

PeaceTraining.eu



STRENGTHENING THE CAPABILITIES AND TRAINING CURRICULA OF CONFLICT PREVENTION AND PEACE BUILDING PERSONNEL WITH ICT-BASED COLLABORATION AND KNOWLEDGE APPROACHES

D2.2

Social media and security analysis report

Project

Acronym: **PeaceTraining.eu**

Title: STRENGTHENING THE CAPABILITIES AND TRAINING CURRICULA OF CONFLICT PREVENTION AND PEACE BUILDING PERSONNEL WITH ICT-BASED COLLABORATION AND KNOWLEDGE APPROACHES

Coordinator: SYNIO GmbH

Reference: 700583

Type: Coordination and Support Action

Program: HORIZON 2020

Theme: Conflict prevention and peace building topic 2: Training curricula for Conflict Prevention and Peace Building personnel

Start: 01. September 2016

Duration: 26 months

Website: project.peacetraining.eu

Consortium: **SYNIO GmbH (SYNIO)**, Austria
University of Deusto (UDEUSTO), Spain
University of Marburg (UMR), Germany
Coventry University (COVUNI), United Kingdom
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KULEUVEN), Belgium
Institute for Conflict Research (ICR), United Kingdom
Peace Action, Training and Research Institute of Romania (PATRIR), Romania
World Mediation Organization (WMO), Germany
ARGE Bildungsmanagement (ARGE), Austria
Baltic Defence College (BALTDEFCOL), Estonia
Federal Ministry of Interior (BMI), Austria
Kosovar Center for Security Studies (KCSS), Kosovo

Deliverable

Number:	D2.2
Title:	Social media and security analysis report
Lead beneficiary:	UDEUSTO
Work package:	WP2
Dissemination level:	Public (PU)
Nature:	Report (RE)
Due date:	31.01.2017
Submission date:	31.01.2017
Authors:	Catalina Uzcanga, UDEUSTO
Contributors:	Patricia García Amado, UDEUSTO Carmen Munteanu, SYNYO Bernhard Jäger, SYNYO
Review:	Erin Tunney, ICR Daniel Erdmann, WMO

Acknowledgement: This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Grant Agreement No 700583.

Disclaimer: The content of this publication is the sole responsibility of the authors, and in no way represents the view of the European Commission or its services.

Executive summary

This report describes the integration of stakeholders in requirement analysis and development of curricula through social media. Making use of broad social media channels as a rather new data source, the project has gathered stakeholders' opinions, perceptions, experiences and attitudes towards conflict prevention and peacebuilding (CPPB) training.

For this purpose, and as a first test run of using such tools in the PeaceTraining.eu project, we have analysed the presence of identified CPPB stakeholders in social media and the way they use these channels in terms of frequency of communication, scope, and information strategy (debate, dissemination, outreach campaigns).

Secondly, the report presents the PeaceTraining.eu strategy to stimulate an online debate on CPPB training. Taking Facebook and Twitter as the main social media used by CPPB stakeholders - according to the findings of our previous analysis - several open questions concerning the challenges of CPPB training were posted using the project accounts. First discussions were initialised to provide deeper insights for following research activities.

The reactions and reflections over the debate were collected, but were not significant enough to feed the discussion and start a lasting and deeper dialogue. The lessons learnt are further explained in this report; they will be applied along the whole project duration and the outcomes reported in future deliverables.

In addition, a survey on the professional competences of CPPB practitioners was elaborated and it has been disseminating through the most followed social media accounts. The aim of this questionnaire is to identify the most relevant areas of knowledge and skills to CPPB work and possible gaps in training.

The survey is still open; this report presents the preliminary results concerning 68 practitioners respondent of the questionnaire. Most of them were staff of local, national and international organisations and almost half of them were affiliated to two different type of organisation. The results reveal that on the one hand conflict management, socio-economic and political aspects of conflict, negotiation and mediation and conflict resolution are the four most important areas of knowledge for CPPB practitioners and on the other hand, concerning the competences, there is higher consensus that problem solving skills, creative thinking, diversity and interculturality, interpersonal communications and conflict management negotiation are the most important. The survey has collected further data and will continue to do so. The final results of the survey will be provided in a future report.

Table of Content

1	Introduction.....	6
2	Use of social media by CPPB stakeholders	8
2.1.	Governmental Institutions	8
2.1.1.	International organizations	9
2.1.2.	National governments	9
2.2.	Non-Governmental Institutions	9
2.3.	Research Institutes	10
2.4.	Training networks	10
2.5.	Comparison of different types of organisations.....	11
3	Gathering opinions and experiences on CPPB training.....	13
3.1.	Stimulating a debate on CPPB training gaps	13
3.2.	Disseminating a survey on social media.....	14
4	Preliminary results of the survey on practitioners' competences	15
4.1.	Descriptors	15
4.2.	Areas of knowledge	16
4.3.	Generic competences.....	16
4.4.	Comments to the survey	19
5	Conclusions.....	20
	References.....	22
	Annex A	23
	Annex B.....	28

1 Introduction

The PeaceTraining.eu project aims to analyse the current Conflict Prevention and Peace Building (CPPB) training, to detect the best practices and methods and possible areas of improvement. Accordingly, the project will create a multidimensional PeaceTraining.eu Curricula Model and a unique interactive platform to make these results available. Along the project, practices and methods will be collected and the consortium aims to detect possible gaps and areas of improvement. For this purpose, the engagement of the CPPB stakeholders is essential. Therefore, the objective at this stage of the project is to raise awareness across the different stakeholders and to gather their opinions, perceptions, experiences, and attitudes making use of social media as a new data source and a space for discussion, debate and interaction.

The term “social media” includes a range of tools and services that enable participatory direct interaction in Internet mediated environments¹. Those tools enable a collaborative process in which natural and genuine conversations may be built on the thoughts and experiences of participants².

Facebook is now the biggest social network worldwide. As of 2016, Facebook had 1.79 billion monthly active users, including over close to 1.66 billion mobile monthly active users³. It holds three main different types of pages, the *Profile* – for individuals; the *Page* – for organizations, which can only be run by authorized representative; and the *Groups* – meant to foster group discussion around a topic area. In each type, text, website URLs, documents, photos, images and video content can be shared⁴.

Twitter is an open network which means that anyone connected to the Internet can follow the texts, known as tweets. However, only registered people can create content on Twitter. This content is limited to 140 characters per message, which may have a link included, and a photo or an image may be added. Any registered person could reply or make comments to a tweet. Thus, Twitter enables conversations between people who do not know each other. More than 317 million people around the world have used Twitter in 2016⁵.

YouTube, funded in 2005, is a video sharing social media network. YouTube is used more as a video channel than as discussion social media network. More than 25.5 million people are subscribers on YouTube, but at least a billion are watch videos on YouTube⁶.

LinkedIn is a professional niche social networking platform opened in 2003. Users upload their profiles to connect with individuals and start network connections. Organizations can also create LinkedIn pages. Within LinkedIn, a Questions and Answers section encourages brainstorming and the generation of ideas⁷. The platform also allows for creating thematic groups. In 2016, there were 467 million global users, including 104 million in European countries⁸.

