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Executive Summary

Context
In Myanmar, decades of military rule have created an environment where deep lack of trust is seen across ethnic, religious, social and political dividing lines, and where fostering fear of the ‘other’ has created an environment in which violence can easily be triggered. This has played out amongst the Buddhist population mainly through rumours and hate speech, especially against Muslims. Institutionalization and structural violence towards minorities - ethnic minorities, and especially Muslim groups - extend into the beliefs, mind-sets and attitudes of the country’s population. While spoilers remain a threat to the country’s transition, there is space to support resilience at a societal level.
Regarding the conflict dynamics, it is important to note that the project was developed just before and started just after the August crisis in Rakhine State that led to 700,000 people identifying as Rohingya fleeing to Bangladesh. The crisis triggered a further increase in Buddhist nationalism and ‘othering’ towards Muslims in 2018, and contributed to current tensions and fear of the population in discussing religious issues.

Introduction
Guided by the context and realizing the need to mitigate these factors to work towards fostering understanding and respect among divided communities in Myanmar, Search for Common Ground (hereinafter Search) developed “Let’s Think, Let’s Change: promoting cultural diversity through popular culture”, a project aimed at addressing these issues. The project was funded by the then Peace Support Fund, now known as the Paung Sie Facility (PSF). Phase I of the project took place from June 2016 to July 2017 and combined community-based work facilitated by youth leaders with a social media campaign, televised public service announcements (PSAs), and a radio talk show. The project locations were North Okkalapa, in Yangon, and Lashio, in Northern Shan State.

This project was rooted in the following theory of change: “If popular culture constructively challenges existing negative narratives and stereotypes of the ‘other’ that fuels 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”.

Phase II of the project was designed and adapted from Phase I, based on the feedback and request of its partners, community members and stakeholders in Myanmar and rooted in the same theory of change. Adjustments were made as a result of the “Listenership Survey and Reflective Review” conducted in June 2017, taking into account the key results of this evaluation. These included specifically engaging youth, creating a televised version of Let’s Think, Let’s Change, targeting the older generation through radio, and targeting institutions to support sustainability. There were three key requests driving this project extension:

- Identified need for providing continued space for dialogue between youth and government;
- Identified need to continue “Let’s Think, Let’s Change” and develop further new and innovative media formats using shorter bitesize episodes recognising audience attention span and increased use of social media amongst the population;
- Need to reach out to other government institutions and educational establishments to support multiplication and sustainability especially for the listening and dialogue circles

---

2 UNOCHA, JRP for Rohingya Humanitarian Crisis: https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/JRP%20for%20Rohingya%20Humanitarian%20Crisis%202018.PDF
Phase II aligns with Search Myanmar’s 3-year strategy finalized in 2017 that supports the democratic transition and social cohesion in the country by i) engaging the public in the ongoing peace process; ii) building resilience to the triggers of violence; and iii) bridging government and citizen divides.

Phase II also supports the PSF’s goal to enhance social cohesion in Myanmar by supporting locally driven, catalytic initiatives and ideas. The overall goal of phase II is: “To promote and accept diversity as a social norm in Myanmar, contributing to social cohesion and inter-communal harmony in Myanmar.”

The project was implemented in Lashio, Shan State and Greater Yangon (North Okkalapa, Hlaingthayar and Insein), selected through specific criteria\(^3\). Lashio is the largest town in Shan State, with 323,405 habitants, 209,137 of whom are between 15-64 years of age. Buddhist and Muslim Shans, the Wa, Ta-aung, Chinese and Burman peoples, amongst others, live in Lashio according to the most recent data available\(^4\). In 2013, Lashio saw anti-Muslim riots when a mosque, an orphanage, and shops were burnt down. Greater Yangon is an “internal migration” area where Myanmar’s citizens from all over the country come mostly to look for the jobs and opportunities that they don’t find in their native areas. This “wild” unplanned and unorganized urbanization creates spaces for more pronounced inequality and social stratification as well as poverty and increased crime. These elements feed feelings of insecurity, inequality, and discontent which manifest as distrust and hatred of “the other”.

**Methodology**

The evaluation intended to extract lessons for program improvement and ascertain the potential for scaling the project up in the future, to see what worked well, and what the successes were. The evaluation was conducted from November 27\(^{th}\) to December 31\(^{st}\). It used a mixed method approach of data collection, involving viewership/listenership survey, KIIs, FGDs, and desk review.

The evaluation involved 5 Focus Group Discussions, 19 Key Informant Interviews and a desk review of 50 documents, 12 radio episodes and 8 TV episodes. All FGDs were conducted in Burmese by the national evaluator and then translated into English. This is also true for some KIIs as well, though others were conducted by the international consultant in English. The relevant participants for these interviews were identified with the help of the Search project team and partners. Similarly, the survey sample size was calculated to be 540 distributed across four project locations and a control area.

**Limitations**

The evaluation was done within a very tight timeline of 5 weeks during November 27\(^{th}\) to December 31\(^{st}\), with some unavoidable and normal milestone (questionnaire and survey) which we knew would take time to develop, translate and implement, in addition to a desk review of 50 documents to read and understand and 20 episodes (radio + TV) of 10 minutes each to see or listen to. Even if they shared the workload, evaluators could not thoroughly read and digest all the desk review documents before they designed the questionnaire.

