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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community-Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM&amp;E</td>
<td>Design, Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAO</td>
<td>Ethnic Armed Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIA</td>
<td>Kachin Independence Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDC</td>
<td>Listening and Dialogue Circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRC</td>
<td>Local Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Ba Tha</td>
<td>Influential Buddhist nationalist movement; also known as the Association for the Protection of Race and Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>Myanmar Creative Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI</td>
<td>Ministry of Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRTV</td>
<td>Myanmar Radio and Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>National Ceasefire Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>National League for Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Public Service Announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSF</td>
<td>Peace Support Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>Search for Common Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBV</td>
<td>Sexual and Gender-Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOGI</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatmadaw</td>
<td>Myanmar armed forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNLA</td>
<td>Ta’ang National Liberation Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDP</td>
<td>Union Solidarity Development Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YBS</td>
<td>Yangon Bus Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of the Listenership Survey and Reflective Review of the Let’s Think, Let’s Change: promoting diversity through popular culture project, implemented by Search for Common Ground (SFCG) in conjunction with Myanmar Radio and Television (MRTV), and funded by the Peace Support Fund (PSF). The project, implemented between July 2016 and June 2017, sought to promote acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar, reducing enabling environments for inter-communal violence and public unrest. To this end, the project has attempted to foster dialogue among divided communities and to increase understanding of the importance of collaboration and respect across dividing lines in society. The initiative combined community-based work facilitated by youth leaders with a social media campaign, televised public service announcements (PSAs), and a radio talk show. The talk show presented various themes and stories that discuss the impact of negative stereotyping and encouraged listeners to question and challenge rumours and negative biases that prevail in society.

The purpose of this research was to evaluate project impact against the stated objectives, identify learnings, and inform future programming. The evaluation was designed and implemented by an external consultant, with support from SFCG and local partners. Field research was undertaken in the two project sites: Lashio in Northern Shan State, and North Okkalapa in Greater Yangon, and in a control site at Hlaingthayar (also in Greater Yangon) in the latter half of May 2017. The evaluation employed two complementary components: a quantitative listenership survey and a qualitative reflective review. The listenership survey sampled 508 respondents across all three research locations to assess listenership, understanding and acceptance of the main themes covered, measurement of their relevance/resonance within the survey populations, and determine what, if any, change could be attributed to the project. The reflective review was conducted in the two project locations only, comprising seven Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and 12 Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with selected project participants.

It was found that 28.6 percent of respondents from the two project locations had previously heard of the radio talk show, compared to 7.4 percent in the control site. Meanwhile, 17.2 percent of respondents from the two project locations reported to have listened to at least one episode of the radio talk show, while only 3.1 percent of respondents from the control group had listened to the broadcast. Across all three survey locations, the listenership rate was recorded at 12.8 percent. This is a significant result. Previous research has suggested that a listenership rate over more than ten percent should be considered as high.1

The Listening and Dialogue Circles (LDCs) which accompanied the radio broadcasts exceeded expectations and have demonstrated a significant impact on project success, as can be seen above in the observed differences for awareness and listenership between the project and control sites. The LDCs were also shown to produce a higher level of understanding and acceptance of the topics discussed compared to listening to the episodes in isolation. There has been a noted appetite for additional LDCs to be held at a greater frequency and in more locations.

While this may be a significant result for an audience-specific targeted media program, listener retention could have been better. Across all three survey locations, the majority (89.2%) of listeners listened to fewer than half of the episodes (five or less), while almost two-thirds

(58.5%) tuned out after only one or two. All of the topics discussed throughout the program were widely noted to demonstrate relevance/resonance among survey respondents and FGD and KII participants alike. It has been posited that individual listeners may have disliked the format of the episodes or felt that they were too long or not interesting enough to hold their attention. The limited listener retention has had an impact on project effectiveness. It cannot be expected that a single or even a small number of exposures to the radio program will result in a significant change in attitudes and/or behaviours in those listeners. To achieve greater impact, future projects will need to attain higher listener retention rates.

Noting that only a short interval of time has elapsed between the implementation of the project activities and this evaluation, it is recognised that it may still be too early to accurately assess project impact. However, a number of outcomes are immediately observable. Notwithstanding the limited listener retention rate, the majority of respondents surveyed have indicated that the project has helped to foster dialogues among divided communities, with 90.8 percent of listeners claiming that the radio program has inspired them to engage in dialogue with people from other cultures or religions. Meanwhile, 81.7 percent of listeners in the two project locations have stated that the radio program has influenced the way that they view people from other cultures and religions, compared to 40.0 percent among the control group who have claimed the same.

Recognising that this project was the first of its kind in Myanmar and that additional work will be needed before diversity is freely and widely accepted as a social norm, this project represents an initial step in the right direction and a solid basis on which to build future activities. The preliminary findings obtained within only a few months of implementation indicate that the theory of change, in which the project is rooted, remains valid and appropriate to the objectives and overall goal.

This evaluation furnishes the following key recommendations for the consideration of SFCG and its partners on potential ways to make future projects stronger. A more complete list of recommendations, with additional justification is included at the end of this report.

1.1 Key Recommendations

- Additional project areas should be included in future projects, with a greater geographic coverage in each of those areas.
- Future projects should endeavour to hold more LDCs, with a greater frequency.
- Youth should remain the primary target audience, although future projects should also target additional age groups.
- Future projects should endeavour to achieve a better listener retention rate in order to increase project effectiveness.
- Future radio episodes should be shortened to ten minutes in length.
- Seek options to broadcasting the radio talk show via an alternate radio station which is more popular with youth.
- Future projects should utilise video as the preferred media format in place of radio.
- If using video as the preferred video format in the future, consider broadcasting the episodes on a different network which is more popular among Myanmar’s youth.
• Continue to develop programming around the issues that were found to be more popular and relevant with the audience.

• Invest in creative marketing and publicity campaigns to further enhance project awareness.

• To capitalise on the popularity of social media, the Facebook page should be updated more regularly with a wider range of content.

• Additional community outreach activities should be incorporated into future projects to raise the project profile and increase community engagement.

• Seek stronger engagement with high schools, universities, and training colleges in the project areas through the Ministry of Education, in order to reach the youth enrolled there.

• Approach the Yangon Bus Service (YBS) and/or Myanmar Railways to discuss the possibility of broadcasting the program on Yangon's public transport network.

• In future, allow for more time to pass between the implementation of project activities and assessment to evaluate the impact of those activities.
2. CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS

Myanmar is an incredibly diverse country, which has been plagued with mistrust and tensions between its many diverse ethnic, religious, social, and cultural groups. While significant developments have taken place in Myanmar over the past five years, many of these tensions persist and the population remains divided. In order for the newly-achieved democracy and the much sought-after peace to be fully realised, many of the existing biases and stereotypes which keep the society divided must be addressed and overcome.

The government officially recognises 135 national races. However this is not the complete picture and many have argued that this list is simultaneously overly complex and incomplete. There are a number of ethnic groups who reside within Myanmar who are conspicuously absent from this list. Ethnicity remains an exceedingly complex and controversial issue in Myanmar. The government is still yet to release the disaggregated data on ethnicity from the 2014 census on the grounds that it is too sensitive and that it could “shatter” peace and stability in the country. In January 2017, officials from the Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population were quoted to say that the data on ethnicity would be released within the next four months; however, five months later, the disaggregated data is yet to materialise.

The nation has been wracked with multiple ethnic armed conflicts since soon after gaining independence in 1948. Several of these conflicts continue today, and indeed, a number of these have escalated over the past year. Notably, following a series of coordinated armed attacks on police guard posts in Northern Rakhine State in October 2016, the level of armed conflict in that area escalated exponentially as government-backed security forces responded with ‘clearance operations’ to hunt down those responsible. The level of conflict in Northern Shan and Southern Kachin States has also intensified over the past 12 months where government forces have been engaged in ongoing conflict with a number of ethnic armed organisations (EAOs) united under the Northern Alliance. And sporadic clashes between some of the various EAOs. In the midst of all of this, negotiations around the Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) have continued between the government and various EAOs. At the time of writing the second 21st Century Panglong Peace Conference had been concluded, although genuine peace remains elusive.

In recent years there have also been heightened religious and inter-communal tensions, particularly (but not exclusively) between the majority Buddhist and the minority Muslim populations in multiple locations around the country. At times, these tensions have escalated to the point of violence and have resulted in an unknown number of deaths, believed to have

---

2 It is beyond the scope of the current study to argue the finer points of ethnicity and citizenship in Myanmar.
5 It is not the purpose or intent of the current report to examine or evaluate the ongoing conflict or violence in Northern Rakhine State.
6 The Northern Alliance includes: the Kachin Independence Organisation (KIA), Myanmar National Democratic Alliance Army (MNDAA), Ta’ang National Liberation Army (TNLA), and Arakan Army (AA).
7 However, some EAOs, including the members of the Northern Alliance have largely been excluded from negotiations.
amassed in the hundreds. Buddhist nationalist groups such as Ma Ba Tha⁹ remain at the forefront of such tensions, fuelling conflict through the dissemination of anti-Muslim rhetoric, typically depicting the minority as foreign invaders who threaten to overrun the majority Buddhist population and turn Myanmar into an Islamic State. This spreading of rumours and negative narratives has precipitated sporadic outbreaks of violence against the Muslim population, such as the recent mob violence in Mingalar Taung Nyunt in Yangon in May 2017, or the forced closure of a number of madrasa in Thaketa township (also in Yangon) in April 2017.

Myanmar is undergoing a period of rapid social and political change, and there is considerable opportunity to capitalise on this momentum. Though Myanmar society remains highly fragmented, the concerted efforts shown by many state and non-state actors to address conflict is encouraging and hope for the future is strong.

---

⁹ Ma Ba Tha, as the group is commonly known, is the Burmese language acronym for the Association for the Protection of Race and Religion.
3. Project Introduction

It is against this backdrop that the *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* project has attempted to reduce the ethnic, religious, political, and social divides which contribute to violence in Myanmar. The stated goal of the project has been to promote the acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar, reducing enabling environments for inter-communal violence and public unrest.

The specific objectives (SO) of the project were:

- To foster dialogue among divided communities in order to promote inter-ethnic and inter-religious diversity; and
- To increase public awareness and understanding of the importance of collaboration and respect across various divides.

This project is rooted in the following theory of change:

*If popular culture constructively challenges existing negative narratives and stereotypes of the ‘other’ that fuel divisions and enables violent conflict, then audience members will gain increased understanding of and respect for different members of their diverse communities. Increased respect will reduce the likelihood of outbreaks of inter-communal violence.*

The initiative combined community-based work led by youth leaders with a social media campaign, television public service announcements (PSAs), and a radio talk show implemented in partnership with MRTV. The talk show engaged national celebrities and local communities, highlighting themes and stories that have explored the impact of negative stereotyping and encouraged listeners to question and challenge rumours and negative biases that prevail in society by engaging the public with stories of inspiration drawn from local communities.

The project focussed on two target areas: North Okkalapa in Greater Yangon, and Lashio in Northern Shan State. These two project areas were selected for their diverse ethnic, religious and social communities, their histories of inter-communal violence and vulnerability to renewed outbreaks of violence.

Primarily targeting youth aged 18-35 years, the radio talk show encompassed twelve episodes which were broadcast nationally on MRTV radio, each with its own focus on an issue relevant to youth and having a bearing on peace within the community. The twelve episodes were as follows:

1. Youth and sport;
2. Youth and unity;
3. Youth and peace;
4. Youth, stereotypes, and equality;
5. Youth and LGBT;
6. Youth and job opportunities;
7. Youth and drugs;
8. Youth and rehabilitation;
9. Youth and the benefit of reading;
10. Youth and domestic violence;
11. Youth and social media rumours; and
12. Youth and online charity work.
The topics and content for all twelve episodes were developed through a series of Youth Consultative Workshops in August and September 2016 attended by 132 youth from the target locations and a National Curriculum Summit in November 2016 with 27 media professionals, celebrities, and youth representatives. Examining the issues identified during the Youth Consultative Workshops, the National Curriculum Summit (NCS) was convened to seek consensus and make collective decisions about the intended outcomes and specific messaging of the radio talk show, the public service announcement (PSA), and the multimedia campaign.

Meanwhile, a Rapid Conflict Assessment (RCA) was conducted in November 2016 shortly before the NCS to explore the conflict dynamics and rumours contributing to unrest and violence in the project areas. A number of the findings from the RCA were incorporated into and guided some discussions at the NCS.

Building on some of the discussion and analysis which came out of the NCS, SFCG and MRTV staff came together in Nay Pyi Taw in December 2016 at a Story Development Workshop (SDW) to develop the concept of the radio talk show and the scripts for all episodes. At the SDW, it was collectively agreed to pilot a new and innovative radio format integrating VOX POPs (on site interviews with the public), studio-based interviews and stories with celebrities and various community members. This was to mark the first time that a show of this kind was trialled in Myanmar and it represented a new initiative for SFCG Myanmar as well as for MRTV.

Each episode ran for 20 minutes and were broadcast twice weekly between 21 January and 8 April 2017.

Once the episodes had already begun to be broadcast, in mid-March 2016, a series of Youth Facilitation Trainings were provided to 34 Youth Facilitators and observers from North Okkalapa and Lashio (drawn from participants from the previous Youth Consultative Workshops). In conjunction with the broadcast, these Youth Facilitators hosted a series of Listening and Dialogue Circles (LDCs) with members of their communities to strengthen understanding and acceptance of the issues covered in the broadcasts. A Facilitator Guide was developed to help the Youth Facilitators to lead the LDCs. A total of 121 of these LDCs were held with 994 participants from the two target areas over two weeks in March and April 2017.

