Counter Narratives and Alternative Narratives

Introduction

This Issue Paper is provided in support of the European Commission’s preparatory EU IT Forum, ‘Countering Violent Extremism: Online Communications’, held on 27 October 2015. The following questions are addressed:

• How do counter-narratives and alternative narratives play a role in prevention of radicalisation?
• What do successful counter-narrative and alternative narrative campaigns look like?
• What are the obstacles to designing and delivering effective campaigns from an industry, government and practitioner perspective and how can they be overcome?
• How can and should success be measured?
• What can stakeholders offer to boost counter-narrative and alternative narrative campaigns?

1Government strategic communications are presented in Table 1 below, but are not the core focus in this paper.
Setting the scene

The key arguments outlined in this paper are:

- There remains a very large gap between the volume and quality of counter- and alternative narrative campaigns and the propaganda machine of ISIL and other extremist groups.
- The primary obstacle to producing more and better quality counter- and alternative narratives is the lack of government, civil society and industry partnerships that are productive, sustained and long-term – with proportionate levels of resource.
- One of the solutions is to create innovative funding models and structures that combine government resources with support and expertise from tech, social media, and advertising companies to support civil society practitioners and grassroots networks in a manner that is sustained and long-term, with creative freedom and rigorous measurement.
- Governments have the resources and motivation to fund counter-narrative campaigns. They can encourage partnerships between civil society and industries, such as tech and social media. Existing funding mechanisms at EU and national level should be leveraged to a maximum to support such partnership initiatives. Here, the EU RAN CoE could provide an important platform for innovative solutions between government, industry and CVE practitioners.

This paper draws upon the insights and lessons learned from the RAN @ working group, the RAN Collection of Approaches and Practices and other research materials related to this topic.

The role of counter- and alternative narratives in prevention of radicalisation

Exposure to extremist propaganda – both online and offline – is critical to the process of radicalisation. Extremist narratives are effective because of their simplicity, their use of scapegoating, and their emotional appeals to fear, anger, shame and honour. Their messages are crafted to exploit identity issues that many young people may be experiencing. It is upon this scaffolding that their violent and exclusionary ideologies are built. But the manner of transmission is equally vital. Popular extremist propaganda often includes: high production value, the use of fast-paced editing, music and a charismatic narrator, and a call to action. The professional and sophisticated use of social media by ISIL in particular has been a game-changer.
Extremists are also populating the spaces where young people consume and share information, socialise and are socialised. While they are increasingly making use of the so-called ‘Dark Net’, but the majority of their efforts are focused on mainstream sites: Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Instagram, WhatsApp, Reddit, Snapchat, Ask fm and Kik.3

The role of the Internet in the process of radicalisation has been the subject of academic debate, with research suggesting that radicalisation required an offline ‘radicaliser’.4 But the rise of social media, and its prominence in the lives of teenagers has dramatically changed in recent years and consequently changes how we should think about the radicalisation challenge.

Insights from research underline why counter-narratives and alternative narratives must be central to countering violent extremism (CVE) efforts. Former extremists cite exposure to alternative sources of information; exposure of hypocrisy and lies of extremists; or boredom (in contrast to the excitement painted by extremist propaganda) as key reasons for their disengagement. Counter-narratives and alternative narratives can deliver these messages.5

Research from public health campaigns, for example, shows the potential impact for shifting attitudes and behaviours when communication campaigns are sustained, well-targeted and of a scale that is proportional to the problem.6 In terms of counter-narratives and alternative narratives more specifically, there remains a large gap in knowledge and research on the effectiveness of counter-narrative and alternative narrative campaigns because there have been limited numbers of high-quality campaigns to date. Anecdotal

knowledge of impact exists and is presented here, but a better understanding requires a substantial scale-up in volume and type of counter- and alternative narratives, with appropriate and sophisticated measurement tools. Moreover, the processes of radicalisation and deradicalisation are complex and involve multiple factors, making it difficult to identify and draw a causal link between changes in attitudes and behaviours, and counter- or alternative narrative campaigns.

One of the key challenges in the counter-narrative spaces is understanding precisely what the term refers to, and the different types of ‘counter-messaging’ or ‘counter-narratives’ that exist. Table 1 below outlines different types of counter-narratives, which include alternative narratives, counter-narratives and government strategic communications. The table provides an indication of what each type involves, their key characteristics, and which stakeholders should be delivering which types.