The following section of this report analyses the use different CPPB stakeholders make of social media in terms of frequency, interaction, number of followers, and the type of information shared.

¹ Lampe and Roth, 2012: 1

² Evans, 2010

³ <https://zephoria.com>, <https://www.statista.com>

⁴ Vander Veer, 2011

⁵ <https://www.statista.com>

⁶ <http://socialblade.com>; <http://www.youtube.com>

⁷ Weinberg, 2009

⁸ <https://expandedramblings.com>

The knowledge acquired through this analysis is essential at this stage as it provides inputs for a constant improvement of the PeaceTraining.eu project social media strategy.

The third section describes the experience of the promotion of a debate over the gaps on CPPB training through social media, its challenges, limitations and results. Finally, the last section presents the preliminary results of the survey on generic competences of peacebuilding practitioners.

2 Use of social media by CPPB stakeholders

One of the pillars of PeaceTraining.eu project is to involve CPPB experts and actors via surveys and social media channels to gather first-hand experience and knowledge. The CPPB main stakeholders were previously identified as European actors who design, manage and implement peacebuilding activities in high-risk settings, as well as actors who provide training and education for these tasks. PeaceTraining.eu stakeholders thus include **international organisations, national governments, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), training institutes, universities and research institutes**.

The analysis of the stakeholders' social media shows, as a first test run, their presence on Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and LinkedIn. Some organisations have also created an official account on Google+, Flickr, Pinterest or Instagram and few of them on Vimeo, Snapchat or Storify. We decided to focus on Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn and YouTube for our analysis due to their popularity among PeaceTraining.eu relevant stakeholders, as showed in Table 1.

Table 1: MOST POPULAR SOCIAL MEDIA ACCOUNTS AMONG STAKEHOLDERS

Organisation	L	Facebook/Twitter name	Followers	Content
Médecins sans Frontières	EN	msf.english	1,284,716	Advocacy campaigns, news
Care	EN	@CARE	1,031,236	Advocacy campaigns, news
Care	EN	carefans	480,000	Advocacy campaigns, news
Oxfam International	EN	oxfamGB	304,352	Advocacy campaigns, news
Oxfam Intermón (SP)	SP	oxfamIntermon	716,495	Advocacy campaigns, news
Oxfam (FR)	FR	OxfamFrance	120,204	Advocacy campaigns, news
Oxfam International	EN	@Oxfam	776,036	Advocacy campaigns, news
International Crisis Group	EN	crisisgroup	134,867	Advocacy campaigns, news
Crisis Group	EN	@CrisisGroup	118,848	Reports, news, events
EU- ECHO	EN	ec.humanitarian.aid	170,976	News, activities
NATO	EN	NATO	1,200,000	News, activities
NATO	EN	@nato	397,250	News
EU- EEAS	EN	@eu_eeas	171,795	News
Foreign & Commonwealth Office	EN	@foreignoffice	682,694	Activities, news
Bundeswehr	DE	Bundeswehr	407,400	Activities, testimonies
Foreign & Commonwealth Office	EN	foreignoffice	200,194	Activities, news
France Ministry of Defence	FR	MinistereDeLaDefense	190,145	News
France Ministry of Defence	FR	@defense_gouv	186,079	News
UK Ministry of Defence	EN	@DefenceHQ	164,000	News, activities
EU- DG DEVCO-EuropeAid	EN	europeaid	134,218	Activities
United States Institute for Peace	EN	usinstituteofpeace	145,398	News, trainings, research, events

2.1. Governmental Institutions

The Governmental institutions mapped out by this project are the ones primarily related to the elaboration and implementation of peacebuilding strategies, either national or international. Their typology ranges from international governmental organizations to the ministry of foreign affairs, the armed forces or national aid agencies.

2.1.1. International organizations

The international organizations gathered in the mapping of stakeholders are **OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre, the European External Action Service (EEAS), the EU DG DEVCO-EuropeAid, the EU ECHO European Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection, NATO and NATO-SHAPE**. They are among the most relevant international organizations in Europe. All of them are carrying out peacebuilding activities in high-risk countries.

All the international organizations analysed have set up a Facebook page, a Twitter account and a YouTube channel. They publish daily content on Facebook and Twitter and sharing videos weekly on YouTube.

Their publications on Facebook are widely commented, shared and liked and the number of followers range from 70,000 to 1.2 million, as is the case of the NATO Facebook page. Publications are used to share news concerning the institution and for the promotion of their activities. On Twitter the number of followers is lower, between 14,000 and 400,000, and accounts are mostly used for dissemination purposes. Debates are ongoing on accounts with no less than 100,000 followers, where great amount of content is being shared more than 100 times and real discussions take place. Four out of six utilise LinkedIn, either with an institutional page or as a group; and half of them are also on Google+ and Flickr.

The publications of the International organizations are in English. Clearly the bigger organizations are the most active on social media.

2.1.2. National governments

National governments are active in conflict prevention and peace building activities, mainly through their Ministries of Defence, Foreign Affairs, Interior and national aid agencies.

Almost all these 84 national institutions have a Facebook and a Twitter account where they publish on a daily or weekly basis, mainly to share news, promote their activities and their own or related events. Aid agencies also publish their vacancies. Both social media networks are mainly used for dissemination purposes; the interaction is low, publications receive just few comments or few enquiries and they hardly ever concern peacebuilding. On average, Facebook pages have more followers (800 to 407,000) than Twitter accounts (200 and 186,000). An interesting finding shows that the social media pages of the army institutions are the most popular ones, such as the Facebook page of the German *Bundeswehr* and the Twitter accounts of the British and the French ministries of Defence.

A quarter of the identified national governments are present on LinkedIn, chiefly the aid agencies; a third is on YouTube and on Flickr or Instagram publishing weekly or monthly to promote their missions and other activities.

The accounts with a daily activity are also the most followed, and their content is more often shared and commented on. These publications are in local languages, whereas most retweets are in English. The content of those pages does not exclusively concern peacebuilding or conflict prevention, but general information regarding the country nationals.

2.2. Non-Governmental Institutions

Non-governmental institutions designing, managing and implementing peacebuilding activities in high-risk countries are also considered essential stakeholders. Almost all NGOs previously identified

have a Facebook page (90%) and a Twitter account (85%). Many publish daily (50% of Facebook pages and 60% of Twitter accounts). In both social media networks, the NGOs are promoting their activities, advocacy campaigns, reports, vacancies, testimonies and few of them asking for fundraising.

Contrary to the governmental accounts, the number of followers on Twitter (300 to 780,000) is higher than the number of followers on Facebook (45 to 700,000). Nevertheless, more likes and shares occur on Facebook, up to a thousand times, comparing to no more than 300 times on Twitter. In addition, only 16% of the Facebook pages reflect brief debates whereas the rest are just dissemination, as it happens on Twitter accounts. Pages with higher numbers of followers are also the ones that publish daily and involve conversations.

Most NGOs post on social media networks in English. However, the major ones, like Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) or Oxfam, have accounts representing their sections in different European countries which publish in local languages.

Most NGOs use YouTube (75%) and LinkedIn (69%) mainly to promote their activities and advocacy campaigns. Finally, only 21% is on Flickr or Instagram publishing weekly or monthly.