Meanwhile, a public service announcement (PSA) and a number of promotional videos were also produced (one for each episode) to help raise the profile of the project and facilitate dissemination of the key messages. These were televised on MRTV three times a week to help promote the project and further the messages contained therein. Both the PSA and the promotional videos were also shared online via the newly-created Let’s Think, Let’s Change Facebook page, along with other key messages.
4. METHODOLOGY

This evaluation utilised a number of different research methods to generate data. Field research was conducted by a team of researchers and enumerators in three locations from 20 to 30 May 2017. The fieldwork was complemented by a non-exhaustive desk review of relevant literature and project documents.

The research methodology was designed and implemented by an external consultant, with support from key SFCG program staff. The research tools, questionnaires, and work plan were designed by the consultant and approved by SFCG program staff prior to commencement of any fieldwork. The field research consisted of two primary components:

1. A quantitative listenership survey; and
2. A qualitative reflective review.

4.1 Listenership Survey

The listenership survey was carried out among a sample of the general population to evaluate project impact and to deepen understanding of listening habits to inform future programming.

The listenership survey also sought to assess the understanding and acceptance of the main themes discussed, measure their relevance/resonance within the survey populations, and determine what, if any, change could be attributed to the project in accordance with the theory of change.

To this end, the Listenership survey adopted the 3-R Framework: Reach, Relevance/Resonance and Response in order to focus on the following three main dimensions:

1. **Reach** includes the geographical coverage, demographics of listeners;
2. **Relevance/Resonance** explores to what extent issues raised in the program and the overall format of the program are relevant to the local socio-political dynamics of the community in concern; and
3. **Response** explores what changes occur in the society as a result of the project and how our target audience are adjusting their behaviour or taking specific actions to address the conflict issues as a result of the program.

The listenership survey was conducted in two project locations and a control site. The outlying township of Hlaingthayar in Greater Yangon was selected as the control site due a number of similarities it shares with the project sites, particularly its noted diversity, large migrant and youth populations, and low socio-economic status of much of its population. Hlaingthayar’s close proximity to Yangon was also a factor in its selection, facilitating ease of access for the Yangon-based research team.

The sample size for the survey was calculated based on a confidence level of 95 percent and a confidence interval of 5 percent, plus a 10 percent non-response error, equalling a survey size of 422. However, the survey was increased to 490 respondents, in order to be consistent with and comparable to previous surveys.\(^\text{11}\) While the two project locations are relatively similar in size, North Okkalapa is the larger, with a population of approximately 333,293.

\(^{11}\) The baseline survey for the Let’s Think, Let’s Change project returned 488 responses.
compared to Lashio’s slightly smaller population of 323,405.\textsuperscript{12} Hlaingthayar, with a population of 687,867, is larger than both project locations combined.\textsuperscript{13} However, it was determined that as a control site, its sample size should not grossly outstrip the two project locations. Following consultation with the SFCG DM&E Team, it was agreed that 180 responses would be sought from North Okkalapa, 155 from Lashio, and 155 from the Hlaingthayar control site.\textsuperscript{14} A number of enumerators exceeded their quotas in each survey location, resulting in a larger returned sample size than was originally proposed. All responses were analysed. The resultant sample size for the listenership survey was 508 respondents.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Survey Location & Population & Sample Size & Returned Sample  \\
& & Proposed & Returned & (%)  \\
\hline
North Okkalapa & 333,293 & 180 & 185 & 36.4  \\
Lashio & 323,405 & 155 & 161 & 31.7  \\
Hlaingthayar & 687,867 & 155 & 162 & 31.9  \\
Total & 1,344,565 & 490 & 508 & 100  \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Sample size for the listenership survey across the three survey locations.}
\end{table}

The listenership survey was managed in the field by the external consultant and conducted by locally-recruited enumerators, identified through SFCG’s local project partners. Two 10-person research teams were recruited: one in Lashio, and one in Yangon; the latter conducting the survey in both North Okkalapa and Hlaingthayar. Each research team was supported by a locally-recruited research supervisor tasked with ensuring the smooth execution of the survey. The research teams were provided with orientation and training before carrying out the survey over two days in each location.

The survey tool was initially developed in English and translated into Burmese in preparation for use in the field. Though the translation was checked for accuracy by SFCG program staff, it subsequently became apparent during the trainings that some errors remained. Additional time was spent during the trainings (in both locations) to ensure that the enumerators understood the questions as intended. However, it is possible that despite these efforts, some questions were misunderstood.

All enumerators were 18-34 years of age. The average age of enumerators was slightly higher in Lashio (24.6 years) than in Yangon (20.0 years). Consideration was given to achieve equitable gender, ethnic, and religious distribution among the enumerators. While three of the four major religions were represented in both areas,\textsuperscript{15} the majority (80 percent) of enumerators were Buddhist. Similarly, numerous different ethnicities were represented,\textsuperscript{16} although the largest contingent identified as Bamar (55 percent). There was significantly higher female participation in Lashio (70 percent) than in Yangon (30 percent), although when averaged across both areas, gender equality was achieved. This is a marked improvement over the baseline listenership and viewership survey.\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{13} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{14} Under the advice of the SFCG Asia Regional DM&E Specialist, Lashio and Hlaingthayar were assigned equal sample sizes – the larger population of Hlaingthayar being offset by its status as a control site.
\item\textsuperscript{15} Buddhism (80%), Christianity (10%), and Islam (10%) – there were no Hindus among the enumerators.
\item\textsuperscript{16} Bamar (55%), Shan (15%), Shan/Muslim (5%), Muslim (5%), Kayin (5%), Wa (5%), Rakhine (5%), and Rakhine/Bamar (5%).
\item\textsuperscript{17} Ania Zongollowicz (2017a), Viewership and Listenership Survey: Lashio & North Okkalapa, Baseline survey report of the Let’s Think, Let’s Change project, February 2017.
\end{itemize}
Enumerators were instructed to select respondents from the target population (aged 18-35 years), with an eye for an equal representation of genders, ethnicity and religious affiliation up to their assigned quotas. Most enumerators worked in pairs and variously sought out respondents in shopping centres, markets, teashops, and other public locations.

The survey was administered electronically, using portable touchscreen tablet computers operating the Responster interface. Xavey Research Solutions\textsuperscript{18} in Yangon was contracted to digitise the survey and provide the tablet computers. This platform was also utilised in previous surveys and has proven to work well in the field, minimising both the time required and the margin of human error in data entry. Each enumerator was provided with his/her own tablet and a unique user ID which was monitored throughout the research phase. Upon completion of the fieldwork, all responses were exported as SPSS datasets and Excel spreadsheets ready for analysis.

4.2 Reflective Review

The reflective review utilised qualitative research tools to complement the findings of the listenership survey. The reflective review was conducted by the consultant in the two project locations: North Okkalapa and Lashio. The reflective review was not conducted at the Hlaingthayar control site.

Semi-structured Key Informant Interviews (KIIIs) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with project participants were used to generate data to measure the success of the project, identify best practices and lessons learned, and help inform future programming and potential scaling-up of the existing project.

In each project location, three FGDs were held with Youth Facilitators, LDC Participants, and the parents and/or guardians of the LDC Participants. One additional FGD was held with media professionals in Yangon who had been involved in different aspects of the project. A total of seven focus group discussions were conducted. (See Appendix 5 for a list of FGD participants).

Twelve KIIIs were conducted with identified project participants across both project locations. Interviewees were identified by the consultant in collaboration with SFCG program staff. (See Appendix 4 for a list of KII interviewees).

All FGDs were conducted in Burmese with the assistance of a locally-engaged interpreter. Meanwhile, eight (out of the 12) KIIIs were conducted in Burmese. Of the remaining four KIIIs, two were conducted exclusively in English without the need for an interpreter, and two were in a mix of English and Burmese, with the help of an interpreter when required. Discussions were not recorded and only hand-written notes were taken to encourage openness. The FGD and KII interlocutors were a diverse mix of ages, genders, ethnicities and religions.

The questions proposed during the FGDs and KIIIs were developed by the consultant, based on the list of eleven guiding research questions outlined in the Terms of Reference. (See Appendix 3 for a full list of questions asked during the FGDs and KIIIs).

\textsuperscript{18} www.xavey.com
4.3 Limitations

This research acknowledges a number of limitations. Firstly, the timeline under which this research was conducted was very tight. Due to some early difficulties experienced by SFCG in securing the services of a research consultant, very little time was available before the project deadline in which to design the research tools, identify and schedule appointments with interlocutors, conduct the field research, and carry out the data analysis and report preparation. As a result, appointments needed to be scheduled on weekends and at times which may have been inconvenient for some interlocutors. A number of interlocutors who had been flagged for an interview were unavailable during the research phase and as such could not be interviewed. This included a number of key SFCG program staff – including both the Program Manager (who at the time had left the organisation and commenced work elsewhere) and the Project Officer (who was engaged in facilitating a workshop during the research period). This also increased reliance on SFCG’s local partner organisations. In both project locations, local partners identified and recruited the survey enumerators and FGD participants. While this helped with the practicability of the research phase within such a tight timeframe, it also introduced a bias in which the enumerators and FGD respondents were selected from among their existing networks. Moreover, it stripped SFCG and the consultant of control over scheduling. The turnout for the FGD with parents and guardians in both locations was low as these appear to have clashed with competing demands.

All FGDs and most interviews were conducted in Burmese with the assistance of an interpreter. It is quite possible, if not likely, that some concepts were lost in translation. There are many words and concepts in Burmese which do not have a translation into English – and vice versa. While feedback on the interpreter’s performance was positive, it should be assumed that at least some statements were not translated accurately or that some concepts were not adequately elaborated across the language barrier.

As was previously noted in the baseline survey, decades of rule and strict control under a series of oppressive military regimes has limited the freedom of expression in Myanmar and created an environment in which many people are mistrustful of others who ask too many questions – particularly on topics which can be construed as being even remotely political. This mistrust can impact upon a respondent’s answers to those questions and ultimately upon data integrity. While it is recognised that the freedoms of expression have improved in Myanmar in recent years, the legacy endures and many people remain reluctant to express their opinions publicly. This is exacerbated by a rigid hierarchical culture and an education system which discourages independent thought or questioning. Young people are expected to show deference to their elders, not to ask questions and not to dispute any of their claims.

Further, Myanmar also has a culture of ‘saving face’, in which a respondent may alter their answer with the intent of providing the response that they think the interviewer wants, for fear that they will appear ignorant for not knowing an answer, or providing one which differs from that of others.

19 The consultancy was advertised in early April 2017, with interviews and selection scheduled for mid-late April. This unfortunately coincided with the Thingyan national holiday when many consultants were out of country and enumerators and participants were unavailable.

20 In Lashio, the FGD with parents and guardians had been scheduled on the same day that schools had reopened when parents are needed to be present to assist with the enrolment of their children. As a result, only one parent had shown up at the scheduled time and the FGD was delayed in the hope that more would come later.

21 Zongollowicz (2017a), Ibid. page 14.
5. Research Findings

5.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

As stated above, the listenership survey returned 508 responses across the three survey locations, 82.1 percent (n=417) of whom were aged between 18 and 35 years.²²

Across all three survey locations, 53.7 percent of respondents were male, 42.9 percent were female, and 3.3 percent (n=17) identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender (LGBT).²³ In Lashio, where there were more female enumerators than male, a higher proportion of women were surveyed than in either of the two Yangon locations. Similarly, almost all respondents (94.1%) who identified as LGBT were in Lashio where a number of the enumerators openly identified as LGBT. Only one respondent in North Okkalapa identified as LGBT.²⁴

²² The primary target population for the Let’s Think, Let’s Change project (and the current study) were youths aged 18-35 years.

²³ Sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) is a complex concept in Myanmar in which a person’s sexual orientation is often seen to be synonymous with their gender identity – not as two separate characteristics as it is in many other countries. This report recognises this and has permitted LGBT individuals to identify as such should they choose to.

²⁴ Low levels of public understanding and acceptance of LGBT persons and enduring stereotypes against them have kept many ‘in the closet’. The proportion of LGBT respondents across all survey locations is thus considered to be conservative whereby some LGBT respondents may have identified with their biological sex for fear of outing themselves.

---

Figure 1: Recorded ages of survey respondents across all three survey locations.

Figure 2: Recorded genders of survey respondents across all three survey locations.
All of the major religions were represented in the survey. The vast majority of respondents were Buddhist (80.9%), although Christians (10.4%), Muslims (6.1%), Hindus (1.1%), and Sikhs (0.6%) were also represented. The proportions of the four main religions among the survey population are reasonably representative and are in line with national averages, although the numbers of the lesser religions are slightly inflated in the survey population. Lashio returned almost four times the number of Muslims compared to the two Yangon locations. This is attributed to better coordination among the Lashio-based research team where enumerators spent more time collecting responses among Muslim communities.

Unlike the baseline survey, the current study sought to record the ethnicity of respondents. Almost two-thirds of respondents (63.0%) identified as Bamar. Though the most recent data is yet to be released, data from previous censuses put the Bamar at approximately 68% of the national population. The two Yangon survey locations returned almost double the number of Bamar (73.0% and 75.3% in North Okkalapa and Hlaingthayar, respectively) than did Lashio (39.1%). Numerous other ethnic groups were also represented, albeit in smaller numbers. The second most populous group identified as being of mixed ethnicity (8.3%) followed by Shan (6.5%), Kayin (5.9%), Rakhine (3.5%), and Kachin (3.3%). The majority of Shan (93.9%) and Kachin (82.4%) respondents were from Lashio, while most Rakhine (88.9%) respondents were recorded in Hlaingthayar.