Table 1. Types of counter-narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>Why</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative Narratives</strong></td>
<td>Undercut violent extremist narratives by focusing on what we are ‘for’ rather than ‘against’</td>
<td>Positive story about social values, tolerance, openness, freedom and democracy</td>
<td>Civil society or government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counter Narratives</strong></td>
<td>Directly deconstruct, discredit and demystify violent extremist messaging</td>
<td>Challenge of ideologies through emotion, theology, humour, exposure of hypocrisy, lies and untruths</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government strategic communications</strong></td>
<td>Undercut extremist narratives by explaining government policy and rationale</td>
<td>refuting misinformation, and developing relationships with key constituencies and audiences</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the different types of counter-narratives, determining where the target audience is – whether it is taking place ‘upstream’ i.e. counter-radicalisation (broader messaging to young people to act as prevention against extremist narratives), or downstream i.e. de-radicalisation (including one-to-one messaging with individuals who already hold radical views), as outlined in the figure below, is vital to success. Failure to fully consider the appropriate type of message and how it matches with the target audience is the most common mistake and obstacle to effective campaigns.

---


Examples of counter-narrative campaigns – including where they sit on the radicalisation spectrum – are included in the Annex to this paper.

**What makes a successful campaign?**

The key to designing a successful campaign is correct identification and understanding of the chosen target audience and where they are situated on the radicalisation spectrum. This will impact on the types of messages, messengers and mediums that are used. RAN@ Working Group meetings and pilot projects have highlighted how user behaviours can inform how counter-narratives and alternative narratives can be targeted in prevention. For example, on YouTube, users tend to search for a video and then browse related content, thus browser behaviour is a key strategic level consideration. A combination of network and content analysis can allow organisations to 1) develop strategies to disrupt certain clusters, 2) develop and position counter-messaging, and 3) evaluate the impact of projects at the strategic level.

Principles drawn from previous campaigns stress the following insights for designing successful campaigns.

- **Develop a theory of change & know your audience.** Careful planning and design, including development of a theory of change, is vital. Key questions to ask are:
  - Who do you want to influence?
  - What influences them (e.g., facts, emotions, satire, which credible voices)?
  - Where do they congregate / what platforms do they use?
  - What are your outcomes / measurables?
- **Target audiences know best.** Campaign content that is co-created with individuals in the target audience (or formerly in the target audience, as in the case of former extremists) will have most resonance. Content should be market-tested with different segments of the target audience through an iterative process.
- **Get the timing right.** The best campaign could fail if timing is wrong. Rapid response capabilities are required to capitalise on unanticipated events, social media campaigns or announcements.

---

9 Institute for Strategic Dialogue (2013), *Final Meeting Report, Second Working Group Session on ‘Bringing together government, civil society and the technology sector to explore effective counter-narrative strategies to counter extremism online. ’*, RAN@ Working Group on Internet and Social Media, March 2013.
• **Emotions are more important than evidence.** Facts and statistics can be dismissed or obfuscated by opposing statistics. Appeals with emotional resonance have greater power.

• **Campaigns should be sustained, rather than sporadic.** Extremist narratives tell a continuing – albeit highly manipulated – story. Counter-narrative campaigns implemented over a sustained period of time will have more impact than one-off efforts.

• **Professionalism and production quality are vital.** The quality – and style – of production are critical to legitimacy and appeal, particularly for younger audiences.

• **Going viral is not the aim.** Going viral implies untargeted and unpredictable. By contrast, successful counter-narratives may be highly targeted to specific audiences and platforms.

• **Link between online and offline.** Successful counter-narrative campaigns are often linked to offline actions. For example, Exit Deutschland’s T-shirt campaign, or Hope Not Hate’s combination of online campaigns and offline community mobilisation.

• **Humour and satire can be effective.** Humour has historically played an effective role in undermining extremists (e.g. with the Ku Klux Klan in the US). Satire or humour can be an effective engagement tool.

### Obstacles to designing effective campaigns

The key obstacle to increasing the volume and quality of counter- and alternative narratives is governments, civil society practitioners and private sector companies working together in productive, long-term partnership. Governments, the private sector and civil society practitioners all have a role to play, and each possess a part of the solution. But equally, each faces challenges which can make effective partnership work extremely difficult.

