. Most of them (91.3%) underlines the high relevance of the disinformation in the spread of hate speech against migrants and refugees ($M=4.44$; $SD=0.729$).

5. REFERENCES

- Blanco-Herrero, D., & Arcila-Calderón, C. (2019). Deontología y noticias falsas: estudio de las percepciones de periodistas españoles. *Profesional de la información*, 28(3), e280308. <https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2019.may.08>
- European Commission (2018). *Special Eurobarometer 469. Integration of Immigrants in the European Union*. <https://ec.europa.eu/comfrontoffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/search/469/surveyKy/2169>
- Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanitzsch, T., Hanusch, F., Ramaprasad, J., & de Beer, A. S. (2019). *Worlds of Journalism: Journalistic Cultures Around the Globe*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fengler, S., Eberwein, T., Alsius, S., Baisnée, O., Bichler, K., Dobek-Ostrowska, B., ... & Zambrano, S. V. (2015). How effective is media self-regulation? Results from a comparative survey of European journalists. *European journal of communication*, 30(3), 249-266. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323114561009>
- Obermaier, M., Hofbauer, M., & Reinemann, C. (2018). Journalists as targets of hate speech. How German journalists perceive the consequences for themselves and how they cope with it. *SCM Studies in Communication and Media*, 7(4), 499-524. <https://doi.org/10.5771/2192-4007-2018-4-499>
- OSCE – ODIHR (2021). *Hate Crime Reporting*. <https://hatecrime.osce.org/greece>
- Pew Research Center (2018). *Around the world, more say immigrants are a strength than a burden. Spring 2018 global attitudes survey*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2019/03/14/around-the-world-more-say-immigrants-are-a-strength-than-a-burden>



PREVENTING HATE AGAINST REFUGEES AND MIGRANTS

ABOUT PHARM (2020-2022)

Preventing Hate against Refugees and Migrants (PHARM)

Migration to Europe has grown in the last years in scale and complexity. The so called 'refugee crisis' and the migratory pressure is particularly acute in southern EU countries as the main entrance to the EU.

The main goal of PHARM project is to monitor and model hate speech against refugees and migrants in Greece, Italy and Spain in order to predict and combat hate crime and also counter its effects using cutting-edge techniques, such as data journalism and narrative persuasion. The activities distributed in 5 coordinated work packages include:

(i) Implementation of a conceptual and methodological common framework for large-scale analysis and detection of hate speech; (ii) Implementation and evaluation of machine learning approaches to model and predict hate crimes against refugees and migrants based on hate speech features; (iii) Survey journalists to understand how they inform and raise awareness about hate speech and how they can help building and disseminating counter-narratives based in data-driven news pieces; (iv) Creation, evaluation and dissemination of counter-narrative fictional stories adapted to different characteristics of citizens using large-scale narrative persuasion.

COORDINATOR

University of Salamanca, Faculty of Social Sciences (ES)

PARTNERS

University of Milan, (IT)

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (GR)

VISIT: <http://pharmproject.usal.es>

CONTACT US: pharm.project.eu@gmail.com

FOLLOW US:



@Pharm_project



Pharm_project



Pharm Project



Pharm Project