---

25 Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism.
26 According to the 2014 Myanmar Population and Housing Census, 89.8% of the national population is Buddhist, 6.3% are Christian, 2.3% are Muslim, and 0.5% are Hindu. [http://www.dop.gov.mm/moip/index.php?route=census/download/product_download&download_id=129](http://www.dop.gov.mm/moip/index.php?route=census/download/product_download&download_id=129). Accessed: 5 June 2017.
28 As many as 16 different mixed races were identified in the survey.
The highest level of education completed by the respondents was also recorded. Over two-thirds (70.5%) of respondents have completed secondary education or higher, although the most frequently cited response was high school (53.0%). This was relatively even across the three survey locations.

5.2 Project Awareness

The *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* project was the first of its kind in Myanmar – using a combination of media formats to reach out to youth in order to address negative stereotypes and raise awareness and acceptance of diversity. While a number of interlocutors from the reflective review noted that some other organisations have used social media to good effect, this marks the first time that an organisation has attempted to combine radio with community dialogues to promote greater discussion around peace. One MRTV radio representative directly involved in the production of the radio program commented:

“This is the first time that anything this big or this ambitious has been attempted before. This is the first time that it has been done in collaboration with the government and the first time that we have focussed on and worked with youth.”
A number of methods were utilised to help promote and increase awareness of the project. A public service announcement (PSA) and a number of promotional videos were produced and broadcast on television and via Facebook. A theme song for the radio program was also produced and was featured in the radio episodes and also in the PSA and promotional videos.

Respondents to the listenership survey were asked if they recognised the theme song when it was played for them. One-quarter of respondents (27.2%, n=138) stated that they had previously heard the theme song. There was no significant difference in recognition between the survey locations, ages, genders, religions or ethnicities. Almost two-thirds (59.4%) of those who had heard the song before could correctly identify it as the jingle from the radio program.

Meanwhile, 42.0 percent of those who had heard the song claimed to have also seen any of the PSA and/or promotional clips – either on MRTV television (19.6%) or via Facebook (22.5%). Of the 508 respondents surveyed, 58 (11.4%) asserted that they had seen at least one of the PSA and/or promotional clips. Of this number, more than two-thirds (69.0%) were able to recall at least one of the topics or issues discussed therein.

Further, a little over one-third (39.7%) of those who had seen the videos claimed that it had challenged their stereotypes towards other religious or cultural groups. The PSA and promotional clips appear to have had the greatest impact in Lashio where almost two-thirds (60.9%) claim that their stereotypes had been challenged.

Across all three survey locations, 21.9 percent of respondents (n=111) reported having heard of the radio program. In the project locations where various activities had been rolled out, 28.0 percent (n=45) and 29.2 percent (n=54) of respondents in Lashio and North Okkalapa, respectively, reported awareness of the radio program. In comparison, only 7.4 percent (n=12) of respondents in Hlaingthayar had heard of the program before, suggesting that the LDCs and other project activities implemented in the two project locations had a significant impact on the population’s awareness of the radio program.

![Figure 6: Respondents’ awareness of the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program across all three survey locations.](image-url)

Among those respondents from all three survey locations who had heard of the radio program, most (42.3%) report to have first heard about it from friends. In Lashio, 66.7 percent of respondents (n=36) had learned about the program by word of mouth from friends, while 24.4% of respondents (n=11) in North Okkalapa could report the same. Meanwhile, 20.0 percent of respondents (n=9) in Lashio had heard of the program from family, while only 5.6
percent of respondents (n=3) in North Okkalapa made this assertion. While relatively few respondents in the two project locations (4.1%) stated that they had first heard about the radio program while listening to the radio, this was the most frequently cited means of learning about the program in Hlaingthayar (41.7%).

**Figure 7:** Sources of information where respondents reported having first heard about the *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* radio program for each survey location.

### 5.3 Listenership

Among those 111 respondents who had reported cognizance of the radio program, almost two-thirds (58.6%) had listened to it. Of the 508 respondents sampled across the three locations, 12.8 percent (n=65) reported having listened to the radio program. In Lashio, 14.9 percent (n=24) of respondents had listened to at least one episode, while in North Okkalapa, 19.5 percent (n=36) of respondents had tuned in to at least one broadcast. In the Hlaingthayar control site, only 3.1 percent (n=5) reported to have listened to the program – once again suggesting the significant impact that the LDCs had not only on project awareness, but also on listenership.

**Figure 8:** Proportion of respondents who listened to one or more episode of the radio program for each survey location.
According to the SFCG Asia Regional DM&E Specialist, similar programs delivered via television in Sri Lanka and Nepal have returned viewership rates of 8 percent and 10.5 percent, respectively. While viewership for a television program is not directly comparable to listenership for a radio program, other research has suggested that a listenership rate of 12.8 percent is high. According to audience research specialist, Graham Mytton, a listenership rate of 5-10 percent is moderate, while a rate of 10-30 percent is considered high.

5.4 Listener Retention

None of the 65 respondents who had listened to the broadcast tuned in for all 12 episodes. The overwhelming majority (89.2%) of those who tuned in listened to fewer than half of the episodes, while 58.5 percent (n=38) only listened to one or two. One respondent claims to have listened to most of the episodes (“all except for one or two”). However she failed to correctly identify the theme song and could only recall one of the topics discussed during the episodes. Her inability to recall the topics discussed or to correctly identify the theme song suggests that her response may not be reliable.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Figure 9:} The number of episodes of the radio program listened to by respondents for each survey location.
\end{center}

It is unclear why listener retention was so low. One possible explanation could be that the audience faced competing demands for their time and were unable to continue listening in week after week. It is equally possible that after listening to one or a small number of episodes, they were not interested in the topics, disliked the format, or felt that they were not relevant.

Various FGD participants and interviewees have suggested that while the talk show was informative, it was not interesting or engaging enough to effectively capture and hold the attention of young people. Celebrity host Myint Myo Aung, expressed his disappointment that the project did not meet his expectations. He has argued that the episodes lacked sufficient creativity and artistry which would have made them more appealing. Without suggesting a departure from the radio talk show format, he has proposed engaging professional scriptwriters who can develop carefully structured story plots with believable and persuasive dialogue as illustrative examples to incorporate into the talk show. Other interviewees also

\[29\text{ Mytton (2000), } \text{Ibid.}\]
\[30\text{ Ibid.}\]
embraced this idea, suggesting that a little light comedy (where appropriate) and other storytelling techniques may be more suitable for a Myanmar audience and their way of storytelling. Advocates for this approach have conceded that there must be a trade-off between the dissemination of fact and artistry, and that in order to make the program more interesting, it may be necessary to reduce some of the content presented.

5.5 Relevance/Resonance

All FGD and KII participants agreed that the project was delivered at an appropriate time. This was said to be true in light of the escalation of armed conflict in Northern Shan State, the outbreak of violence in Northern Rakhine State and the subsequent “clearance operations” conducted by security forces, ongoing Union-level discussions regarding the National Ceasefire Agreement (NCA), heightened tensions with Ma Ba Tha and other Buddhist nationalist groups,31 and the assassination of U Ko Ni.32 All of these developments have involved tensions across ethnic and religious divides, and all have occurred during the project cycle.

In Lashio, one interviewee maintained that the escalation of fighting in Northern Shan State had little impact on community participation in the project or their willingness to openly discuss the various issues in the LDCs. He did add that while ethnic tensions remain high between the Shan and the Ta’ang, they have died down a little during 2017. A second Lashio-based interviewee spoke of ongoing religious divisions in the town, which he believes are simmering just below the surface. While open hostilities in Lashio have decreased since the outbreak of violence in 2013, the tensions and mistrust remain.

It was argued by one Yangon-based interviewee that as the messages in the episodes are very subtle and discuss “othering” in place of any overt discussion about ethnic or religious conflict, they should continue to remain relevant and important in the future.

Most of the listeners (81.5%) have affirmed that the topics covered in the radio program are relevant to youth in their communities. Twenty percent of listeners (n=13) identified youth and drugs as being a highly relevant issue in their community. Other issues frequently cited as relevant have included: youth and sport, youth and peace, youth and LGBT (all n=12), youth and domestic violence, youth and unity (both n=11), and youth and job opportunities (n=10). Topics which returned fewer responses, indicating that they are perceived to be less relevant/resonate included: youth, stereotypes and equality (n=5), youth and online charity work (n=3), youth and the benefit of reading (n=2), and youth and rehabilitation (n=1). Meanwhile, 12 listeners (18.5%) asserted that none of the 12 topics covered in the radio program were relevant in their communities. However, of this 12, seven had claimed that the radio program had influenced the way that they viewed people from other cultures and religions (see below for further discussion of this), and ten said that they would still recommend the program to others.

31 For instance, there have been a number of sporadic outbreaks of violence against the Muslim population in Theketa and Mingalar Taung Nyunt in Greater Yangon.
32 The well-known Muslim legal adviser and constitutional expert was gunned down at Yangon International Airport on 29 January 2017.
Within the FGDs and KIIIs, the topic of youth and sport was universally acknowledged to be both relevant and important in both project areas. Even the female participants, who maintain that many girls are discouraged or even prohibited from playing outside or engaging in sport upon reaching adolescence, recognised the relevance/resonance of this topic. One of the LDC participants from North Okkalapa made the following statement:

“In the [youth and sport] episode, I like how the diverse footballers achieved their goal together as a team even though they are from different backgrounds. They have mutual understanding and respect.”

Youth and drugs was also identified as a very important issue in both locations, and Youth Facilitators reported that LDCs on this topic generated a lot of discussion. Drugs are relatively cheap and easy to obtain throughout Myanmar. In Yangon, a methamphetamine tablet can be purchased for as little as 3,000 Kyat (less than $2.50). “We cannot turn blind eye to drug issues in society; it could be our concern one day,” said one LDC participant from North Okkalapa.

Youth and social media rumours was also reported to have generated a lot of discussion in both project areas. Noting the frequency with which many youth use Facebook, one Lashio-based interviewee asserted that this topic may well represent the most immediate need:

“Addressing online rumours could be the issue that we need to address first. Young people use Facebook a lot, although not all of them are able to question the accuracy of the information that they read online. Rumours can lead to an increase in tensions, and this can result in violence.”

---

[33] This quote was not collected by the consultant as part of the research undertaken for this evaluation. It was provided by SFCG after being recorded by one of the Youth Facilitators during an LDC.

[34] According to a former drug user in Yangon, separately interviewed by the consultant.

[35] This quote was not collected by the consultant as part of the research undertaken for this evaluation. It was provided by SFCG after being recorded by one of the Youth Facilitators during an LDC.
This view appears to be supported by results generated by the listenership survey in which 69.2 percent of listeners (n=45) stated that they do not check the accuracy of online rumours. However, there are some indications that the project has helped to address this. One LDC participant from Lashio stated the following:

"I used to believe everything that I read on Facebook – especially information which was shared by a lot of people. Although now I have learned to check the accuracy of reports and to check the sources."

Youth Facilitators in both project areas noted that the LDCs discussing youth and LGBT generated a lot of discussion. While awareness and acceptance of the LGBT community in Myanmar has improved over the past few years, universal acceptance is still a distant dream and widespread and deeply entrenched social stigmas remain. For example, one woman in the parents and guardians FGD in Lashio argued that discussions about LGBT persons should focus on changing their behaviours so that they can be “more normal”, openly declaring that “We do not like to see them in our community”. However, not all FGD and KII participants shared this view. One LDC participant from Lashio noted that:

“People who are LGBT are human beings too. They should be allowed to love one another and we should encourage people not to discriminate against them.” 36

Meanwhile, another LDC participant from North Okkalapa commented on how the dialogue had changed his views towards the LGBT community:

“I learned more about LGBT people and got a new perspective towards them. We should stand for them too.” 37

Domestic violence is another highly sensitive topic in conservative Myanmar, and while it may have been expected that this taboo topic generated little discussion or interest, the domestic violence episode and the accompanying LDC were actually one of the most popular. This was a particularly hot topic in Lashio. The majority of the participants attending the domestic violence LDC were women, and it was reported that the few men in attendance walked out. One Youth Facilitator believes that many women in some parts of Lashio are abused by their husbands. She reported that at one of the LDCs that she hosted, eight of the twelve women in attendance broke down during the discussions. It was further noted that while most of the LDCs took approximately 1.5 hours, those discussing domestic violence took three to four hours to complete. This is attributable to the additional time needed to build trust among the participants to better facilitate an open discussion.

Meanwhile, numerous respondents have identified a variety of topics which they believe to have been less relevant or less interesting. While most respondents had their own individual opinions, the following observations relate to a wider consensus from the FGD and KII participants.

The episode addressing the topic of youth, stereotypes and equality was arguably the least popular among the Youth Facilitators and LDC participants. Youth Facilitators from both project locations related their reservations with this episode. Most felt that the portrayal of the relationship between the mother and the daughter was unrealistic and insincere. There was a consensus among the Facilitators that the story line and the Facilitator Guide were very one-

36 This quote was not collected by the consultant as part of the research undertaken for this evaluation. It was provided by SFCG after being recorded by one of the Youth Facilitators during an LDC.
37 This quote was not collected by the consultant as part of the research undertaken for this evaluation. It was provided by SFCG after being recorded by one of the Youth Facilitators during an LDC.
sided and failed to treat the daughter as equal. Some reported that the episode delivered mixed messages: that youth have rights, yet that they should still abide and honour their parents. The take home message for one Facilitator was to "be the person that your mother wants you to be". This episode was even acknowledged by SFCG program staff to have been the weakest link. Several FGD and KII participants have called for this episode to be revised or cut. While this episode did not appear to resonate well with youth, some Facilitators have noted that it may have been better received among at least some of the parents and guardians who had joined the LDCs. One Youth Facilitator from North Okkalapa noted the following from one parent who had attended one of the LDCs:

“I learned that open communication pays off significantly in building trust and good relationships between parents and children.”