• **Governments** have reach and resources, particularly in promoting alternative narratives. But they:
  - lack credibility as effective messengers with target audiences (often government endorsement can act as a ‘kiss of death’ for potentially credible messages and messengers);
  - are risk-averse in terms of the types of messages that they are comfortable supporting (e.g. messages that criticise foreign policy, or are more radical by nature).

• **Civil society practitioners (including grassroots networks)** can provide counter-narrative campaigns with credible messengers who ensure that the message is delivered in a trustworthy and convincing manner. But they:
  - lack funding, resources and expertise in digital marketing and measurement analytic tools;
  - are often unable to take a long-term, strategic view because what funding they do receive is predominantly piecemeal and one-off, rather than sustained and long-term, which dramatically undermines their ability to work effectively;
  - may have difficulty finding and supporting credible messengers (including former extremists and survivors of extremism);
  - may have reputational concerns related to explicit CVE-content or partnerships with government which may undermine credibility with target audiences.
• **Technology and social media companies, as well as creative marketing and advertising companies,** can use their expertise and experience in conceptualising and disseminating ideas online and offline and affecting or changing attitudes. But:
  - They lack the specific knowledge of extremist movements and radicalisation.
  - Their primary focus is on core business – especially if they are accountable to shareholders. This could mean a lack of time and investment in creating counter-narrative campaigns.
  - They may have concerns over working in a highly contested and controversial area and/or concerns that working too closely with governments could impact on brand reputation.

**Measuring success**

The success of counter messaging overall depends on it being of a scale and quality that is proportional to the challenge we face: equal to the ISIL propaganda machine in terms of volume, production value, and speed. At present, combined counter-narrative and alternative narrative efforts represent a drop in the ocean compared to ISIL. Measuring this overall impact can only be done through macro-level, longitudinal measures and indicators, which is difficult, but which new technologies are starting to make possible.

Success should also be measured at a tactical level and used to inform the delivery and impact of individual campaigns. Measures of success at this tactical level will depend on the type of campaign deployed and where it is situated on the radicalisation spectrum. The aim of downstream interventions – targeting broader populations of young people, for example – will not be a change of attitude, but rather an increase in resilience or inoculation to extremist propaganda. An intervention further upstream, by contrast, will be seeking to capture, exploit or spark a ‘cognitive opening’ that can plant a seed of doubt or slowly chip away at the certainty of extremist narratives.

A more elaborated outline of tactical and strategic approaches, indicators and tools for measuring success is included in the Annexe.

**Recommendations for next steps**

The success of groups like ISIL is closely linked to their online propaganda convincing an increasing number of young people worldwide to join and sympathise with their cause. Counter-narratives and alternative narratives are vital to preventing this, but at present, the volume and quality of counter- and alternative narratives is not even close to being delivered at the same scale, quality and proportion as that produced and disseminated by ISIL. There are several major challenges. One is that there are limitations to governments’ credibility in terms of delivering counter-narratives directly. At the same time, government funding and engagement is needed to support initiatives adequately while providing necessary guidance on measures to ensure direction, effect and efficiency. Another obstacle is a lack of innovative funding and collaboration models that take into account the challenges facing each of the relevant stakeholders mentioned above. Below are recommendations for governments, civil society practitioners and tech and social media companies on how these challenges can be met.
• **Governments** have the resources and motivation to fund counter-narrative campaigns. They can encourage partnerships between civil society and industries, such as tech and social media. **Existing funding mechanisms at EU and national level should be leveraged to a maximum to support such partnership initiatives.** Governments have an important role in making sure this remains a priority and they are also accountable for how government funding is spent and focused on target audiences. It is important to recognise that governments should not be fronting counter-narrative campaigns, nor should they have sign-off or influence on the content. It is absolutely vital that governments use their resources to develop funding models and infrastructures that avoid the ‘kiss of death’ phenomenon, and are sustainable and long-term, rather than piecemeal and tied to political cycles. Ultimately, governments need to help to create an infrastructure that is community-owned and operated, but that is non-governmental in how it operates.\(^1\) EU RAN CoE could provide a hub for exchange of initiatives and ideas alongside other initiatives.