2.3. Research Institutes

The project has mapped out a total of 30 research institutes in Europe dealing with peacebuilding and conflict prevention. Half of them do not use specific social media accounts but the ones of the affiliated university. Almost all research institutes and related universities have accounts on Facebook and Twitter and publish daily or weekly. The specific Research Institutes are more present on Facebook than on Twitter. The posted content ranges from news, events and seminars to ongoing research and results or vacancies. Publications are mainly in local languages. As in the case of the governmental institutions, Facebook pages have more activity both in number of followers (between 1,700 and 16,000) and in numbers of likes or shares (between 1 and 50) than Twitter does (between 800 and 4,800; 80,000 followers for USIP).

Most universities where the research institutes are hosted and approximately the half of the specific Research Institutes have created an account on Facebook and Twitter. Finally, only some research institutes are on YouTube and Instagram.

2.4. Training networks

Ten training networks were identified. Training networks refer to communities or associations organised by different CPPB training partners, which may be institutes and/or researchers. Almost all established networks are on Facebook (80%) either as an organization or as a group (The European Association of Peace Operations Training Centres (EAPTC) as a closed group). Most pages are used to disseminate information, news and events which are shared or liked. The number of followers is between 26 and 23,000. The social media accounts are not used to establish a direct dialogue or start a debate.

Half of the training networks are on YouTube and Twitter publishing daily news and events. Twitter is less frequent but the accounts have more followers, between 40 and 40,000. Only three of them have created an account on LinkedIn, two as organizations and one as a group. The official language for posting and debates on these social media accounts is English.

The most popular accounts among the stakeholders are major NGOs (Médecins Sans Frontières, Care and Oxfam), NATO and the Foreign Office from the UK. NGOs promote their advocacy campaigns

through Twitter and Facebook, sometimes with testimonies, while the governmental institutions promote their activities and the agenda of their representatives. With few exceptions, the accounts with more than 100,000 followers host debates around issues concerning their organisation or disseminating publications.

2.5. Comparison of different types of organisations

Facebook and Twitter, and LinkedIn to a lesser extent, are the most popular social media channels of the PeaceTraining.eu project stakeholders. The following tables compare the use the different types of organisations make of Facebook (Table 2) and of Twitter (Table 3).

The biggest organisations, such as intergovernmental institutions and the major NGOs are the most active on Facebook. They update their pages daily. Those are the most followed pages. In addition, their posts provoke more reactions, such as clicking a "like" button or sharing the post and they tend to have more comments and interchange of ideas around that information (Table 1). The Facebook page of the stakeholder publishes a post and the followers, usually individuals, are the ones who respond, comment, expose new ideas and state the opposite view.

Minor NGOs may have also a big number of shares or likes but they do not trigger as many comments and debate. There seems to be a positive relation between the frequency of posts, the number of followers and the participation of those followers both in disseminating the information and in creating and participating in a debate.

Table 2: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FACEBOOK PAGES BY TYPE OF ORGANISATION

FACEBOOK PAGES		Followers	Updates	Shares or Likes	Content	Debate
Governmental institutions	International	70,000- 1,200,000	Daily	30- 8,000	News, activities	YES
	National	870- 407,000	Almost daily	0- 300	News, events	NO
NGOs	Major	10,000-1,284,000	Daily	8- 3,000	Advocacy campaigns, news, fundraising	YES
	Minor	46- 46,000	Almost daily	0- 2,500	Advocacy campaigns, news, events, fundraising	NO
Research institutes		1,100- 24,000	Weekly	1- 130	Events, publications trainings, data	NO
Training networks		26- 23,000	Almost daily	0- 5	News, events, trainings	NO

Table 3: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TWITTER ACCOUNTS BY TYPE OF ORGANISATION

TWITTER ACCOUNTS		Followers	Updates	Retweet or favourite	Content	Debate
Governmental institutions	International	14,000- 400,000	Daily	3- 470	News, activities	In the most followed (<100,000)
	National	184- 186,000	Almost daily	0- 200	News, activities	In the most followed (<100,000)
NGOs	Major	81,000- 1,031,000	Daily	4-300	Advocacy campaigns, news	NO
	Minor	300- 12,000	Almost daily	0- 50	News, events, vacancies, fundraising	NO
Research institutes		800- 12,000	Daily	0- 30	News, events	NO
Training networks		500- 40,000	Daily		News, events, trainings	NO

International NGOs have the largest number of Twitter followers. They post news and information about their advocacy campaigns daily but there are none or few comments on their publications. However, governmental institutions with more than 100,000 followers, such as the British and the French ministries of defence, have daily activity, including conversations and debates.

Social media networks are thus mainly used by the stakeholders to disseminate their news, information and campaigns. The number of followers, the number of years in the social media and the number of publications are directly related with the number of times a publication is shared, liked and answered or commented. Briefly, the size and the reputation of the organisation impacts number of followers and number of shares. So, getting a post shared on a page with a large number of followers makes it most likely to generate conversation and not die.

3 Gathering opinions and experiences on CPPB training

Following the results of the previous section, Facebook and Twitter were signalled out as the most popular and participatory social media among the ones used by the identified stakeholders. Thus, a strategic planning was established, as a first test run, to start a debate at the same time on both media. As a part of the PeaceTraining.eu project's dissemination strategy, a Twitter account (@peacetrainingeu), a Facebook page (<https://www.facebook.com/PeaceTraining.eu>) and a group (<https://www.facebook.com/groups/267154323680040>) were created. A survey targeting CPPB practitioners was also distributed through the social media networks of the project.

3.1. Stimulating a debate on CPPB training gaps

The PeaceTraining.eu Facebook group was created on December 2016 and has been growing constantly. From December 16th to 29th the Twitter and Facebook group launched several open questions with the intention of stimulating a debate on CPPB training gaps.

Some questions were specifically addressed to military and UN peacekeepers as *"Which competences in peacebuilding were you missing after deployment? @UNPeaceKeeping"*. Others were generally addressed to all CPPB practitioners, such as *"Peace Training versus reality. Which are the gaps in peace training?"* or *"How to manage spoilers in Peace Building?"*. All of them were published on both Twitter and the Facebook group.



Figure 1: EXAMPLES OF POSTS ON TWITTER AND ON FACEBOOK GROUP

In further posts, the platforms identified in the previous section as having a higher number of followers were tagged, with their Twitter or Facebook accounts, to involve them in a discussion. Furthermore, direct messages were also sent to the accounts of the stakeholders identified as the most popular. However, some major NGOs, as Médecins Sans Frontières or Care do not give the opportunity to publish on their Facebook *home* page; others do firstly, but then filter the posts and select which one they want to be on their page.

Debates require previous dynamic of dialogue and trust building to function. This is to say that time invested in building the network is needed. Offering interesting information, participating in others' debates create social network community pages⁹.

As the PeaceTraining.eu project was at an early stage, results were inconsistent. After gathering more followers and the project will have run for a longer period, will be known and recognized, the next results will be available. The social media platforms of the project are continuously growing and the limited results of this strategy of stimulating a first debate have pushed researchers to rethink and revise the social media strategy. For instance, final results of the survey on CPPB competences, as much as other future reports of the PeaceTraining.eu project, should give several footholds to reopen new debates, and then the PeaceTraining.eu project social media network will be denser.