Meanwhile, another parent from Lashio uttered the following:

“I used to beat my children when they did not do as I instructed, I will try not to do so in the future.”

However, none of the parents and guardians who participated in the FGDs in either project location had listened to this episode, so their views on and response to the content remain unknown.

Youth and the benefit of reading was also flagged by many Youth Facilitators and LDC participants in both locations alike as being somewhat “boring” and “cliché”. While recognising the importance of reading and observing that many youth do not read, numerous respondents have suggested that this episode, should it be covered again in the future, also be amended. Other episodes identified as less relevant and/or interesting included youth and online charity work (especially in Lashio), and youth and rehabilitation (noted for North Okkalapa).

Community interest in the topics presented can be seen in the topics that listeners chose to discuss with their peers. A little over half of the respondents (55.4%) to the listenership survey who had listened to at least one of the episodes reported that they had talked to others about the topics discussed. However, 77.8 percent of those who did engage in dialogue concede that they did so rarely, although when they did, it was almost always (92.8%) with friends. The more popular topics for discussion included: youth and sport, youth and peace, youth and drugs, and youth and job opportunities (in that order). It must be remembered though that most respondents reporting having only listened to a small number of episodes, and that they only discussed the topics that they had listened to.

---

38 This quote was not collected by the consultant as part of the research undertaken for this evaluation. It was provided by SFCG after being recorded by one of the Youth Facilitators during an LDC.
39 This quote was not collected by the consultant as part of the research undertaken for this evaluation. It was provided by SFCG after being recorded by one of the Youth Facilitators during an LDC.
40 Only two parents who had participated in the FGDs in both project locations acknowledged that they had listened to any episodes at all.
41 This does not include discussions which took place at any of the LDC.
Numerous interlocutors also provided suggestions on a range of potential new topics that they would like to see addressed in the future. Religion and an explanation of the main tenants of the four major religions\(^2\) was proposed by a number of interviewees in order to reduce misunderstandings between the different religions and their followers. Most acknowledged the heightened sensitivity around all discussions relating to religion in Myanmar and advised considerable caution should this topic be discussed in future episodes so as not to further enflame existing tensions. Given the wise and considerable care taken by SFCG and MRTV thus far to avoid any overt discussion about religious and ethnic divisions, it is not expected that the topic of religion will appear highly on anyone’s agenda. Meanwhile, politics, the political system, and how it works in Myanmar was also put forth as a potential new topic by two different interviewees – one in Lashio, and one in Yangon. It was argued that politics is often seen as a topic for adults in which youth should not become involved. Although this topic, like religion, can also be very sensitive in Myanmar and attempts to discuss it may be met with some resistance from the government and opposition parties. Equality in the classroom and bullying are two other topics which have been proposed for future episodes. Bullying may well be a very good choice as it has a direct impact on peace, and the acceptance of diversity. Cyber-bullying in particular has become an issue in Myanmar with easier internet access and the rise of social media sites like Facebook.\(^3\) A recent survey by Telenor Myanmar found that as many as 23 percent of children and youth believe that cyber-bullying is a serious issue in Myanmar.\(^4\)

---

\(^2\) Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, and Hinduism.


5.6 Fostering Dialogues among Divided Communities

One of the intended outcomes of the project was to foster dialogues among divided communities in order to promote inter-ethnic and inter-religious diversity. The vast majority of respondents (90.8%) from the listenership survey stated that the radio program inspired them to talk to people from other religious or cultural backgrounds. Excluding the Hlaingthayar control site, in the two project locations where project activities were implemented, this figure climbs to 91.7 percent (n=55). The percentage of listeners who reported that they had been inspired to open communication channels with people from other religions and/or ethnicities was slightly higher in North Okkalapa (94.4%) than in Lashio (87.5%). There was no obvious variation between the different ages, genders, religions, or ethnic groups.

Similarly, a number of Youth Facilitators and Listening and LDC participants in both Lashio and North Okkalapa have also reported that the project has encouraged them to engage in dialogues with people from other religions, ethnicities and cultures. In the words of one Youth Facilitator from North Okkalapa:

“I never used to talk to people from other religious backgrounds, but now I make a conscious effort to do so.”

A Yangon-based Youth Facilitator also intoned:

“The way that I have conversations with other people has changed. I used to be very adversarial and competitive. It is like I have stopped having arguments and am now having discussions.”

Another way to ascertain if the project was successful in fostering dialogues across dividing lines in society was to determine if listeners had made any new friends with people from other religions or ethnic groups on account of the radio program. Across all three survey locations, 77.0 percent of listeners (n=50) maintain that they have made new friends with people from other religions and/or ethnicities since first hearing the radio talk show. A total of 15 respondents (eight from North Okkalapa and seven from Lashio) report that they have made more than ten new friends from other ethnic or religious backgrounds since the radio program was first broadcast in January 2017.

**Figure 12:** Percentage of listeners from each survey location who report that the radio program has inspired them to talk to people from other religions and/or cultures.
While the number of new friendships reported by respondents cannot be solely attributed to the radio program, a number of FGD participants have claimed that their new friendships across dividing lines are directly attributable to their involvement in the project. In North Okkalapa, at least two LDC participants maintain that they have developed new friendships with people from other cultural backgrounds, while one Youth Facilitator, also from North Okkalapa, acknowledges that he has made a new friend with an individual who identifies as LGBT. Similarly, an LDC participant from North Okkalapa declared that:

“I did not accept LGBT people before but now I find it easy to acknowledge them.” 45

---

45 This quote was not collected by the consultant as part of the research undertaken for this evaluation. It was provided by SFCG after being recorded by one of the Youth Facilitators during an LDC.
5.7 Understanding of the Importance of Collaboration

A second objective of the project was to increase public awareness and understanding of the importance of collaboration and respect across various divides. Respondents to the listenership survey were asked if the radio program has influenced the way that they view people from other cultures and/or religions. Across all three survey locations, 78.5 percent (n=51) of listeners indicated that it had. Excluding the Hlaingthayar control site, a total of 81.7 percent of listeners (n=49) claim that the project has influenced their views of people from other religious or cultural groups. In Lashio, almost all listeners (91.7%) claimed that their views have been altered, while in North Okkalapa, three-quarters (75.0%) have maintained the same.

![Figure 14: Percentage of listeners from each survey location who report that the radio program has influenced the way that they view people from other religions and/or cultures.](image)

One Lashio-based LDC participant said:

“I have come to know that unity is important in peacebuilding. I used to think that our ethnicity was our first priority.”

The listenership survey presented respondents with a number of statements and asked them to indicate if they agreed or disagreed with these statements in the hope that this would shed some light on the effect that the project may have had on the intended outcomes. When asked if their exposure to the radio program had helped them develop a greater understanding of the divisions in Myanmar society, only 7.7 percent (n=5) of listeners stated that it had. However, this does not necessarily mean that there is limited understanding of social divisions among the survey population. This answer must be analysed in conjunction with the low listener retention rates (described above). It cannot be expected that a single or even a small number of exposures to the radio program will result in a significant change in attitudes in those listeners. It is quite possible that the episode/s listened to by these respondents did not explicitly discuss the divisions within Myanmar society and thus made little contribution to their understanding. For example, those who only tuned in to the youth and job opportunities episode are unlikely to have gleaned too much new information in this regard.

---

46 This quote was not collected by the consultant as part of the research undertaken for this evaluation. It was provided by SFCG after being recorded by one of the Youth Facilitators during an LDC.
Similarly, when asked if they agreed with the statement: "We can make a difference if we work together, despite our individual differences", only 6.2 percent of listeners (n=4) indicated their agreement. This could indicate that numerous negative stereotypes still endure among the survey population, reducing the willingness of respondents to work across the various divisions within society. Myanmar in general, and the target locations in particular, are very diverse and divided communities. Although, it is also possible that this reflects a somewhat pessimistic view that ordinary people, and youth especially, are unable to effect change in their communities. For a country with a legacy of oppressive military rule and a culture which traditionally discourages youth to speak out or oppose those in authority, this is not beyond the realm of possibility. Meanwhile, 16 listeners (24.6%) indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement – possibly reflecting discomfort and an unwillingness to express an opinion.

Finally, when respondents were asked if the radio program had taught them that collaboration and respect across dividing lines is essential for peace, 10.8 percent (n=7) of listeners indicated that it had. Again, this should not necessarily be understood to suggest that the project has failed to achieve its objectives. As argued above, respondents may not have actually listened to any of the episodes which might have shed any light on this for them. Moreover, while a negative response may indicate that they did not learn anything new, it says nothing about any opinions or understanding that they already possessed.

In addition to the questions posed in the listenership survey, FGD participants were also asked a variety of questions to this effect. The Youth Facilitators and LDC participants from North Okkalapa and Lashio provided a range of examples which implied their enhanced understanding of the importance of collaboration, although these are perhaps best summed up in the words of one young female LDC participant from Lashio:

"I used to have biases against other ethnicities. This project taught me to regard people for their humanity, rather than by their ethnicity or religion".

One LDC participant from Lashio who was not involved in the FGD was also reported to have said that:

“If we listen to and understand each other’s challenges and difficulties, there will be no conflict among the various religious groups and we could achieve unity in the community.”

It is encouraging to remark that a number of Youth Facilitators and LDC participants have already started to demonstrate their increased understanding of the importance of collaboration across various social, ethnic, or religious divides. With greater exposure, one might be able to expect to observe similar changes in listeners as well.

---

47 This quote was not collected by the consultant as part of the research undertaken for this evaluation. It was provided by SFCG and was recorded by one of the Youth Facilitators during an LDC.
5.8 Acceptance of Diversity as a Social Norm

The overall goal (or impact) of this initiative has been to promote the acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar, reducing enabling environments for inter-communal violence and public unrest. It is widely recognised that a project’s impact can take a long time to accomplish, particularly when the goal is attitudinal or behavioural change. It is not unusual for this to take years to achieve. Considering that the radio program was broadcast only five months prior to this assessment taking place (in January 2017) and that the LDCs were concluded only one month before this evaluation began, it is acknowledged that it may still be too early to accurately assess project impact. It is unreasonable to expect to see too much in the way of impact just yet. That said, there are a number of intermediate or initial outcomes which we can state at this early stage.

Survey respondents were asked to react to the statement: “I believe that a diverse society is a weak society”. Two-thirds of listeners (64.6%) indicated that they disagreed with this statement, suggesting that they believed the converse: that a diverse society is in fact a strong society. The listeners were also asked if they believed that the radio program had contributed to harmony in their communities. In this instance, 12.3 percent (n=8) of listeners maintained that it had. As remarked above, it would be difficult to see what impact the radio program could have on communal harmony after only a single or a small number of exposures. Further, it should be expected that any discernable impact on communal harmony would take considerably longer than a couple of months to achieve.

Having been exposed to more episodes and/or more detailed discussion of the topics that were covered, participants from the LDCs have demonstrated a much higher awareness and acceptance of diversity as a social norm. Though it is still too early to determine if there have been any significant or lasting changes among the participants, a number of their statements from the FGDs suggest that they are well on their way:

"Diversity is normal. It is the acceptance of that diversity which is the issue that we must address."

"Diversity can present different perspectives. This can lead to discussion; and discussion can lead to the best solution for the greatest number of people."

"Diversity is strength. If everything and everyone is the same, there will be no development and no improvement. Change grows out of difference and the collaboration and compromise needed to overcome those differences."

Meanwhile, one Youth Facilitator from Lashio shared a story from one of his LDCs on youth and LGBT which demonstrates that attitudinal change and acceptance can happen within a very brief timeframe. At the LDC in question, two brothers and their mother were in attendance. The elder brother is transgender female. This was no surprise to either the family or the local community who were all aware of the young man’s sexual orientation. It became very apparent in the course of the LDC that his brother and mother did not accept him on account of his sexuality. It is not known how well the community accepted this, although given the general treatment of SOGI minorities / LGBT persons in Myanmar, it is safe to assume that his acceptance was not particularly widespread or well received. It was reported that discussions between the brothers became quite heated with the younger of the two openly accusing his elder brother of bringing shame upon the family because of his sexuality, the way he behaved, the way he dressed, and the way that he lived. According to the Youth Facilitator present (himself openly identifying as LGBT), both the brother and the mother came to an understanding and acceptance by the end of the end of the discussion. The mother was said
to have publicly admitted that she was wrong about her son and that she had come to a new understanding of him.48

5.9 Sustainability and Local Ownership

FGD and KII participants were asked various questions to ascertain if any mechanisms, processes or strategies had been developed to sustain the project initiatives beyond the life of the project. Youth Facilitators, CSO representatives, and activists were asked if they had used the radio episodes, PSAs, Facilitator Guide, or any other materials produced under the project in their regular day-to-day work.