• **Tech and social media companies** have committed to working in this space in recent years. But more could be done, for example, through **offers of pro bono or discounted use of social media advertising tools for civil society counter narrative campaigns.** Tech and social media companies could also provide **pro bono support with analytic tools that can be used to measure campaign impact.** More needs to be invested in longer-term cooperation and support. Training of relevant practitioners in all EU Member States could be a useful initiative with greater involvement through the EU’s RAN CoE and associated initiatives to develop partnerships with the credible voices/civil society actors to help/support them in their development of counter narrative campaigns.

• **Advertising and film production companies** should do more to **provide pro bono support to civil society organisations and practitioners in designing effective messages as part of their corporate social responsibilities.** They could also help civil society practitioners understand how they measure the impact of their campaigns, and processes for market-testing with target audiences.

• **Civil society organisations** are critical countervailing voices against violent extremism and can play an important role in developing and delivering counter-narratives. They are usually the ones who know most about what is going on with members of the communities, as well as what types of communication and messages will have appeal. Therefore there is a call for civil society organisations to become more pro-active in this space. However, often civil society actors and practitioners lack resources, expertise and capacity in the digital space to effectively deliver and measure the impact of sustained counter-narrative campaigns. **Greater funding from government (subject to the recommendation above on limiting government’s role in sign-off or public association with**

---

\(^1\)For example, ISD’s Innovation Hub, in its initial phases, can serve as one potential model for funding and supporting counter- and alternative narratives: bringing together civil society practitioners and content creators with the support of tech and social media companies, to provide sustained and strategic long-term support, dissemination and evaluation.
campaigns) and in-kind assistance by key industry players is needed to support and professionalise civil society efforts in a way that enables them to take a more strategic view and approach.

- **Effective messengers**, including ‘formers’ and survivors of extremism, can be particularly valuable in crafting counter-narrative campaigns. However, there are barriers to their involvement. Many may not want to have public profiles, or will have full-time jobs and families, and lack resources and time to work on creating counter-narratives and alternative narratives at scale. **Ways must be developed to incentivise and support ‘formers and survivors’ to take part in this work to a greater extent**: for example, **paying ‘formers and survivors’ for their time and work should be considered where appropriate. Additional offers should include access to skills-development (for example, from tech, film production or advertising companies) and forms of pastoral support. Furthermore, young people may be able to create effective content, particularly alternative narratives, which resonate with their peers; but many may feel reluctant to work on CVE specific campaigns or topics. Grassroots networks of young people should be recruited to generate content that is more generally related to issues like social cohesion or political activism, including content that may be critical of government, rather than specific CVE topics.**

**Role and contribution of the RAN Centre of Excellence**

The RAN Centre of Excellence (CoE) – including the full range of RAN Working Groups, and especially the RAN Communication Narratives Working Group, will play a pivotal role in bringing together government representatives, civil society practitioners and private sector industries to form innovative partnerships. RAN CoE will continue to forge and encourage partnerships related to the challenges and recommendations mentioned above. In this light RAN CoE will:

- explore ways for frontline practitioners from the public, private and voluntary/community sectors to partner up to tackle radicalisation leading to violent extremism both online and offline using narratives and communication tools;
- improve relationships and cooperation between these different frontline practitioner groups;
- deliver a series of products for first line workers and/or individuals at risk and disseminate lessons learnt, including through training programmes for practitioners;
- deliver concrete support to content creators and disseminators, most likely in the form of videos, training, knowledge and network connections;
- involve youngsters to help with the creation of content and explore dissemination channels.
- organise peer group exchange of methods and measurement;
- work together with other related RAN Working Groups such as RAN Education, RAN Victims and RAN Youth, Families and Communities;
- provide further policy recommendations to the EU, national and local government from a practitioner perspective.
Annexe: Examples of counter- and alternative narratives

The following examples are ordered according to their target audience and ‘intervention’ in the radicalisation process. While some are more up-stream, trying to raise awareness with the general public and/or influence groups and individuals who are not yet radicalised or at risk, others are more down-stream intervention projects that intervene directly with already-radicalised individuals to prevent them from committing violent acts and to de-radicalise them. More examples may be found in the RAN Collection of Approaches and Practices.