3.2. Disseminating a survey on social media

To tap into the resources of social media as a data source and gather the opinions and views of stakeholders, the project decided to create and disseminate a survey on CPPB competences designed for practitioners. The objective was to establish a rank of the main areas of knowledge and competences needed in CPPB work following the experiences of current practitioners. Area of knowledge makes reference to the different theories published around different subjects concerning CPPB. Competence refers to specific range of skill, knowledge or ability required in CPPB practice¹⁰. Based on the Tuning project (<http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/>) and the competence-based learning framework¹¹, the survey asked participants to rank ten areas of knowledge and ten generic competences. In addition, two open questions left free space to add new ones considered important for CPPB. The survey was ready on December 19th 2016 and was distributed among the identified stakeholders and on the main social media accounts categorized in the first section of this report.

A similar strategy as for the debate on CPPB training gaps was followed. The survey was distributed through the PeaceTraining.eu Facebook group and Twitter account several times a week. In parallel, a brief invitation to participate and to share it was posted in the most popular accounts of the stakeholders. Up to 117 people clicked and started the survey from December 20th to January 9th. This result is rather positive considering the European Holiday period. Nevertheless, the number of responses was less than expected and similar lessons may be learnt. It is important to build up a strong network based on dialogue and trust. Yet, based on feedback received the survey will be improved and distributed in more phases of the project. The outcomes will be presented in future reports.

⁹ Evans, 2010; Diaz Aroca, 2013

¹⁰ Teodorescu, 2006

¹¹ Villa-Sánchez & Poblete-Ruiz, 2008

4 Preliminary results of the survey on practitioners' competences

This section presents the preliminary results from the survey on practitioners' competences collected from December 20th until January 9th. In total the survey, uploaded in <http://www.surveymy.com>, received 117 responses. A first question asked whether the person is CPPB practitioner. A negative answer leads directly to the end of the questionnaire. From those 117 participants, only 72 were from CPPB practitioners and of those, 68 questionnaires were completed. The preliminary analysis will thus consider those 68 responses.

4.1. Descriptors

Most responses came from individuals enrolled in *NGOs both local and international*. 15 out of 68 respondents had an academic affiliation. Less present were people working in Governments, development agencies or training organisations and very few from the 69 were militaries or police officers. 54% are working exclusively in one types of organization, whereas 46% are working in several types (see Table 4).

From the contact questions, up to 47 respondents left their email address for further contacts and in total, the participants left. Respondents left 24 new email addresses to resend the survey. Consequently, and due to the fact that the survey will remain open, the responses will also be increased by the snowball sampling.

Table 4: AFILIATION OF THE RESPONDENTS

Affiliation (MULTIPLE CHOICE)	TOTAL	Exclusively
Local NGO/CSO	26	13
International NGO/CSO	23	11
Academics	15	5
Government / Civil Servant	10	2
Training Organisation	10	1
Development Agency	9	3
Intergovernmental (e.g. ESDC, CEPOL)	7	2
Military	4	0
Police	3	0
EU Project or Network	0	0

4.2. Areas of knowledge

The survey asks CPPB practitioners to rank the ten areas of knowledge from the most important. For the analysis, the areas of knowledge ranked in the first position were given 10 points, the ones in the second position were given 9 points and so on each area of knowledge was weighted until 1 point for area of knowledge on the last position of the rank. The total obtained for each area of knowledge was then divided by the number of respondents: 67 for this specific question.

Table 5: RANKING OF AREAS OF KNOWLEDGE (N=67)

Areas of knowledge		
1	Conflict management	6.49
2	Socio-economic and political aspects of conflict	6.31
3	Negotiation and mediation	5.90
4	Conflict resolution	5.72
5	Reconciliation Processes	5.19
6	Social change	5.16
7	Institution-building	4.28
8	Gender analysis	4.19
9	Democratisation processes	3.94
10	Civil-military relations	2.55

The most important area of knowledge for CPPB, following the practitioners' answers, is conflict management. Areas directly related with the conflict and the negotiation were better ranked than tangential ones (see Table 5). Thus, social change, institution building, gender analysis, democratisation processes and civil military relations are rarely firstly ranked.

An open question gives the option to add other areas of knowledge considered important for practitioners. Many theories and areas were then mentioned. For example, some theories directly concerned with CPPB were mentioned such as *peacebuilding theories; conflict transformation; violence reproductions and transmissions; and human security and urban crime prevention*. Some cross-cutting and structural areas were also appointed such as *ecology, postcolonial studies, and social justice*. Some of the responses could be grouped in psychology such as psychosocial theory and practice in violent conflict, but also trauma resilience practices and PTSD clinical responses.

Some of the responses were not directly related with the areas of knowledge but rather with education and awareness for peace: with *peace education at school, storytelling on peace heroes, discourses transformation through arts, research on community conflict resolution*.

4.3. Generic competences

In a third part of the survey, respondents were asked to rank ten generic competences. Those competences were selected from the book *Competence-based learning* from the Tuning Higher Educational Structures publications¹² after it has been identified as the central reference for

¹² Villa-Sánchez & Pobleto-Ruiz, 2008

competences of CPPB practitioners. Obviously, this list of competences is not a closed one and therefore, an open question asked about other ones.

“Problem-solving skills” and the *“creative thinking”* were the best ranked competences for CPPB (see Table 6). Those two competences are instrumental and are interrelated. *“Problem-solving skills”* refer to an appreciate difference between the reality and the situation we consider ideal. Problem-solving requires the identification of a non-desirable situation and the willing to solve it, to change it. The experience in problem solving develops creativity. The *“creative thinking”* is the ability to see problems from different and new perspective. The result is finding new and original ways to address situations. The third and fourth most important competences were *“diversity and interculturality”* and *“interpersonal communication”*. Both of them are interpersonal generic competences. *“Diversity and interculturality”* is an individual competence, the ability to understand and accept social and cultural diversity as something enriching. Roughly the same score got the interpersonal communications competence. This one is a social interpersonal competence, which refers to interacting positively with other people through empathetic listening and through clear expression.

The *“conflict management and negotiation”* competence is ranked fifth in the survey preliminary results. This is also a social interpersonal competence which represents the seeking to resolve differences that arise between persons and/or groups. This competence is highly related with the *“oral communication”*, which comes on the sixth position in this ranking.

The *“adaptability”* competence is ranked seventh. It was defined as the ability to continue to perform effectively in a context of adverse conditions such as pressure of time, opposition and changing situations. This competence is related to the control of time and the spirit to face criticisms.

The following competence in the rank, *“advocacy skills”*, scores 0.90 point less. It refers to the ability of informing people about systemic barriers that affect human right.

Lower positions are left to *“written skills”* and *“ICTs skills”* competences. It seems to be a consensus that the development of ICTs skills is not the priority in CPPB training, as it only scores 2.39.