All of the Youth Facilitators from both project areas reported that they had not yet used the Facilitator Guide or any of the other materials produced under this project in their regular work. This is not entirely surprising as the LDCs were only held one month prior. Several of them, however, did acknowledge that the facilitation skills that they learned have been very useful; with some claiming to use these new skills on a daily basis. These new skills have served the Lashio-based Youth Facilitators particularly well. During May 2017, a number of the Youth Facilitators were asked to participate in and facilitate various events held in Lashio, including the CSO Forum on 7-9 May,49 as well as the Agriculture Development Strategy on 22 May – attended by various NGOs and government representatives. A few of the Lashio-based Youth Facilitators working on LGBT issues have declared that they are hoping to adapt some of the content from the Facilitator Guide for use in their own work.

Meanwhile, the Millennium Centre in Lashio holds a weekly discussion club every Monday for its members. One interviewee affiliated with the Centre stated that they intended to hold their own LDC on youth and the benefit of reading the following week. No further contact has been had with the Millennium Centre and it is not known if they have since hosted the LDC, or what the outcomes of it were. Additional LDCs were also said to be planned for the future, although at the time, no further LDCs had been scheduled. Similarly, Youth29 in North Okkalapa has also announced plans to conduct their own LDCs, although it is not yet known when these will be conducted, or on which topic.

SFCG program staff have stated that the relationship with MRTV and other media professionals is now stronger than it ever has been in the past, that this was attributable to the project, and that future collaboration should be much less complicated.

MRTV radio has announced plans to rebroadcast all 12 radio episodes in August – September 2017. MRTV proposes to rerun the program at the same times and on the same days as the original broadcast. The program will be advertised approximately one week ahead of airing, although they will not use the PSA or the promotional clips to do so on television.

Meanwhile, on their own initiative, the MRTV television department produced a 15-minute TV special on the project. At the time of writing this TV special had not yet been broadcast, but it was expected to be aired at some point in the not too distant future. This is a very encouraging development as it may indicate an eagerness to move on to the next phase of the project which is slated as an eight episode television series. Depending on the content of the TV special (not seen by the consultant), this could be used to advertise and generate interest in

48 What is not known about this case, however, is what happened to the son once the family returned home. It remains unclear if the mother and brother recanted their public statements or resumed their rejection of the elder son behind closed doors. It is clearly to be hoped that this was not the case and that the acknowledgements given by his family were sincere.

49 Topics covered at the CSO Forum were said to have included politics, the economy, security, and natural resources, among others.
future projects as well as to promote the rerun of the radio series.

The Deputy Director of MRTV has indicated that she would be very interested in scaling up and implementing a second phase of the project in conjunction with SFCG. If SFCG is unable to continue with a second phase, MRTV has signalled that they would be prepared to proceed on their own. While MRTV is confident that they can implement the project on their own, they believe that it will “be more effective with Search for Common Ground’s involvement”. There is an appetite for future projects to also address peacebuilding issues “because peace is the primary concern of the government”. Although it was suggested that issues such as child abuse and health might also be broached in future versions.
6. BEST PRACTICE AND LESSONS LEARNED

6.1 Project Design and Implementation

Most project participants who participated in the FGDs and KIIs reported overall satisfaction with the project, its design and its implementation. Youth Facilitators and others who had attended the initial Youth Consultative Workshops in August and September 2016 have stated that the format was conducive to open discussion and learning and that there were ample opportunities to share and have their perspectives heard. As noted by one Yangon-based participant noted:

“All participants were equally able to share their perspectives and be heard.”

A number of participants, however, have maintained that insufficient time was given to the workshops. According to those present, hosting the workshop over three days made it feel “very rushed and intense”. Numerous workshop participants suggested that it would have been better conducted over five days.

The Community Facilitation Training provided to the Youth Facilitators in March 2017 ahead of the LDCs were also well received by the majority of those in attendance. While they acknowledged the usefulness of the facilitation training that they received, a number of Youth Facilitators have claimed that there was a disconnect between what was covered in the training and what was required of them during the LDCs. Facilitators from both project areas remarked that while they learned about facilitation, in practice they were required hold dialogues with community participants, and that the learning received had not effectively prepared them for this. Training in the future may need revision to better prepare Facilitators to lead the LDCs. Meanwhile, numerous Youth Facilitators have maintained that there was not enough time allowed for the Facilitation Trainings, and that these also would have benefitted if additional time had been allocated. Some of the media representatives involved at different stages throughout the project have stated that they also were afforded insufficient time in which to complete the tasks that they had been assigned.

Feedback from the media professionals involved in the project was also largely positive. The media trainings provided to MRTV representatives and other participants were reportedly well liked and appreciated. According to one MRTV representative:

“The trainings were very helpful and effective. I learned the difference between conflict and violence.”

The audio editing skills were noted to be particularly well received, as was instruction in new techniques for recording natural sounds and additional training in radio program formatting. While those who participated in the FGD acknowledged that they were not personally using these new skills regularly, they did note that a number of their colleagues were.

Early on in the project a decision was made to postpone the production of the PSA in favour of prioritising the promotional clips. While this was probably the correct decision, one MCA representative stated that the PSA could have been more effective had it been released sooner. The PSA was launched on 3 April 2017, just as before the final radio program episode was aired on 8 April 2017. Considering that the PSA was a central component of the publicity and multimedia campaign, it may have been more effective at promoting the project if it was launched and aired at the same time as the episodes.
6.2 Suggestions to Improve Listenership and Retention

While the project was largely viewed positively among the KII and FGD participants, one of the most frequently cited critiques that they made of the project was the decision to utilise radio as the primary communications medium. Almost all FGD and KII participants asserted that few young people in Myanmar listen to the radio. While radio is a popular and effective tool in certain other countries where SFCG works, it appears to be much less popular in Myanmar. Noting that the Myanmar context is very different to many other countries where SFCG operates, one interviewee suggested that radio is no longer as popular as it once was. Meanwhile, one Youth Facilitator from Lashio submitted that people most frequently listen to the radio in her community only when the power goes out (with people tuning in on portable battery-powered radios). Another interviewee suggested that:

“[Youth] were the right target group, but it was shared on a platform which only older people listen to.”

The FGD and KII participants asserted that not only do few youth listen to the radio on a regular basis, but those who do, tend not to listen to MRTV. While the Deputy Director of MRTV claims that 58.2 percent of the population (approximately 31.4 million people)\(^{50}\) listens to MRTV radio\(^{51}\) comments from almost all interlocutors suggest the opposite. Most FGD and KII participants indicated that Cherry FM and Mandalay FM are the preferred radio stations for youth in the project locations. A number of young FGD participants suggested that if the project is to continue in the future, that SFCG should consider broadcasting the program “on a different channel which youth listen to”.

A number of Youth Facilitators and LDC participants also suggested that the episodes might be too long to hold the audience’s attention for the full 20 minutes. This may be evidenced by the high number of LDC participants who were said to have left before the end (particularly in Lashio). It was proposed that the episodes should be shortened to ten minutes each, believing that this was sufficient time to deliver the message, without exceeding the audience’s attention span and risk them tuning out. Several FGD participants were in favour of condensing messages into sound bites to convey the greatest meaning in the fewest possible words. This was noted to be especially important when delivering messages via Facebook which favours brevity (see below for suggestions on how to optimise the Facebook platform).

Meanwhile, it was also commonly suggested that SFCG should use video in place of radio as the primary communications medium. Many FGD and KII participants noted that most of today’s youth need visual stimulation, with some adding that it can be difficult to engage and inspire youth without any visual stimulation. These findings are consistent with the baseline listenership and viewership study, which noted that, “young people prefer television to radio”\(^{52}\).

It was further noted by one interviewee that it will be much easier to deliver the message in a more artistic and engaging way through the medium of video, although he did observe that while it can be much more engaging, video is much more expensive to produce than radio. According to SFCG program staff, the cost of television commercial airtime alone can be prohibitive at around 120,000 Kyat (US$90) per second. At this rate, the airtime for a five minute clip could cost as much as $25,000. While the Let's Think, Let's Change radio program was broadcast by MRTV at no additional cost to SFCG, it is not yet clear if a similar arrangement can be negotiated with the television branch of MRTV, although this obviously would be preferable.

\(^{50}\) According to the 2014 Myanmar Population and Housing Census, the current population of Myanmar is approximately 53.9 million people.

\(^{51}\) Meanwhile, on its website, the Ministry of Information maintains that MRTV has a nationwide reach of 75.4 percent. http://www.moi.gov.mm/eng/.

In the same way that it has been reported that few youth listen to MRTV radio, it has also been noted by various FGD and KII participants that few youth watch MRTV television. Most young people prefer to watch Channel-7, MRTV-4 or Entertainment-TV. It should be noted that the first two of these stations are government-controlled and it may be possible for SFCG to enter into an arrangement with them through the MOI similar to that reached with MRTV. Both of these stations are also free to air, which was a noted preference among viewers in the baseline study. However, SFCG program staff report earlier conversations in which MRTV-4 representatives made it clear that they were only interested in broadcasting entertainment and that they had no appetite for any political topics. That said, it might be possible to revisit this conversation now that phase one of the project has been completed without incident.

The consultant is aware that SFCG is already in discussions regarding a second phase to the project which could involve producing and broadcasting eight episodes via television. Based on the insight gleaned from this research, this should be a very welcome move. However, as noted by one Yangon-based Youth Facilitator, care must be taken to ensure that any future television broadcasts do not clash with the popular Korean films and soap operas which have a very strong following in Myanmar. Further, while 20 minutes was roundly dismissed as being too long for the radio broadcast, most respondents believe that 20 minutes will be acceptable for a video clip. That said, it may be advisable to shorten the length of the clip so as not to risk losing the interest of the audience as well as for budgetary considerations.

Recognising that few young people in Myanmar regularly listen to the radio, and those who do tend not to listen to MRTV, wider promotion and advertising of the program may be needed. If most youth do not tune in to MRTV, they will not know that the program is on. One Youth Facilitator from North Okkalapa suggested placing advertisements in various journals and newspapers to increase awareness and enhance the reach of the program. Other suggestions might include media outreach: to attempt to solicit more news articles and feature stories about the program in local print and broadcast media.

Another Yangon-based Youth Facilitator suggested approaching the newly-formed Yangon Bus Service (YBS) to negotiate broadcasting the episodes on public buses. The episodes could be installed on USB devices and broadcast via the buses’ sound systems (at least on some of the newer buses which have them). This same strategy could also be employed in cooperation with Myanmar Railways on the Yangon Circular Railway. According to a Myanmar Railways Divisional Traffic Manager, up to 95,000 commuters now use the Circular line daily. Broadcasting the episodes on one or both of Yangon’s main public transport networks has the potential to greatly increase the reach of the program in Greater Yangon.

Facebook has become massively popular in Myanmar in recent years – particularly among its youth. In May 2016, there were a reported 9.7 million Facebook users in Myanmar. Of this number, approximately 6 million were aged 19-34 years. Given its immense popularity among Myanmar’s youth, Facebook should be fully embraced to promote the project. As noted by one FGD participant, “Young people always want to use the latest things. We need to embrace technology to inspire youth.” In the first six months since it was launched in December 2016, the Let’s Think, Let’s Change Facebook page has almost 17,000 followers, and the PSA and promotional videos have collectively reached almost 2.8 million people with just under 500,000 views. Despite this success, a number of FGD and KII participants

---

53 Ibid, page 5.
56 Search for Common Ground (2017). “Publicity and Social Media Campaign”, in Quarterly Progress Report
suggested that the Facebook page should be updated more regularly so that it is more visible in subscriber’s feeds. The Facebook page could be used as a platform to share additional information about the topics covered in the episodes. The page could be optimised with regular posts to share stories, statistics, or relevant news articles. The focus, however, should be on keeping these messages succinct. Infographics and podcasts are two effective ways to quickly disseminate information via visual or audio means rather than through lengthy pieces of text which the audience may not read. However, distilling messages into easily digestible sound bites is not without risk. While this may help to capture a wider audience, if done incorrectly, it could risk oversimplifying and losing the message. If future projects utilise video, the episodes can be streamed via Facebook. One interviewee suggested the possibility of even hosting live-streaming on the Facebook page.

6.3 Suggestions to Enhance Reach

With respect to the geographic scope of the project, all FGD and KII participants stated that the target areas were appropriate, albeit limited. Many interlocutors suggested that future activities should focus on more areas – not only in other additional parts of the country, but also in outlying villages around the current two project sites. In the words of one Lashio-based Youth Facilitator:

“It would be better to conduct the Listening and Dialogue Circles out in the villages rather than just inside Lashio. The outlying villages receive very few projects, which has caused them to feel excluded. Holding Listening and Dialogue Circles in their villages will help to include and empower them.”

The LDCs exceeded expectation. Originally intended to reach 900 individuals across the two project locations, the dialogues were attended by 994 participants across the two sites. Despite, or perhaps because of this success, Youth Facilitators and LDC participants have alike called for more LDCs and more people in each LDC. A number of the Lashio-based Youth Facilitators have reported that there have been requests for additional LDCs in their communities – particularly on the topic of domestic violence (see below for further discussion of this). A number of Youth Facilitators have stated that the LDCs are central to the success of the project:

“They [the LDCs] are vital to understanding and change. Community understanding is much greater with the Dialogues than by listening to the radio program alone.”

FGD participants also identified a number of issues with the LDCs, with particular reference to the some of the venues where they were held. A number of FGD participants have claimed that some of the LDCs which were hosted in public venues were too noisy and/or too crowded, making it difficult to hear the broadcast and the discussion, while perhaps also making it more difficult for some participants to express their opinions for fear of doing so in public. This was observed in both project locations. Meanwhile, some other LDCs were said to have been held in churches and monasteries. While peoples of all faiths were welcomed at these LDCs, there was a noted discrepancy in the attendance of other religions. For instance, at one LDC conducted at a Christian church in Lashio, Christians were by far the most numerous in attendance. In order to ensure that all peoples are feel free and comfortable to attend, it is recommended not to hold any future LDCs at places of worship. However, as noted in the Rapid Conflict Assessment conducted under this project, there are limited non-secular spaces.
where people can gather in both project locations. Viable alternatives to religious sites might include NGO/CSO offices, in hotels, or in schools and universities. Although it should not be expected that suitable non-secular venues will be available in all locations.