**Extreme Dialogue (up-stream)**

Launched across Canada in February 2015, Extreme Dialogue aims to reduce the appeal of extremism among young people and offer a positive alternative to the increasing amounts of extremist material and propaganda available on the Internet and social media platforms. A series of short documentary films tells the personal stories of Canadians profoundly affected by violent extremism; a former member of the extreme far-right and a mother whose son was killed fighting for ISIL in Syria. The films are accompanied by a set of educational resources that can be used with young people in classrooms or community settings and are intended to build resilience to extremism through active discussion and enhanced critical thinking. These resources include Prezi presentations and practitioners’ resource packs and are available via the “Stories” pages in both English and French. Funded by Public Safety Canada via the Kanishka Project, Extreme Dialogue has brought together project partners the Institute for Strategic Dialogue, film-makers Duckrabbit, and the educational charity Tim Parry Johnathan Ball Foundation for Peace. Extreme Dialogue will also be coming to Europe in 2016, with funding provided for additional films and educational resources by the European Commission and support from project partners West London Initiative in the UK, Cultures Interactive in Germany and Political Capital in Hungary.

For more information visit: [http://extremedialogue.org/](http://extremedialogue.org/)

**‘Rechts gegen Rechts’ Charity March (up-stream to mid-stream)**

The offline and online counter-narrative campaign “Rechts gegen Rechts” (Right against Right) was launched in 2014 by the Centre for Democratic Culture ZDK in Germany in support of EXIT Germany (see above). The campaign uses neo-Nazi demonstrations and marches across Germany to collect money for EXIT Germany. For each step the right wing extremists march during their gatherings and for the number of hours they demonstrate overall, local citizens and companies donate money to EXIT Germany to help people leave the right-wing extremist scene. This counter-narrative campaign was also launched online by advertising it on the project’s website, on Facebook and YouTube, and was advertised on Twitter through the hashtag #rechtsgegenechts. The campaign attracted worldwide attention in the news media and received awards which both increased awareness of right-wing extremism and the number of donations made to EXIT Germany substantially.

For more information visit: [http://rechts-gegen-rechts.de/](http://rechts-gegen-rechts.de/)
Operation Trojan T-Shirt (mid-stream)

The offline counter-narrative campaign Trojan T-Shirt was launched by EXIT Germany, a civil society initiative which tries to encourage people to leave the right-wing extremism scene and assists them during the process. In 2011, EXIT anonymously donated T-Shirts to the biggest German right-wing rock music festival organiser with the slogan “Hardcore Rebels – National and Free” which the organisation distributed for free at a far-right rock music festival. After the first wash, the T-Shirt Slogan would change to “What your t-shirt can do, you can too – we help you to leave the right-wing scene. EXIT Germany”. The campaign reached 250 people directly and received extensive national and European coverage in the media. It was one of the most shared topics on social media in 2011. After the campaign the number of people who wanted to leave the right-wing extremism scene tripled, although this number needs to be looked at cautiously. Private donations to EXIT Germany also increased by 334% in 2011 in comparison to 2010.

For more information visit: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CSIbsHKEP-8
http://www.exit-deutschland.de/english/

Abdullah X (mid-stream to down-stream)

Initially an offline initiative working with young people at the grassroots level, the Abdullah-X (AX) project moved online, creating a YouTube channel, Twitter and Facebook profiles and a stand-alone website to counter the increasing prevalence of extremist content on such platforms. Using targeted marketing techniques, concise but compelling content and an engaging visual style, the AX counter-narrative videos reached over 52,000 viewers (70% from ads), and more than 1 million ‘impressions’ (the number of individual screens on which ads for AX content appeared) in the UK over a six-week trial period with direct support provided by YouTube. By addressing contemporary and controversial issues relevant to young Muslims, the channel has been able to garner impressive subscription, sharing and discussion figures when compared to other counter-narrative video content online.

For more information visit: http://www.abdullahx.com/

‘One-to-One’ Online Interventions (down-stream)

The One2One initiative by the Institute of Strategic Dialogue (ISD) brings together a team of former extremists from across ideologies that are identifying those at risk of carrying out violent acts and directly reaching out to these individuals online, offering to engage in a constructive dialogue. When ISD started this programme, based on similar efforts in the past, 10% of participants were expected to respond with a significant proportion of those responses being negative. Instead, the programme has resulted in a 59% response rate, with not a single threat or aggressive response. Although it’s still early days, this highlights the great potential of this approach. Based on the early success of this pilot programme, ISD is developing One2One as a mobile app to apply the lessons learned and to ensure that positive voices online can directly reach young people expressing extremist sympathies at a scale large enough to turn the tide against extremist recruiters online.