Table 6: RANKING GENERIC COMPETENCES (N=62)

Competences		
1	Problem-solving skills	7.05
2	Creative thinking	6.81
3	Diversity and interculturality	6.69
4	Interpersonal communication	6.63
5	Conflict management and negotiation	5.94
6	Oral communication	5.50
7	Adaptability	5.29
8	Advocacy skills	4.39
9	Writing skills	3.02
10	ICTs skills	2.39

When asked about any other generic competence required in CPPB, respondents answered freely. Their contributions can be classified around 4 subjects:

1. **The interpersonal individual and social competences:** Intercultural competence, Interpersonal skills; Communication skills; Listening skills; Empathy, defined as the ability to develop empathy to opposing side by a process of mutual understanding; and Teamwork.

In this section, a suggestion was made regarding the “interpersonal communication” competence and the “empathy” competence: **“I see empathy and interpersonal communication as very different (and putting empathetic listening into interpersonal communications limits the extent to which empathy is considered). I would recommend empathy as a distinct competency, and if it were, I would rate it at the top. We assume social workers and development workers and peacebuilders are empathetic by nature but empathy is a competency that can be strengthened and developed through training and awareness”**. Empathy defined as the ability to understand and sense other peoples’ feelings and emotions, should thus include in the specific competence of CPPB practitioners.

2. **The instrumental cognitive competences:** Systems thinking; Critical thinking skills; Research skills; Reflexivity. **“To be humble, not thinking of yourself as the greatest expert, to spread positive energy amongst those we work with and to suggest always new moving ideas how to bring different actors together”**.

3. **Systemic competences:** Leadership, Proper record keeping

4. **Specific competences** about the conflict analysis were also pointed out:

4.1 Understanding the local context: the social structures, the past history. Identifying the third parties involved, the connectors and dividers in past years, the changes, the interest in the international community, their direct and indirect implication in the conflict. Understanding the role of other (peacebuilding) actors/institutions involved in the conflict settlement, ensure complementation, rather than competition

4.2 Knowledge of the local language.

4.3 Understanding the psychological dimensions: what drives people to violence, including identity-based conflicts, and what this means for post violence recovery and reconciliation.

4.4 Loss assessment

“Gender” was also mentioned as another important competence for CPPB practitioners, willing to highlight the importance of the ability to understand power dynamics and intersectionality and not just 'women issues'.

Cross tables do not show any relation between the different variables. Neither the ranking of areas of knowledge nor the ranking of competences seem to be related with the affiliation to a type of organisations. However, the number of responses was still limited and the public sector (including military and police) was underrepresented. Thus, more conclusive results are expected after the closing stages of the survey dissemination.

4.4. Comments to the survey

Some of the respondents to the survey took the time to provide constructive feedback regarding the questionnaire as a tool for collecting data on CPPB practitioners' competences.

One of those comments concerned the meaning and description of the areas of knowledge: "I doubt that there are consensus definitions of the items in your list". The following phases of the PeaceTraining.eu project will take into account the definition of each competences and area of knowledge developed in the present training curricula and check whether different training institutes are referring to the same when pointing a competence or an area of knowledge.

Another comment indicates that the rank could be of little use, all those generic competences being essential for CPPB: "It is difficult to rank the ones mentioned above as several are equally important and need to be known and applied simultaneously".

The choice of competences to be developed in a CPPB training, following another participant, depends on the specific work area of the CPPB practitioner: "Question 6 was difficult to answer because there is no definition of 'practitioner'. If a practitioner's position is to interface on a regular basis with community members and to be an on-the-ground presence, that person needs a particular set of skills. If the practitioner is the head of an NGO, that person needs some of the same but some other skills". Thus, the ideal curricula would need to identify generic competences and specific competences depending on the practitioner's position.

Finally, one participant considers this is an issue which deserves to be studied and reflected thoroughly: "I do not find that the system provided sufficient time for reflection of the complexity of each response which results in making quick choices without sufficient time for consideration". This comment leads us to the idea of continuing researching and reflecting on the competences and the curricula of CPPB trainings.

Actually, the survey has been online until January, 31st. Consequently, complementary responses will be available. Based on the received feedback and on new responses, the survey will be revised and improved and circulated in more phases of the project.

5 Conclusions

The first conclusion arising from this report is the popularity of social media among the stakeholders of the PeaceTraining.eu project. Almost all of them have created a Facebook page and a Twitter account they frequently update. A majority is also on LinkedIn and YouTube.

The accounts with more activity update their wall several times per day, both on Twitter and on Facebook. Those are the biggest organisations, for instance the intergovernmental institutions and the major NGOs. Those accounts have reached more than 100,000 followers and there is more activity both in sharing information and in responding to the message. The posts of those accounts often ignite the spark of a debate around a piece of news or an idea.

Thus, the first lesson learnt is that the network has to be shaped and strengthened before gathering opinions and perceptions from it. To do so, the social media strategy has to be revised and some facts could be taken into account:

- **Individual accounts are essential**, as many pages of the stakeholders do not participate directly in debates. PeaceTraining.eu projects stakeholders are often too big organisations to be involved in social media debates. The strategy should rather target individuals engaged in CPPB, working in different types of organisations. For the moment, it seems that practitioners follow the accounts of their sector (NGOs, military, research).
- **Special relations should be developed with the most popular accounts**, such as the intergovernmental institutions, the governmental aid agencies, the armed forces, the major NGOs and the ones specialised in CPPB. Specialised peace training centres should also be included in this social media network.
- As the preliminary results of the survey on practitioners' competences showed, the **PeaceTraining.eu project is presently reaching more people from NGOs**. An effort should be made to access the practitioners in other types of organisations.

The second conclusion is that the work in social media data gathering is a longer-winded process that should exceed this first phase of the PeaceTraining.eu project, which was a first test run. The network has to be strengthened, new and interesting content has to be published, and high participation, with exchange of ideas on social media is due, both in own project social media channels as in others'. In addition, the results of the CPPB practitioners' competences assessment and the results of the project on CPPB training curricula will give a new foot hold to go deeper with the debate on CPPB training gaps.

Finally, as a first outcome of the project, preliminary results of the survey on practitioners' competences brought evidence on the most important competences for CPPB practitioners. Two instrumental competences were firstly ranked: problem solving skills and creative thinking. Both could be related to the ability of seeing problems in different perspectives and having a wide range of immaterial resources to think solutions or address those situations in original ways.

The second two most important competences were of an interpersonal kind: "diversity and interculturality" as well as "interpersonal communication". The first one is individual, as it depends on whether the person perceives diversity as enriching and the second one is social as it requires both the empathetic listening and the clear expression. Half of the competences added in a new list from the respondent were related with the instrumental and the interpersonal generic competences.

The “empathy” competence was mentioned by two respondents as an extra competence not listed in the proposed ones. Empathy, as capacity to understand or feel what another person is experiencing, needs thus to be included in the specific competences of a CPPB practitioner, as would be also included the knowledge of the local language, the holistic understanding of the specific context and the understanding the psychological dimensions of people involved in conflict situations.

The findings from the preliminary results of the survey on practitioners’ competences will also help us to further communicate the project and promote the future PeaceTraining.eu platform in a better way and will allow us to raise more awareness on the issue and the outputs of the project.

References

Literature:

Evans, D. (2010). *Social media marketing: An hour a day*. John Wiley & Sons.

Lampe, C., & Roth, R. (2012). Implementing social media in public sector organizations. In *Proceedings of the 2012 iConference* (pp. 191-198). ACM.