A number of interviewees from both target locations suggested that future projects would be better served if they were to engage with high schools, universities, and training colleges. This would require cooperation with the Ministry of Education (MOE). A representative of the Change Youth Centre and Library in Lashio has claimed experience working with various educational institutions in Lashio and has offered to assist SF CG to establish those connections. While some Yangon-based interlocutors also made this suggestion, they did not make the same offer to facilitate. By reaching out to and engaging with educational institutions, there is significant potential to increase the reach of the project among the youth who study at those institutions, as well as providing non-secular spaces in which to host LDCs.

It was also roundly observed by FGD and KII participants that future projects should endeavour to target all age groups – not only youth. As remarked by one of the media professionals involved in the production of the program:

“We should focus on the older generation as well; not just the young people. The older generation have more life experience and are also more frequently the cause of some of the issues discussed in the episodes.”

It was further suggested that there should be more direct interaction and engagement of the local communities where project activities are implemented. Doing so will likely increase community participation and involvement. One Youth Facilitator in Lashio has proposed seeking community perspectives on some of the topics, rather than only sharing the views of the celebrities. He believes that this will make the project more interesting, accessible, and relevant for local communities. Other FGD participants recommended to do this in conjunction with more outreach work and follow-up dialogues with local communities; using this as an opportunity to gather community feedback, and to share some of the personal experiences and case studies to demonstrate how change can and does occur. Some of this feedback could be broadcast or shared by live-streaming through Facebook (see discussion of this above).

It was widely acknowledged that involving celebrities in the project capitalized on their star power and made it more interesting to tune in. “Different people have different favourites, and they went to hear what their favourite celebrities have to say”, said one FGD participant. “Some people believe everything that some celebrities say”, added another. Although it was also acknowledged that it was better to engage experts or people who could bring real life experience to the discussions rather than people just because they were famous. It was remarked by one respondent that there are a number of celebrities now engaged in various projects aimed at peacebuilding, although there is little coordination between them. The project could be much stronger if these individual celebrities could be brought together to cooperate under the one banner.

58 Including: Lashio University, Lashio Technical University, Lashio Computer University, and Lashio Teacher Training College
7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has found that at 12.8 percent, listenership of the *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* radio talk show among the survey population was high.

However, there does appear to have been some problems in retaining listeners. Almost two-thirds (58.2%) of listeners tuned out after only one or two episodes, and most (89.2%) reported having listened to fewer than half. It is not known why listeners did not keep tuning in, but it has been posited that listeners may have disliked the format or that 20 minutes may have been too long to effectively hold the audience’s attention. The low listener retention rate has had a negative impact on project effectiveness. It cannot be expected that a single or even a small number of exposures to the radio talk show will result in a significant change in attitudes and/or behaviours in those listeners. It is believed that higher listener retention rates will produce stronger results if attained in the future.

Meanwhile, the project was universally acknowledged as having been delivered at an appropriate time and in appropriate target locations. The topics covered were generally acknowledged as being relevant to the target audience, although some topics were more popular than others. Youth and sport, youth and peace, youth and drugs, youth and LGBT, youth and domestic violence, and youth and unity were reported as the most popular topics among LDC participants.

Acknowledging that it may still be too early to accurately assess achievement of the project’s goal and/or objectives, preliminary data is encouraging. The overwhelming majority (90.8%) of listeners surveyed have asserted that the project has inspired them to engage people from other religious and/or cultural backgrounds in dialogue, suggesting that positive progress has already been made on the first project objective of fostering dialogues among divided communities in order to promote inter-ethnic and inter-religious diversity. Similarly, over three-quarters (78.5%) of listeners have reported that the project has changed the way that they regard people from other religions and/or cultures. Meanwhile, multiple Youth Facilitators more directly involved in the project have similarly indicated a variety of ways that the project has increased their awareness and understanding of the importance of collaboration and respect across various divides.

7.1 Recommendations

- Recognising that the current project was the first of its kind and that it was highly ambitious, future or follow-up projects should seek to achieve even greater reach. **Additional project areas should be included, with a greater geographic coverage in each of those areas.** Project activities should be implemented in outlying or satellite communities in addition to some of the more central locations targeted by the current project.

- The LDCs were much more effective at promoting understanding and acceptance of the various issues covered than listening to the radio episodes in isolation. **Future projects should endeavour to hold multiple rounds of LDCs.** Facilitators can seek participants’ feedback to ascertain whether subsequent LDCs should address different issues, or if there is sufficient appetite, to have a second round of discussions on particularly popular topics.
Future projects should target more age groups. While youth should remain a central focus of the project, thought should be given to designing a campaign which will better appeal to a wider demographic. One possible way to do this would be to engage families as a single unit. This approach might address the generation gap. Recognising that one design might not be suitable for all age groups, it may be necessary to design activities or project components which specifically target other age groups.

To ensure equitable representation of different religious faiths, future LDCs should be hosted in secular, neutral locations to encourage diverse participation. Although, it is recognised that this may make it difficult to hold LDCs in some communities.

Future projects should utilise video as the preferred media format in place of radio. This was also a recommendation from the baseline survey. Radio is not the media format of choice for Myanmar’s youth. Relatively few young people in Myanmar listen to the radio, while most prefer to watch television or gain news and information through social media.

If future youth-oriented projects transition to the use of video, consider broadcasting the episodes on a different network which is more popular with this demographic group. According to the majority of FGD and KII participants, only a small percentage of youth watch MRTV. Alternative networks might include MRTV-4 or Channel-7, both of which were identified as among the preferred channels for youth, both are government-controlled by the Ministry of Information, and both are free to air.

Korean movies and costume dramas are highly popular among Myanmar TV viewers. SFCG should be strategic in selecting an appropriate time slot to broadcast the TV Program to ensure that it does not clash with the broadcast of the Korean shows. If possible, it is recommended to secure the time slot immediately before the Korean shows.

However, should future projects continue to rely on radio, consideration should be given to broadcasting via a different radio station. Mandalay FM and Cherry FM have both been identified as the preferred radio stations among Myanmar’s youth.

Under the current project, each radio episode was 20 minutes long. Youth Facilitators and LDC participants both maintain that this was too long to hold the audience’s attention. Future radio episodes should be shortened to ten minutes in length.

The listener retention rate for the current project was low. Most listeners tuned-out after listening to only one or two episodes. Project impact has been limited as a result. Future projects must achieve a better listener retention rate. It cannot be expected that only a single or a small number of exposures to the episodes will result in any lasting or significant change.

Professional scriptwriters should be engaged to draft creative storylines, develop interesting and relatable characters, and share the message through sincere and believable dialogue. Where appropriate, humour and personal stories should also be incorporated.
• Some episodes were more popular than others. **Future projects should continue to develop programming around the issues that were found to be more popular and relevant, while considering revising some of the less popular or less relevant topics to further enhance audience retention.** Potential topics for revision might include: youth, stereotypes and equality, youth and rehabilitation, youth and the benefit of reading, and youth and online charity work. Meanwhile, additional topics to consider addressing in future episodes might include discussions around disability or cyber-bullying.

• Including celebrities in the current project helped to make the episodes more interesting and appealing to a greater number of people than it likely would have without them. **It is recommended that a range of celebrities should be engaged in future projects as well.** Celebrities should be carefully matched with their areas of interest and expertise. Experts with experience in the relevant topics should also be engaged. The best-case scenario would be to build up a small team of celebrities and experts to appear not only in the episodes, but also at public events and talks, and possibly even during some community outreach activities (see below).

• **Another way of increasing community interest in the program is to conduct a range of community outreach activities.** This will not only increase the profile of the project among local communities, but also their level of engagement. Community outreach activities might include seeking feedback or opinions from community members. These can be recorded, and where appropriate, broadcast. These opinions can be incorporated into the episodes themselves or broadcast separately online. Getting some of the celebrities involved in this will further increase community interest and engagement. Other activities might include competitions. Community members might be asked to design a new logo or graphic for the project, or prizes could be given to the best feedback provided.

• **Promote the project even more widely.** Invest in creative marketing and publicity campaigns that raise awareness of the project including placing advertisements in journals, magazines and newspapers. Similarly, billboards, posters, and flyers can also be used to raise the public profile. Various businesses and shops could be approached to ask if they wouldn’t mind sticking up a poster or two.

• Another way of raising the profile of the project would be through high schools, universities, and training schools. **It is suggested to engage with various institutions, possibly through the Ministry of Education, to reach out to the youth there.** It may be possible to negotiate to host a number of LDCs or to conduct public talks and panel discussions at educational institutions. These would also be good venues for celebrities to get involved in outreach activities.

• **Approach the Yangon Bus Service (YBS) and/or Myanmar Railways to discuss the possibility of broadcasting the program on Yangon’s public transport network.**

• Facebook has become exceedingly popular in Myanmar, and especially among its youth. Future projects should seek to capitalise on this popularity. **The Facebook page should be updated more regularly with a wider range of content and greater efforts to promote the page should be made.** The Facebook page can be used as a platform to share additional information about the various topics. This can be done through infographics and podcasts, as well as through text. Recorded
interviews from the community outreach activities can be uploaded or possibly even live-streamed – as could any public events or talks that are conducted. Moderated online discussions could also be hosted on Facebook immediately following the broadcasts – possibly with some of the experts and/or celebrities from those episodes participating. These discussions could be promoted through announcements in the broadcasts themselves. Consider also setting up a website to host all of this content – either as a standalone dedicated website, or as a page within the existing SFCG website.

- The Mobile App, developed under the current project, was unfortunately only released at the end of the project as all activities were winding up. **Future projects should seek to include the App in project activities as value added.**

- Only a brief period of time had elapsed between project implementation and the current assessment. As a result, the impact observed to date has been limited. **Future projects should allow for more time to pass between the implementation of project activities and assessment to evaluate the impact of those activities.**
APPENDIX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Reflective Review and Listenership Survey of ‘Let’s Think, Let’s Change: Promoting cultural diversity through popular culture’

Search for Common Ground (SFCG), Myanmar is seeking to hire a consultant to carry out an End Line Reflective Review of the project “Let’s Think, Let’s Change: Promoting Cultural Diversity through Popular Culture,” and Listenership Survey of its media components. This project is funded by Peace Support Fund (PSF), Myanmar. For this consultancy, SFCG Myanmar seeks to procure the services of a consultant to conduct to design, plan and conduct an assignment. This will include designing, planning and conducting a listentership survey, analysing the final results through SPSS and writing a listentership survey report. The assignment also includes conducting interviews of the project participants and other relevant stakeholders to generate overall results of the project based on its overall goal, objectives and desired results and logframe indicators and integrate the findings from the qualitative interviews as well as the listentership survey data into one single reflective report. The joint objective of the assignment is to generate results that demonstrate success against set against the objectives, and highlights the project’s contribution in promoting diversity as a social norm in Myanmar and reducing enabling environments for inter-communal violence and unrest.

1. Introduction

Established in 1982, Search for Common Ground (SFCG) (www.sfcg.org) is an international peacebuilding organisation that currently works in 35 countries globally. SFCG’s vision is to end violent conflict through non-adversarial collaborative approaches. SFCG is working in Myanmar since April 2014. It is partnering with Myanmar Radio and Television (MRTV), Myanmar’s state owned and most widely accessible television and radio stations to implement a 12-month project aimed at reducing ethnic, political, and religious divides that contribute to violence in Myanmar. This initiative combines community-based work led by youth leaders with a multi-media campaign, television public service announcements (PSA), and a radio talk show in collaboration with MRTV. The talk show engages national celebrities, youth leaders and local communities, highlighting themes and stories that explore the impact of negative stereotyping and encourage listeners to question and challenge rumours and negative biases that prevail in society by engaging the public with stories of inspiration drawn from local communities.

The overall goal of this initiative is “to promote the acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar, reducing enabling environments for inter-communal violence and public unrest”. The specific objectives (SO) are:

1. To foster dialogue among divided communities in order to promote inter-ethnic and inter-religious diversity;
2. To increase public awareness and understanding of the importance of collaboration and respect across various divides.

This project is rooted in the following theory of change:

If popular culture constructively challenges existing negative narratives and stereotypes of the ‘other’ that fuel divisions and enables violent conflict, then audience members will gain increased understanding of and respect for different members of their diverse communities. Increased respect will reduce the likelihood of outbreaks of inter-communal violence.
2. The Reflective Project Review and the Listenership Survey

The radio talk show and other media activities represent a core component of this project with the objectives and the expected results in the project document and indicators in the log frame linking to the radio programme. Hence Search Myanmar would like to conduct a listenership survey of the programme in order to measure the contribution made by the programme as indicated in the log frame and other project documents. The survey findings will complement qualitative findings collected though FGDs and KIIs with key community stakeholders in including project participants (MRTV staff and production team, youth facilitators and representatives of audience members in the target areas. This additional information will help to assess the effectiveness and broader impact of the project and will contribute to the continuous improvement and learning within Search’s programs and across the organization. The survey in combination with the final reflection and review will assess the contribution of the project in promoting the acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar, reducing enabling environments for inter-communal violence and public unrest.