For more information visit: http://www.strategicdialogue.org/includes/One2One_Web_v2.pdf

---

Impact measurement

**Tactical, short-term measures**

Data such as clicks, views, Tweets and follower-count can help to provide feedback on daily activities and track individual interactions. Social media analytic tools available on most social media platforms, as well as those offered by companies like Google or Bitly, can further assess the tactical impact of a campaign through features such as:

- user demographics;
- user engagement (e.g. how many people were reached by the campaign and when, how much they interacted with its content, and projects’ websites and social media accounts);
- user geography;
- user behaviour (e.g. did it spark comments and discussion by those who came in contact with counter-narratives; was the content shared online);
- ad Type, placement, content and targeting (e.g. YouTube “in-stream ads”, boosted Tweets on Twitter);
- Media coverage (i.e. fostering debate on the issue).

Software developments are ongoing, many borrowed from digital marketing and the tech industry, and they hold further promise for measuring tactical impact. For example, a common tool is ‘Hashtag-tracking’, whereby the historic and real-time impact of a #hashtag is assessed (e.g. in which context and how often is it used or retweeted, what responses it generates, who uses it). This gives direct access to actionable data and can help to improve Twitter campaigns and increase understanding of users’ networks and behaviour. But going beyond ‘hashtags’, other software – utilising natural language processing and machine-learning – can measure and analyse a large volume of Tweets in real-time, and categorise them according to theme and sentiment utilising keywords and phrases that may not include hashtags (for example, as used by the Centre for the Analysis of Social Media, ‘CASM,’ at the London-based think tank Demos).

Similarly, internal evaluations of counter-narrative campaigns undertaken by the Institute for Strategic Dialogue shed light on how different promotional and dissemination strategies can impact tactical engagement. For example, driving engagement through paid advertising led to a larger number of ‘hits’, clicks or views, but of a shorter, more ephemeral duration (e.g. user watching a counter-narrative video for less than three seconds). By contrast, organic engagement (which does not involve the use of paid advertisements for dissemination), may lead to far fewer ‘hits’, but evaluations suggest a possible higher degree of in-depth engagement (e.g. by commenting on videos or retweeting posts). The impact of different dissemination strategies needs further exploration and ‘A/B testing’ across multiple campaigns – targeting different audiences, with different messages and approaches.

These tools enable clear measures of online reach and short-term impact, but they are also limited: further work is needed to determine whether campaigns have reached intended audiences and/or whether they are changing offline behaviour.

**Strategic, long-term measures**

At a strategic level, a successful long-term strategy and proportionate approach to counter- and alternative narratives should lead to:
• fewer people supporting extremist ideas online (measured through searching, liking, following and sharing content);
• more people speaking out against extremist ideas online;
• more people supporting (by same metrics as above) content that is critical of extremists;
• fewer people supporting violent extremist organisations – for example, by travelling abroad to fight with or support groups like ISIL.

Longitudinal measures, particularly online, can be used to measure ‘extremity shift’ in discourse over an extended period of time:

• Discourse analysis in semi-closed or semi-discrete forums, over a sustained period of time to determine ‘natural’ level fluctuations and how they are impacted by external events. This provides a baseline control to measure the intervention impact against.
• Network analysis to determine high volume users and map the network ecosystem, including key influencers and behaviours of those on the fringes.

This requires large-scale data collection and social listening techniques that are at the cutting edge of online analysis. But the relationship between online and offline behaviour is still not fully understood. Moreover, even if these measures are made quantifiable, a question of causality and attribution will remain: was it counter- and alternative narratives that had the impact, versus other initiatives, geopolitical developments, or other factors? Randomised control trials (known as ‘A/B testing’ or ‘split testing’ in online marketing) and quasi-experimental approaches can help to isolate impact.

Finally, answering the relationship between online and offline interaction requires the triangulation of social media analytic tools with qualitative interviews and/or quantitative online surveys. This is inevitably challenging. Securing participation in research from target audiences will depend on where in the radicalisation spectrum they are situated, but the offer of financial incentives (which is customary in social research) may help. Interviews with ‘formers’ – especially those radicalised in the past few years – could also help to shed light on the role of counter- and alternative narratives online in the process of deradicalisation.
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