Teodorescu, T. (2006). Competence versus competency: What is the difference? *Performance improvement*, 45(10), 27-30.

Vander Veer, E. A. (2011). *Facebook: the missing manual*. "O'Reilly Media, Inc."

Villa-Sánchez, A., & M. Poblete-Ruiz (2008). Competence-based learning: a proposal for the assessment of generic competences. *Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto*.

Weinberg, T. (2009). *The new community rules: Marketing on the social web*. "O'Reilly Media, Inc."

Websites:

<http://expandedramblings.com/index.php/by-the-numbers-a-few-important-linkedin-stats/>, retrieved on 11.01.2017

<http://www.oklahomamediagroup.com/the-difference-between-facebook-pages-profiles-groups-and-new-community-pages/>, retrieved on 10.01.2017

<https://www.statista.com/statistics/272014/global-social-networks-ranked-by-number-of-users/>, retrieved on 11.01.2017

<http://socialblade.com/youtube/user/youtube/monthly>, retrieved on 11.01.2017

<http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/>, retrieved on 12.12.2016

<http://twiplomacy.com/blog/country-promotion-2016>, retrieved on 05.01.2017


<http://twiplomacy.com/info/europe>, retrieved on 05.01.2017

<https://www.youtube.com/yt/press/statistics.html>, retrieved on 11.01.2017

<https://zephoria.com/top-15-valuable-facebook-statistics/>, retrieved on 11.01.2017

Annex A

Peace-building Practitioners Survey


Load unfinished survey
Exit and clear survey

Peace-building Practitioners Survey

The Project

PeaceTraining.eu is a **Horizon 2020** project aimed at reviewing the current conflict prevention and peace building training curricula and method in Europe in order to create a complete capacity-building curriculum model to enhance the theoretical and practical competencies of institutions, bodies and organisations working on conflict prevention and peace-building, especially in conflict-prone countries.

The project is managed by a consortium of 12 European public and private institutions with extensive experience in peace research and peace training.

As stakeholders, **participants in the project will get latest insights on the European training scene** in the field of conflict prevention and peace-building and they will have the opportunity to discuss their perspectives in on-site workshops.

Acknowledgement: This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Grant Agreement No 700583.

The Survey

The aim of this survey is to obtain a **ranking of competencies** (theoretical and practical) required in an **effective peace training program from the practitioner's point of view**. This information will contribute to develop a curriculum adapted to the real needs of peace-builders working on the field and detect possible gaps in existing training.

Conditions of Participation

The survey must be completed by peace-building practitioners; hence, you have been identified as an important contributor to this research. With your participation, you are contributing to research which seeks to strengthen the capabilities and training curricula of conflict prevention and peace-building personnel.

We guarantee that **your responses will be completely anonymous and never analysed or displayed individually. The survey will take only 5 minutes to be completed.**

Participation is entirely your choice. Whilst you have been asked due to your expertise in this field, we fully understand that participants may not be able or willing to engage.

Again, you are more than entitled to withdraw participation in the research at any stage. If you would like to do so, please contact us, and we can erase data gathered from your survey.

Contact Details

If you would like to talk to someone regarding this survey, please contact:

Catalina Uzcanga

Pedro Arrupe Human Rights Institute
University of Deusto
Avenida de las Universidades, 24. 43008 Bilbao
catalina.uzcanga(at)deusto(dot)es
+34 943326600 (ext. 5291)


If you want to have more information about the project, please visit our website: <http://project.peacetraining.eu/>
Or contact at: office(at)peacetraining(dot)eu

There are 9 questions in this survey.

Next

PeaceTraining.eu

Curricula . Knowledge . Navigation



Resume later

Exit and clear survey

0%

✳ 1 Are you a practitioner working on peacebuilding or prevention of armed conflict / armed violence?
This includes staff of local, national and international organisations, government and diplomatic staff, EEAS, and security personnel and forces involved in crisis management and prevention initiatives; peace talks, mediation and peace processes; development work in conflict contexts with components specifically addressing peace and prevention programming.


Yes

No

Next

PeaceTraining.eu

Curricula . Knowledge . Navigation



Resume later

Exit and clear survey

✳ 2 Please, clarify what type of organization you work for at present (use multiple choices if necessary):

☐ Government / Civil Servant

☐ Police

☐ Military

☐ Academic

☐ Local NGO/CSO

☐ International NGO/CSO

☐ Training Organisation

☐ EU Project or Network

☐ Intergovernmental (e.g. ESDC, CEPOL)

☐ Development Agency

☐ Other:

✳ 3 Please, specify the number of years you have been working as practitioner (please round off to express integer number):

⚠ Your answer must be between 0 and 99
⚠ Only an integer value may be entered in this field.

★ 4 Taking into consideration the following fields of knowledge, which ones do you think are most relevant / essential for practitioners – including government officials, diplomats, security forces, NGOs and civil society staff, mediators and peace workers – working on peace and conflict issues, prevention and crisis management? Please rank them (starting with the most relevant on top)

Double-click or drag-and-drop items in the left list to move them to the right - your highest ranking item should be on the top right, moving through to your lowest ranking item.

Your choices

Social change
Socio-economic and political aspects of conflict
Conflict management
Negotiation and mediation
Conflict resolution
Reconciliation Processes
Democratisation processes
Institution-building
Gender analysis
Civil-military relations

Your ranking

5 Please, specify any other field of knowledge you consider important for practitioners: (Open answer max 300 characters)

--

★ 6 Taking into consideration the following generic competences, which ones do you think are most relevant / essential for practitioners – including government officials, diplomats, security forces, NGOs and civil society staff, mediators and peace workers – working on peace and conflict issues, prevention and crisis management? Please rank them (starting with the most relevant on top)

Double-click or drag-and-drop items in the left list to move them to the right - your highest ranking item should be on the top right, moving through to your lowest ranking item.

Your choices


Creative thinking (Addressing and responding well to situations in new and original ways within a given context)
Problem solving skills (Identifying, analyzing and defining the significant elements constituting a problem in order to solve it effectively)
ICTs skills (Utilising Communication and Information Techniques as tools for expression, information, co-operative and communicative work)
Oral communication (Expressing clearly and opportunely one's ideas, knowledge and feelings in speech, adapting to the audience)
Writing skills (Relating effectively and respecting the templates through clear written expression for example writing proposals, report writing)
Diversity and interculturality (understanding and accepting social and cultural diversity as something enriching, furthering coexistence between people without incurring in discrimination)
Adaptability (continuing to perform effectively in a context of adverse conditions such as pressures of time, opposition and changing situations)
Interpersonal communication (interacting positively with other persons through empathetic listening and through clear expression of what one thinks and /or feels)
Conflict management and negotiation (Seeking to resolve differences that arise between persons and/or groups in any type of context)
Advocacy skills (informing people about systemic barriers that affect human rights)

Your ranking

7 Please, specify any other generic competency you consider important for practitioners:(Open answer max 300 characters)

Next

PeaceTraining.eu
Curricula . Knowledge . Navigation





Resume later Exit and clear survey

50%

8 We'd like to keep you posted on our ongoing research activities. In case you are interested, please leave your Email address.