2.1 Geographical Scope of the Survey

While the radio talk show was broadcast nationally, the reflective review and listenership survey will focus on collecting data from the project’s two target areas, Lashio – Northern Shan State and North Okkalapa – Yangon, where other intensive outreach activities have all been implemented. The survey will also be rolled out in two additional communities, one urban and one rural to help assess the reach of the media programmes and measure impact of those programmes on the “general” Myanmar population. The qualitative interviews will be conducted in the two project locations only.

2.2 Key Reflection and Listenership Questions

The questions should be framed around:

Guiding listenership survey questions:

1. What are demographic characteristics of the respondents and the listeners?
2. Where did the listeners get the information about media/radio programme?
3. Where did they listen to the media/radio programmes?
4. What is the demographic reach of the radio programmes especially around ethnicity/religion, age, gender and education, among others (reach)? How many of the respondents have heard and listened to the media programmes implemented by the project? What is the variable disaggregated listenership of the media programmes? What is the listenership of the media programmes in the project locations and outside of the project locations?
5. How often the listeners have listened to the media programmes? What is the listenership habit of the survey population?
6. What were the main messages delivered by the radio talk show and other media programmes such as PSAs? How easy was it or the listeners to understand the messages?
7. Which episode appealed to the listeners the most and why? What issue was discussed in that episode?
8. Did the issues and stories discussed in the media programmes resemble incidents in their personal experience or in their own community? How people related these discussion with their personal life and challenges?
9. How relevant were the topics covered in the radio talk show considering the current social and conflict dynamics in their society/community?
10. Did the listeners take any action out of the inspiration of the radio talk show? Did their thinking, attitudes or behaviours towards people from across dividing lines change?
11. Is there any shift in their understanding of the value of collaboration after listening to the radio programme? Has the media programmes have contributed in promoting social harmony, minimizing rumours or promote inter-group relationships in any way? Did they make friends from other religions or ethnicities?
12. Have they talked about the media programmes with others? If yes, with whom, how frequently and on what different issues?
13. How has understanding of the role of youth in reducing ethnic, political and religious divides in Myanmar changed since listening to the radio programme?
14. Would they recommend listening to Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio talk show to others? Why?
Guiding Reflective Review questions:

1. What is their overall impression of the project? (local people and other stakeholders’ opinion on the project and its activities)
2. How relevant is the project considering the overall conflict dynamics in Lashio and North Okkalapa? Were the activities well designed to achieve the desired objectives and results?
3. Did this project do something new that others are not doing? What value added did it bring, if any?
4. How participant friendly was the project, its design and its implementation methodology and process?
5. What did the project achieve, in general?
6. How did the project contribute in building capacity of radio producers in conflict sensitive journalism and other aspects of radio programme production?
7. How successful was the project in fostering dialogue among divided communities? Have there been some specific examples of improved understanding and relationships? Has there been increased tolerance as a result of the project initiatives?
8. How has the project contributed in increasing the public awareness and understanding of the importance of collaboration and respect across various divides in project locations?
9. How has the project contributed in creating a conducive environment for promoting the acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar?
10. Has there any mechanisms, processes or strategies created to sustain the project initiatives post-project? Has there any sense of ownership among MRTV leadership or the radio programme producers or other concerned stakeholders around the goal, objectives and strategies of the project?
11. What are the best practices and lessons learned? Has there any potential of scaling up the project initiatives?

2.3 Methodology

The methodology and tools will be designed by the Consultant and submitted to SFCG for approval. The field research cannot be done without getting the formal approval on the methodology, sampling and the survey questionnaires.

The survey will adapt the 3-R framework: Reach, Resonance and Response that focuses on three main dimensions: Reach includes the geographical coverage, demographics of listeners; Relevance explores to what extent the issues raised in the program and the overall format of the program is relevant to the local socio-political dynamics of the community in concern; and Response explores what changes occur in the society as a result of the show and how our target audience are adjusting their behaviour or taking specific actions to address the conflict issues as a result of the show.

The assignment will incorporate the following tools:

1. Desk review of relevant project documents (contracts, proposals, baseline report, monitoring report/data, quarterly reports), as well as review of other externally done research reports/literatures, political party manifesto and government documents and laws.
2. Listenership Survey in in Lashio and North Okalappa along with one additional area with an appropriate sample size calculated in consultation with the SFCG DM&E Team and approved by the SFCG Asia DM&E Specialist.
3. Key Informant Interviews and Focused Group Discussions with specific stakeholders, partner staff – the list of interviewees will be finalized with the approval of SFCG. Case studies/stories demonstrating improved dialogue and exchange amongst and between diverse groups as well as increased public awareness of the value of collaboration.

Sampling

The researcher will conduct at least 4-8 KIIs in the target areas and 3 FGDs with 4-8 people per ground with a greater weighting on Greater Yangon. The Listenership survey will be based on an appropriate sample size identified based on the combined target population of the four areas with greater weight on the project locations. The total sample size will be proportionately divided into the four areas and
interviews will be conducted inclusive of gender, ethnicity, religions and age groups. The methodological approach, including the finalization of sample size and survey administering mechanisms will need to be approved by SFCG.

3. Scope of Work and Deliverables

The Consultant will be expected to undertake the following:

**Inception Report**

- Document detailing the reflective review and listenership plan, setting out methodology including sampling frame, data collection tools, timeline, and logistical requirements.

**Survey**

- Development of survey questionnaires in English and translated into Myanmar language for listenership survey;
- Identify field researchers in each state, provide them one-day orientation on administering the survey;
- Do field testing of questionnaires and finalize them based on the feedback received from the field-testing;
- Coordinate and mobilize the researchers for the field survey in each state/township and ensure the quality and accuracy of data;
- Compilation and entry of data and analyse using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) or any other similar statistical tools; and
- Generate tabulation plan based on the questionnaire.

**Reflective Review**

- Development of questionnaires in English and translated into Myanmar language for key informant interviews and focused group discussions;
- Identify and define interview and FGD participants in consultation with SFCG;
- Provide clear explanation of qualitative data analysis and presentation and integration of Listenership survey data and the KIIs/FGDs data into the report; and
- Coordinate with Search Team and local organizers to ensure smooth of operation.

**General**

- Prepare and present preliminary findings with integrated survey and qualitative findings to SFCG Myanmar (power point format is acceptable);
- Incorporate relevant feedback and suggestions provided by SFCG Team, including SFCG’s ILT, and submit revised report. Depending on the quality of the report, there could be more than one round of feedback on the report and the Consultant is obliged to revise the survey report as requested by SFCG;
- Evaluation report written, edited and formatted to professional standards submitted to SFCG along with CD with all raw data, within seven days of submission of the final report;
- Submit interview notes and any other documents taken or collected to SFCG Myanmar within seven days of the submission of the final draft; and
- Presentation of the findings to SFCG in an internal meeting within 7 days of submitting the final draft.

**Summary of Key Deliverables**

- Final Questionnaire for listenership survey;
- Draft report. The review of draft report may be carried over more than one round depending on the quality of the report and the extent to which the comments on earlier drafts are addressed; and
- Fully edited and formatted report reflective review and survey report.

3.1 Structure of the Report
The evaluator must develop the structure template of the evaluation report in consultation with SFCG Myanmar’s Country Director before starting the report writing process. The structure should have at least following components.

- Cover page with appropriate photo
- Executive summary of project introduction, brief methodology, key findings and recommendations – no more than 3 pages
- Table of contents
- List of abbreviations and acronyms
- Brief Context Analysis
- Introduction of the project
- Methodology and tools
- Scope and Limitation
- Findings, analysis, and conclusions with associated data presented, where appropriate in clear graphs or charts. The findings section should be structured in consultation with SFCG.
- Appendices, which includes ToR, plan, tools – questionnaires, checklists, field plan, and list of interviewees.
- CD with any additional media materials including photographs

4. Support from SFCG Myanmar

The external consultant will lead the Study with support from SFCG DM&E Coordinator, SFCG Asia Regional DM&E Specialist, Head of Programmes and SFCG Myanmar Country Director. SFCG Myanmar Country Director will serve as the Overall Evaluation/Survey Manager.

SFCG will provide preparatory assistance to the consultant(s), which will include:

- Providing background materials (project briefing, ToRs, proposal, logframe, listenership survey, conflict analysis report, monitoring data, quarterly report and any other required documents.)
- Preparation meeting with Country Director and team.
- Continued support for smooth conduction of the assignment.
- Logistical arrangement including travel.
- Review of the report.
APPENDIX 2: LISTENERSHIP SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

1.1 What is your age? (select one)
   1.1.1 Less than 18 years
   1.1.2 18-24
   1.1.3 25-35
   1.1.4 Above 35

1.2 What is your gender? (select one)
   1.2.1 Male
   1.2.2 Female
   1.2.3 Other (any of the LGBT)

1.3 Which religious belief do you follow? (select one)
   1.3.1 Buddhist
   1.3.2 Muslim
   1.3.3 Hindu
   1.3.4 Christian
   1.3.5 Animist
   1.3.6 Sikh
   1.3.7 Atheist
   1.3.8 None / No answer
   1.3.9 Other (specify)

1.4 What ethnicity do you belong to? (select one)
   1.4.1 Bamar
   1.4.2 Kachin
   1.4.3 Kayin
   1.4.4 Kayah
   1.4.5 Rakhine
   1.4.6 Chin
   1.4.7 Mon
   1.4.8 Shan
   1.4.9 Ta’ang
   1.4.10 Wa
   1.4.11 Kokang
   1.4.12 Indian
   1.4.13 Chinese
   1.4.14 Other (specify)

1.5 What is the highest level of education that you have completed? (select one)
   1.5.1 Master’s degree (or higher)
   1.5.2 Bachelor’s degree
   1.5.3 High School
   1.5.4 Middle School
   1.5.5 Primary School
   1.5.6 Religious education
   1.5.7 Informal education
   1.5.8 No education

2.1 Have you heard this song before? (listen to the song; select one)
   2.1.1 Yes
   2.1.2 No (skip to 3.1)

2.2 What is it the song for? (type your answer)
   2.2.1 (indicate if accurately identified)
2.3 This song was featured in a number of public service announcements on television and on social media. Did you see any of these? (select one)
   2.3.1 I saw it on television
   2.3.2 I saw it on social media
   2.3.3 No (skip to 3.1)

2.4 Did the public service announcements challenge any stereotypes that you might have about people from other cultures or religions? (select one)
   2.4.1 Yes
   2.4.2 No
   2.4.3 Unsure

2.5 Which of the issues discussed in the public service announcements can you remember? (select all that apply)
   2.5.1 Youth and Sport
   2.5.2 Youth and Unity
   2.5.3 Youth and Peace
   2.5.4 Youth, Stereotypes, and Equality
   2.5.5 Youth and LGBT
   2.5.6 Youth and Job Opportunities
   2.5.7 Youth and Drugs
   2.5.8 Youth and Rehabilitation
   2.5.9 Youth and the Benefit of Reading
   2.5.10 Youth and Domestic Violence
   2.5.11 Youth and Social Media Rumours
   2.5.12 Youth and Online Charity Work
   2.5.13 None

2.6 Did any of the issues discussed in the public service announcements resonate with any incidents from your personal experience in your community? (select all that apply)
   2.6.1 Youth and Sport
   2.6.2 Youth and Unity
   2.6.3 Youth and Peace
   2.6.4 Youth, Stereotypes, and Equality
   2.6.5 Youth and LGBT
   2.6.6 Youth and Job Opportunities
   2.6.7 Youth and Drugs
   2.6.8 Youth and Rehabilitation
   2.6.9 Youth and the Benefit of Reading
   2.6.10 Youth and Domestic Violence
   2.6.11 Youth and Social Media Rumours
   2.6.12 Youth and Online Charity Work
   2.6.13 None

3.1 Have you heard about the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program? (select one)
   3.1.1 Yes
   3.1.2 No (skip to 5.5)

3.2 Where did you first hear about the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program? (select one)
   3.2.1 Family
   3.2.2 Friends
   3.2.3 Neighbours
   3.2.4 Colleagues
   3.2.5 Community leaders
   3.2.6 Radio
   3.2.7 Television
   3.2.8 Newspaper
   3.2.9 Facebook
   3.2.10 Other social media (specify)
   3.2.11 Teashop conversation
3.2.12 DVD
3.2.13 Listening and Dialogue Circle sessions
3.2.13 Other (specify)

3.3 Have you listened to the *Let's Think, Let's Change* radio program? *(select one)*
3.3.1 Yes
3.3.2 No *(skip to 5.5)*

3.4 Where did you most frequently listen to the *Let's Think, Let's Change* radio program? *(select one)*
3.4.1 At home
3.4.2 At the tea shop
3.4.3 On public transport
3.4.4 At a friend’s house
3.4.5 In public places
3.4.6 At work
3.4.7 At one of the Listening and Dialogue Circle sessions
3.4.8 Other (specify)

3.5 How many of the episodes of the *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* radio program did you listen to? *(select one)*
3.5.1 All 12 episodes
3.5.2 All episodes except one or two
3.5.3 More than half
3.5.4 Half of the episodes
3.5.5 Only a few episodes
3.5.6 One or two

4.1 Which of the issues do you remember the most from the *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* radio program? *(select all that apply)*
4.1.1 Youth and Sport
4.1.2 Youth and Unity
4.1.3 Youth and Peace
4.1.4 Youth, Stereotypes, and Equality
4.1.5 Youth and LGBT
4.1.6 Youth and Job Opportunities
4.1.7 Youth and Drugs
4.1.8 Youth and Rehabilitation
4.1.9 Youth and the Benefit of Reading
4.1.10 Youth and Domestic Violence
4.1.11 Youth and Social Media Rumours
4.1.12 Youth and Online Charity Work
4.1.13 None