9
Do you want to share this survey with other practitioners? If so, please copy the link below:
<http://www.surveymy.com/p/index.php/269423?lang=en>
or leave an email address here.

Submit

 Curricula . Knowledge . Navigation

Resume later

Thanks for your support!

If you would like to talk to someone regarding this survey, please contact:

Catalina Uzcanga

Pedro Arrupe Human Rights Institute

University of Deusto

Avenida de las Universidades, 24. 43008 Bilbao

catalina.uzcanga(at)deusto(dot)es

+34 943326600 (ext. 5291)

If you want to have more information about the project, please visit our website: <http://project.peacetraining.eu/>

Acknowledgement: This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under Grant Agreement No 700583.

[Learn more about the EU Project PeaceTraining.eu](#)



Annex B

List of stakeholders' social media accounts

Organisation Name	L	FACEBOOK	use	content	followers	TWITTER	since	use	content	followers
OSCE Conflict Prevention Centre	EN	osce.org	Few comments	News, events	77827	@OSCE	2009	Few comments	News	92738
European External Action Service	EN	EuropeanExternalActionService	Debates	News, activities	155368	@eu_eeas	2009	Debates	News, Activities	171795
EU: DG DEVCO-EuropeAid	FR	europeaid	Few comments	News, activities	134218	@europeaid	2009	Dissemination	Activities	26300
EU: ECHO	EN	ec.humanitarian.aid	Debates	News, activities	170976	@eu_echo	2012	Dissemination	News, Activities	44908
NATO	EN	NATO	Debates	News, activities	1200000	@nato	2009	Debates	News	397250
NATO-SHAPE	EN	SHAPE	Few comments	Activities	70145	@SHAPE_NATO	2009	Dissemination	News, Activities	14244

Organisation Name	L	FACEBOOK	use	content	followers	TWITTER	use	content	followers
Federal Ministry for European and I	DE	aussenministerium	Few comments	News, activities	65000	@MFA_Austria	Dissemination	News	21076
Federal Ministry of Defense and Sp	DE	bundesheer	Few comments	News, activities	51000	NO			
Austrian Development Agency	DE	austriandev	Dissemination	Activities	7047	@austriandev	Dissemination	News, Activities	1471
Ministry of Interior/ BMI	DE	BundesministeriumFue	Debates	Activities	37700	@migration_oe?lang=de	Few comments		3745
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	ND FR	DiplomatieBelgium/268	Few comments	Activities	18000	@BelgiumMFA	Few comments	Activities	16500
Belgian Development Agency (BTC)	EN FR I	BelDevAgency/	Few comments	Events, activities	5916	@BTC_Belgium/	Dissemination	News, Activities	2201
Ministry of Interior	ND FR	Intérieur-Binnenlandse	Dissemination	News, activities and	2550	@CivilSecurityBe	Dissemination	News, Activities ar	6282
Ministry of Defense	ND FR	defence.be	Few comments	Activities	8200	@belgiandefence	Dissemination	News, Activities ar	7932
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	BU	Ministry-of-Foreign-Aff	Few comments	News	15900	@MFABulgaria	Dissemination	News, Activities	10544
Ministry of Defence	BU	MoDBulgaria	Dissemination	News, events	9300	@MoDBulgaria			2
Ministry of Foreign and European A	CR	Ministarstvo-vanjskih-i-	Dissemination	News	4200	@MVEP_hr	Dissemination	News	15941
Ministry of Defense	CR	osrhcroarmyhv/?fref=ts	Few comments	News	5400	NO			
Ministry of Interior	CR	NO				@mup_rh	Dissemination	News	1042
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	EN EL	CyprusMFA/?fref=ts	Few comments	News	2740	@CyprusMFA	Few comments	News	8700
Ministry of Defense	EL EN	NO				@DefenceCyprus	Dissemination	News	2738
Ministry of Defense	CZ	MinisterstvoobranysCesl	Few comments	News, events, activ	9966	@ObranaTweetuje	Dissemination	News, Activities	6709
University of Defense for the Czech military professional personnel						@UniObranyBrno	Dissemination	Activities	276
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	EN					@CzechMFA	Dissemination	News, Activities	5028
The Czech Development Agency	CZ	czechaid	Dissemination	News, activities, gr	1323	@czechaid	Dissemination	Activities	184
Ministry of Interior	CZ	Ministerstvo-vnitro-České-republiky				@vnitro	Few comments	News, Activities	9958
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	DK EN	UdenrigsministerietsBo	Few comments	News	12213	@UM_dk	Few comments	News	7649
Ministry of Defense	DK	ForsvarsministerietsPer	Few comments	News, activities, ev	871	NON OFICIAL @FMN_dk			
Danish International development	DK	danida.dk	Few comments	Activities and eveni	9907	NO			
Ministry of Defense	EE (Tw	https://www.faceb	Few comments	Activities	16500	@MoD_Estonia	Few comments	News, Activities	1713
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	EE (Tw	https://www.facebook.	Few comments	News, promotion o	13478	@valismin	Dissemination	News and promoti	26100
Ministry of Defense	FR	https://www.facebook.	Few comments	News	190145	@defense_gouv	Debates	News	186079
Bundeswehr	DE	Bundeswehr	Debates	Activities, testimon	407400	@bundeswehrInfo	Few comments	Activities	45419
GIZ	DE	facebook closed group				@giz_gmbh	Few comments	News	24114
Ministry of Defense	SL	Slovenian Ministry of D	Dissemination	Activities	1000	@MO_RS	Dissemination	Activities	1307
FIIAPP	ES	https://www.facebook.com/FIIAPP/			3330	@FIIAPP			
Ministry of Defence	NO					@DefenceHQ	Debates	news, activities	164.000