4.2 Which of the stories and issues discussed in the *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* radio program resembled incidents from your personal experience in your community? *(select all that apply)*
4.2.1 Youth and Sport
4.2.2 Youth and Unity
4.2.3 Youth and Peace
4.2.4 Youth, Stereotypes, and Equality
4.2.5 Youth and LGBT
4.2.6 Youth and Job Opportunities
4.2.7 Youth and Drugs
4.2.8 Youth and Rehabilitation
4.2.9 Youth and the Benefit of Reading
4.2.10 Youth and Domestic Violence
4.2.11 Youth and Social Media Rumours
4.2.12 Youth and Online Charity Work
4.2.13 None
4.3 Did the *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* radio program prompt you to engage in dialogue with others about some of the issues discussed? *(select one)*
  4.3.1 Yes
  4.3.2 No  *(skip to 4.8)*

4.5 Who did you discuss it with? *(select all that apply)*
  4.5.1 Family
  4.5.2 Friends
  4.5.3 Neighbours
  4.5.4 Colleagues
  4.5.5 Other (specify)

4.6 How often did you discuss it? *(select one)*
  4.6.1 After every episode
  4.6.2 After most episodes
  4.6.3 After some episodes
  4.6.4 Rarely

4.7 Which issues did you discuss? *(select all that apply)*
  4.7.1 Youth and Sport
  4.7.2 Youth and Unity
  4.7.3 Youth and Peace
  4.7.4 Youth, Stereotypes, and Equality
  4.7.5 Youth and LGBT
  4.7.6 Youth and Job Opportunities
  4.7.7 Youth and Drugs
  4.7.8 Youth and Rehabilitation
  4.7.9 Youth and the Benefit of Reading
  4.7.10 Youth and Domestic Violence
  4.7.11 Youth and Social Media Rumours
  4.7.12 Youth and Online Charity Work

4.8 Which of the topics would you like to learn more about? *(select all that apply)*
  4.8.1 Youth and Sport
  4.8.2 Youth and Unity
  4.8.3 Youth and Peace
  4.8.4 Youth, Stereotypes, and Equality
  4.8.5 Youth and LGBT
  4.8.6 Youth and Job Opportunities
  4.8.7 Youth and Drugs
  4.8.8 Youth and Rehabilitation
  4.8.9 Youth and the Benefit of Reading
  4.8.10 Youth and Domestic Violence
  4.8.11 Youth and Social Media Rumours
  4.8.12 Youth and Online Charity Work
  4.8.13 None

4.9 Did the *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* radio program influence the way that you view people from other cultures and religions? *(select one)*
  4.9.1 Yes
  4.9.2 No

4.10 Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements. *(select one)*
  - Strongly agree
  - Agree
  - Disagree
  - Strongly disagree
  - Unsure
4.10.1 The Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program has helped me to develop a greater understanding of the various divisions within Myanmar society.

4.10.2 I believe that a diverse society is a weak society.

4.10.3 We can make a difference if we work together, despite our individual differences.

5.1 Did the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program inspire you to talk to people from other cultures and religions? (select one)
   5.1.1 Yes
   5.1.2 No

5.2 How many new friends have you made from other religions or ethnicities since you first listened to the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program? (select one)
   5.2.1 More than 10
   5.2.2 6-9
   5.2.3 3-5
   5.2.4 1-2
   5.2.5 None

5.3 Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements. (select one)
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
   - Unsure

5.3.1 After listening to the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program, I understand that collaboration and respect between people from across dividing lines is essential for peace.

5.3.2 After listening to the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program, I am more accepting and trusting of people who are different from me.

5.3.3 I learned that men and women from different cultures and religions have important roles to play in Myanmar society.

5.3.4 I believe that young people have important roles to play in reducing the various divisions in Myanmar society.

5.3.5 The Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program has taught me the importance of questioning the accuracy of rumours.

5.3.6 I now check the veracity of news and rumours before sharing them.

5.3.7 I believe that the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program has contributed to harmony in my community.

5.4 Would you recommend listening to the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program to others? (select one)
   5.4.1 Yes
   5.4.2 No
   5.4.3 Unsure

5.5 Thank you for your time!
APPENDIX 3: KII AND FGD QUESTIONNAIRE

The Terms of Reference (ToR) proposed eleven guiding questions for the reflective review (see Appendix 1). These guiding questions yielded a further 66 questions designed by the consultant for use during the FGDs and KIIs. Not all 66 questions were asked in every interview or focus group, as not all questions applied to all interlocutors. The following questions acted as a guide to help prompt the interlocutors into a discussion with the consultant using his discretion to determine which questions to pose during discussions. This list of questions is not exhaustive and many other follow-up and spontaneous questions were asked in the course of discussions as the need arose.

1. What was the overall impression of the project?

A. What was your role in the project?
B. What were your main achievements?
C. What was your favourite part of this project? Why?
D. What was your least favourite part? Why?
E. What was your impression of the project as a whole?
F. What did you learn from participating in this project? (trust, respect, understanding, collaboration, friendship, etc.)

2. How relevant was the project considering the overall conflict dynamics in the project locations? Were the activities well designed to achieve the desired objectives and results?

A. Were the topics / issues discussed in the radio programs, PSAs, social media pieces, and listening and dialogue circles were relevant to young people in your area? Why?
B. Were any of the topics / issues not relevant? Which ones? Why?
C. Which topics / issues were the most interesting for you?
D. Which of the topics / issues generated the most discussion?
E. Were there any issues / topics which caused disagreements or tensions among the participants?
F. Did any of the discussions strengthen divisions or reinforce stereotypes in your community?
G. Considering the conflict dynamics in your area, how timely was this project?
H. Given that the situation on the ground can change very fast in Myanmar, and that many changes have taken place over the past year, is the project still relevant today? Will it still be relevant in future?

3. Did this project do something new that others are not doing? What value added did it bring, if any?

A. Do you know of any other projects that are doing work like this? Which ones?
B. Did this project do anything new that has not been done before?
C. Have you used the radio program, the facilitator guide, or any of the other tools developed under this project in your everyday work?

4. How participant-friendly was the project, its design, and its implementation methodology and process?

A. Share your perspectives on the Consultative Workshops / National Curriculum Summit / Reflection Workshop (pose as appropriate). Did the format facilitate discussion around the relevant topics?
B. Were you able to share your perspectives on what change is needed for a peaceful society?
C. What are your experiences from the Youth Facilitation Trainings? What worked well?
D. Do you have any recommendations to make these better in future?
E. Was it easy to understand the messages discussed in the radio program, the PSAs, and the social media pieces?
F. Was there anything that you were not able to understand?
G. Did using radio and multi-media to deliver the messages make it easier or harder to understand?

H. How useful were the listening and dialogue circles in facilitating your understanding?

I. The project featured a number of celebrities. Did this make it more or less interesting to listen?

J. What were your biggest challenges during the project?

5. What did the project achieve, in general?

A. What do you think the project achieved?

B. Do you think that the project has been successful in promoting inclusiveness and acceptance of diversity? How?

6. How did the project contribute in building capacity of radio producers in conflict sensitive journalism and other aspects of radio programme production?

A. What did you learn from your involvement in this project?

B. Did you find the curriculum summit/story development workshop, discussions around perceptions of identity, the common ground approach, and training in the use of media for peacebuilding useful?

C. Was the proposed message trajectory developed in the workshop successful in the retention of listeners and the internationalisation of messages?

D. Did you find the assistance/guidance provided by the external media consultant (Jerome) helpful? In what way?

E. Describe what you learned about conflict sensitive journalism and the positive and negative roles that the media can play in peacebuilding.

F. Are you using this new knowledge in your everyday work?

G. Is there anything that you would like to learn more about?

H. Has your experience with this project left you with any ideas for new programming?

7. How successful was the project in fostering dialogue among divided communities? Have there been some specific examples of improved understanding and relationships? Has there been increased tolerance as a result of the project initiatives?

A. Has the project had any impact on your life? (interactions with people from other cultures or religions, at work, new friendships, new ways of looking at differences, etc)

B. How has this affected the way that you interact with people who are different from you?

C. Tell me about something new you learned about people from other cultures, religions, or social groups.

D. Has the project inspired you to engage in dialogue with people who are different from you (across ethnic, religious, social, political divides)?

E. Have you made any new friends with people from other cultural or religious groups?

F. What examples can you give of specific cases in your community where the project has helped bring together people from divided communities?

G. Did you experience any difficulty in getting older people to listen to your perspectives?

H. How do you respond to rumours about other people in your community?

I. How do you check the accuracy of these rumours or information that you hear or read about?

8. How has the project contributed in increasing the public awareness and understanding of the importance of collaboration and respect across various divides in project locations?

A. What is needed to bring about peace in Myanmar? (Note how many respondents reference collaboration, mutual respect, etc.)

B. What is your understanding of the importance of collaboration and respect across dividing lines for a peaceful society?

C. What examples can you give of specific cases in your community where people from different backgrounds have worked together on any of the issues discussed throughout the program?

D. Please give me an example from your community/listening circle where a person’s views of or behaviour towards people who are different from them has changed as a result of the project.
9. How has the project contributed in creating a conducive environment for promoting the acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar?

   A. What are your views on the importance of diversity within society? Do you believe that diversity is a source of strength or weakness?
   B. How has the project influenced your views on this?
   C. In what ways has the project contributed to creating an environment in which people are more willing to accept and respect diversity?

10. Have there been any mechanisms, processes or strategies created to sustain the project initiatives post-project? Has there any sense of ownership among MRTV leadership or the radio programme producers or other concerned stakeholders around the goal, objectives and strategies of the project?

   A. To what extent have local partners (MRTV and production teams) demonstrated ownership of the project?
   B. What, if any, plans have been developed by local partners for similar initiatives in the future?
   C. Do you think that any of the project activities or processes will continue to have an impact after the completion of the project?

11. What are the best practices and lessons learned? Has there any potential of scaling up the project initiatives?

   A. Were there any unintended / unexpected outcomes or impacts in this project?
   B. Were there any external factors which facilitated or hindered the project?
   C. To what extent did the project address gender, religious, ethnic, disability, (etc.) equality and inclusion among the participants?
   D. Did the project target the right group of people?
   E. What are the best ways to engage and inspire young people?
   F. Discuss the reasons why fewer than intended DVDs (100 / 2,500) were produced and distributed? What impact has this decision had on the intended reach of the project?
   G. How successful were the promotional materials (stickers, T-shirts, posters umbrellas, cups, bags, books and pens) in marketing the project? Did these have any additional influence on the objectives of the project?
   H. Based on you experiences with the program, what recommendations would you have to make future programs better?
   I. What topics / issues would you like to see discussed in the future?
   J. If possible, would you take part in similar projects again in the future?
## APPENDIX 4: LIST OF KII INTERVIEWEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20/5/17</td>
<td>Maung Myat Thu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Seik Tha Tu Kha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burmese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21/5/17</td>
<td>Sun Sun Oo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MRTV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burmese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22/5/17</td>
<td>Thida Latt</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Muslim Student Youth Network</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Burmese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23/5/17</td>
<td>Swe Zin Myo Win</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24/5/17</td>
<td>Kar Hlaung</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25/5/17</td>
<td>Hein Min Oo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Youth 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English/Burmese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>26/5/17</td>
<td>Zarni Maung Maung</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LGBT Rights Activist</td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Bamar</td>
<td>Burmese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>27/5/17</td>
<td>Nan Thet Thet Tun</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Local Resource Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shan</td>
<td>Burmese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>28/5/17</td>
<td>Ah Ker Soe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Youth Interfaith Cooperation Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burmese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>28/5/17</td>
<td>Ko Thuta</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Change Youth Centre and Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29/5/17</td>
<td>Sandi Aung</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Capacity Building Initiative</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>Shan/Muslim</td>
<td>Burmese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>29/5/17</td>
<td>Kyaw Zin Tun</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Millennium Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English/Burmese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5: List of FGD Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21/5/17</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td>San San Wai</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MRTV-radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thein Ky Aye</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MRTV-TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thi Dee Wai</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Wah Dee</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>22/5/17</td>
<td>Youth Facilitators</td>
<td>Thazin Tun</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Rakhine / Bamar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cho Tha Zay Aung</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May Kay Say Win</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wunna Tun</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pay Phyo Thay Ha</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Htet Oo Hlaing</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Bamar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Min Khant Kyaw</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>Kayin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Than Htway Aung</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Bamar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>22/5/17</td>
<td>LDC Participants</td>
<td>Wai Yan Kyaw Thu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Bamar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phyo Hai Ha Kyaw</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ei Cha Moo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Win Win Mo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Rakhine</td>
<td>Did not participate in LDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Win Myint Myat Aye</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Bamar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>24/5/17</td>
<td>Parents / Guardians</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No children participated in LDCs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>25/5/17</td>
<td>Youth Facilitators</td>
<td>Yu Yu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swe Wah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Bamar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phyo Phyo Mon</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Shan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thurein Moe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Bamar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sai Ohn Myint</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Shan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>El Show</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>Wa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Naung Naung</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>Bamar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>27/5/17</td>
<td>LDC Participants</td>
<td>Ye Jin Aung</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ye Mein</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ei Than Na Tun</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joined FGD late - name not recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>27/5/17</td>
<td>Parents / Guardians</td>
<td>Kyi Than</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>Bamar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Khaw Mai</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joined FGD late - name not recorded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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