Organisation Name	L	FACEBOOK	use	content	followers	TWITTER	use	content	followers
ALBOAN	SP BQ	https://www.facebook.com/ALBOANongd	Few comments	Events, advoca	10761	@ALBOANongd	Few comments	Events, advoca	5688
CEAR-EUSKADI	SP BQ	https://www.facebook.com/CEAREuskadi	Dissemination	News, events, i	1066	@CEAREuskadi	Dissemination	News, events, i	368
Save the Children	SP	https://www.facebook.com/SaveChildrenE	Few comments	News, advocac	133142	@SaveChildrenE	Dissemination	News, advocac	86300
Protection International	EN	https://www.facebook.com/ProtectionInt	Few comments	News, events	2764	@ProtectionInt	Dissemination	News and ever	2338
European Peacebuilding Liaison Offi	EN	https://www.facebook.com/EPLO_	Dissemination	News	1912	@EPLO_	Dissemination	Events and nev	1439
Search for Common Ground	EN Ind	https://www.facebook.com/CommonGrou	Few comments	News, events	46328	@CommonGrou	Dissemination	Events	844
Pax Christi International	EN	https://www.facebook.com/PaxChristi	Dissemination	Events, news	2495	@PaxChristi	Dissemination	News and ever	2352
Oxfam International	EN	https://www.facebook.com/Oxfam	Debates	Events, advoca	304352	@Oxfam	Dissemination	Advocacy cam	776036
Oxfam (BE)	FR ND	https://www.facebook.com/OxfamBE	Few comments	News, advocac	16701				
Oxfam (FR)	FR	https://www.facebook.com/OxfamFR	Debates	News, advocac	120204				
Oxfam (SP)	SP	https://www.facebook.com/OxfamSP	Debates	News, advocac	716495				
International Crisis Group	EN	https://www.facebook.com/CrisisGroup	Few comments	News, events, i	134867	@CrisisGroup	Dissemination	Reports, news,	118848
Cordaid	ND EN	https://www.facebook.com/Cordaid	Few comments	News, advocac	16880	@cordaid	Dissemination	Activities	11854
Causeway Institute for Peace-buildi	EN	NO				@CIPCR	Dissemination	Events	677
Global Partnership for the Preventic	EN	https://www.facebook.com/gppac	Few comments	News, advocac	13449	@gppac	Few comments	News, events	3941
International Alert	EN	https://www.facebook.com/intalert	Few comments	News, advocac	10215	@intalert	Dissemination	Activities, advc	10306
Nansen Dialogue Network	EN NO	https://www.facebook.com/NansenDN	Dissemination	News, advocac	1495	@NansenDN			37
NGO Support Centre	EN GR	https://www.facebook.com/ngo_centre	Dissemination	Events, Report:	2137	@ngo_centre	Dissemination	Events and rep	868
Nonviolent Peaceforce (NP)	EN	https://www.facebook.com/Peaceforce	Few comments	Activities, advc	8438	@Peaceforce	Dissemination	News, events a	6998
Partners Network/ Partners for Den	EN	https://www.facebook.com/pdci_network	Dissemination	Advocacy cam	319	@pdci_network			292
TIDES Training & Consultancy	EN	https://www.facebook.com/TIDES	Few comments	Advocacy cam	606	NO			
Médecins sans Frontières	EN	https://www.facebook.com/MSF	Debates	News, advocac	1284716	@MSF	Dissemination	News, advocac	81152
Network for Building Peace	EN	NO				NO			
Global Partnership for the Preventic	EN	https://www.facebook.com/GPPAC	Dissemination	News, advocacy		@GPPAC	Dissemination	News, advocac	3953
Peace Direct	EN	https://www.facebook.com/peacedirect	Few comments	News, advocac	9980	@peacedirect	Dissemination	News, advocac	10913
Caritas International	EN	from country delagations				@iamCARITAS	Dissemination	News, advocac	15444
Geneva Peacebuilding Platform	EN	https://www.facebook.com/GPPlatform	Dissemination	Events	45	@GPPlatform	Dissemination	Events	501
Alliance for Peacebuilding	EN	https://www.facebook.com/AfPeacebuildi	Few comments	News, advocac	6461	@AfPeacebuildi	Dissemination	Events	9834
Peace and Collaborative Developme	EN	https://www.facebook.com/pcdnetwork	Dissemination	News, events a	14668	@pcdnetwork	Dissemination	News, call for a	13100
Care	EN	https://www.facebook.com/CARE	Debates	News, call for f	480000	@CARE	Few comments	News, call for f	1031236
CONCORD	EN	https://www.facebook.com/CONCORD_Eu	Few comments	News, advocac	5290	@CONCORD_Eu	Dissemination	News, advocac	7246
Crisis Action	EN	NO				@Crisis_Action	Dissemination	News	3333
Conciliation Resources	EN	https://www.facebook.com/CRbuildpeace	Dissemination	News, advocac	5831	@CRbuildpeace	Dissemination	News, advocac	7792
Saferworld	EN	https://www.facebook.com/Saferworld	Dissemination	News, advocac	7500	@Saferworld	Dissemination	News, vacancie	7777

Organisation Name	L	FACEBOOK	use	content	followers	TWITTER	use	content	followers
Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO)	EN	https://www.facebook.com/PRIO	Few comments	News, promotion	6618	@PRIOUpdate	Few comments	News	4829
United States Institute for Peace	EN	https://www.facebook.com/USIP	Commented	News, promotion	145398	@USIP	Debates	News and promotion	80194
European Institute of Peace	EN	https://www.facebook.com/EIP	Few comments	Events, vacancies	1750	@Eurpeace	Dissemination	News, advocacy campaign	4238
University of Bradford	EN	https://www.facebook.com/universityofbradford		News and promotion	15909	@BradfordUni	Dissemination	News, reports	
Columbia University, Barnard College	EN	https://www.facebook.com/barnardcollege	Few comments	Researches, events	24000	@BarnardCollege	Debates	News, promotion of	11700
University of Notre Dame's Kroc Institute	EN	https://www.facebook.com/kroc	Little comments	News, promotion	5362				
University of Peace	EN	University for Peace	Few comments	Call for applications	59000	@UPEACE	Dissemination	Call for applications	19568
Coventry University						@covcampus	Dissemination	News	49119
European Graduate School, Saas-Fee	EN	European Graduate School	Dissemination	Events	47000	@EuroGradSch	Dissemination	Conferences, CFP	6584
European Peace University	EN	https://www.facebook.com/EPU			1813				
University of Trento - Peacebuilding and Conflict Resolution Steering Committee						@sisunitn	Dissemination	News, events	
Uppsala University	EN					@uppsalaPeace	Dissemination	Events, news, research	845
Swisspeace	EN	https://www.facebook.com/swisspeace	Dissemination	Events, promotion	2365	@swisspeace	Dissemination		786
Institut Català Internacional per la Pau (ICIP)	CA	https://www.facebook.com/ICIP	Dissemination	Events, news	5292	@ICIPeace	Few comments	Advocacy campaign	4115
Galtung Institute	EN					@galtunginstitute	Few comments	retweets	2070
SIPRI	EN	https://www.facebook.com/SIPRI	Few comments	Data about arms	16104	@SIPRIorg	Few comments	News, data	28800
Peace Training and Research Organization	EN	https://www.facebook.com/PTRO	Dissemination	Events	1099	@PTROafghan	Nothing since 2014		235

Name	L	FACEBOOK	type	use	content	followers	TWITTER	use	content	followers
European Security and Defense College	EN	NO					NO			
Europe's New Training Initiative for Civilian Crisis	EN	Entry	Europe's New Training Initiative	Dissemination	Events	65	NO			
The International Association of Peacekeeping	EN	NO					NO			
The European Association of Peace Operations	EN	https://www.facebook.com/EAPO	Group closed			26	NO			
Peace Operations Training Institute	EN	https://www.facebook.com/POTI	organization	Few comments	Events and dissemination	6836	@peaceoperations	Dissemination	News	458
	EN	https://www.facebook.com/POTIgroup	group	Debates	News, events, events	23234				
Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training	EN, FR	https://www.facebook.com/KAIPTC	Dissemination		News, events and	2782	@KaipctGh	Few comments	News, event, call	46
United Nations Institute for Training and Research	EN	UNITAR	organization	Dissemination	Events	12526	@UNITAR	Dissemination	Events	40230
European Association of Development Research	EN	European Association of Development Research	Dissemination		Events	4003	@EADI	Dissemination	Events, positions	2102
Peace and Collaborative Development Network	EN	https://www.facebook.com/PCDN	Dissemination		News, events and	14668	@pcdnetwork	Dissemination	News, call for applications	13100