---

\(^3\) The areas have been selected based on the following criteria: areas vulnerable to renewed eruptions of inter-communal violence; ethnically and politically diverse with significant political and economic divides; areas with contested land, inward migration giving rise to ‘othering’ of ‘outsiders’ resulting in social tensions; areas with complex inter-communal tensions (inter-religious, inter-ethnic, inter-social, and exacerbated by proximity of armed tensions); previous history of violence, or susceptible to narratives stemming from other parts of the country.

Key Findings

The evaluators consider that the project’s design, implementation and methodology worked fine and are coherent with the need of the target areas. But they acknowledge that in a project of this dimension there is a need for more time for some activities, such as public screenings. Even if the coordination between Search Myanmar, MRTV, and other partner organizations while implementing the project proved sometimes challenging, all trainings were delivered according to the plan and there was even an additional “Media technical” training. Generally, the project activities (e.g. capacity-building media and outreach) were sufficiently coherent to generate the desired results. During a “National Curriculum Summit”, youth, media professionals and celebrities selected and developed 5 thematic messaging areas after reviewing the research findings together and these formed the core of the scripts and synopsis. The thematic areas were: i) Collaboration without discrimination, ii) Diversity, iii) Social media, including sexual harassment, iv) Drug abuse, v) Youth and adults-generational gap. These formed the core area for message development for the media products (Radio program, TV series, PSAs, songs). The 12 episodes of radio program and 8 episodes of TV program were both broadcast on MRTV. The TV series was also re-broadcast on DVB, Mizzima, and Channel 9 TV Channels (Free to Air). In addition, Channel 9 has offered to broadcast the TV series again in January 2019 and Mizzima is interested in broadcasting the PSAs and music video as they are targeting the issue of diversity to youth. Across these diverse broadcasting stations, the shows reached a large number of the public across Myanmar as shown by the viewership survey. The TV series has also been boosted on Facebook on DVB, MRTV and hash-tagged by celebrities reaching an audience of over 10 million.

The survey conducted in the target areas shows that 14% of the population knew or had heard about the LTLC radio series and 12.6% of the population knew the TV series. Still, according to the survey, 9.3% of the population either listened or watched the series. With a population of 50,279,900 under the last official census (2014), an estimated 4.6 million (0.093*50,279,900 = 4,655,546) people have been reached by the programs in Myanmar. In fact, this figure could be significantly higher as it was calculated based on the listenership/viewership of MRTV broadcast only. Broadcasting on DVB, Mizzima and Channel 9 has extended this reach. However, the viewership of the rebroadcast has not been captured in this evaluation due to its timing. At least 3,060,000 Myanmar citizens have been positively impacted by the messages, which reached the 3,000,000 anticipated people. The survey also revealed that after listening/viewing the radio and TV series, 33% of radio listeners and 35% of TV series viewers engaged in dialogue with ‘others’.

Following the Theory of Change, the evaluation confirms that the project contributed to developing constructive narratives and opportunities to deliver those narratives in challenging the existing negative narratives or stereotypes, and consequently contributed to increasing public understanding of and respect for different members of their diverse communities. It can also be said that the project contributed to building capacity of media professionals (radio and TV producers) and youth in conflict transformation and social cohesion. Examples of this are that the project participants now use their new skills and knowledge in their professional practice.

The evaluation concludes that the project has been successful in contributing to achieving the project goal “to increase the promotion and acceptance of diversity as a social norm, contributing to social cohesion and inter-

---

5 In order to get an average, if we calculate average of the 3 percentages (67%, 77%, 61%), it gives 68%. We can therefore consider that 4,500,000*68%=3,060,000 Myanmar citizens have been positively impacted by the project. It is of course a rough calculation but considering the added impact of broadcasting on DVB, Mizzima and other channels (with an audience population of more than 10 million), there is no doubt about the real impact of the programs. So, the evaluation can conclude that the project contributed to creating a conducive environment for promoting the acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar.
communal harmony, in Myanmar as evidenced by the increased tolerance of diversity among the target beneficiaries as measured by the positive attitude shift of the target communities towards “others” (28% against a target of 12%), and survey participants saying that they have had a meaningful conversation with someone from “other” ethnic, religious/socio-political identity, at least once in the last 12 months (30% against a target of 12%).

When looking for evidence that demonstrates that the shift in knowledge, attitude and behaviour has been locally rooted and will continue after the life of the project, the main evidence is the snowball effect linked to the youth evaluators’ expression of positive attitude. Most of the interviewees showed the intention to carry on the mobile screening experience, on whichever scale possible. Many admitted they had already conducted some without formally informing Search. One facilitator, a Muslim lady, already conducted an additional mobile screening in her community in Yangon with 30 participants and disseminated 30 DVDs with 5 facilitator Guide Books in December 2018. Almost all of them wanted to have more of this kind of activities and to have it continue on a regular basis.

15 of the 18 indicators surveyed proved outcomes or outputs were achieved, most of were even surpassed. The conclusion is that considering the table of indicators (see page 37), the “Let’s Think, Let’s Change” is a successful project that merits further scaling up.

**Recommendations**

**Mobile Screenings**
- Organize more mobile screening sessions as they prove very efficient to create dialogue opportunities.
- Bring mobile screenings to the rural areas surrounding the cities.
- Consider target areas of Ayeyarwaddy and Magway for the mobile screenings.
- Keep the pool of youth facilitators that benefited from most of the training and train them to become trainers themselves with specific inputs about adults’ learning.

**Production Recommendations**
- Conduct research about current TV programs to understand what works, what people like and why.
- Search could eventually combine all the video episodes into a long movie format, with some added editing and broadcast the product as a movie or use it in public screening.
- Consider hiring separate consultants for the production of the television and radio streams rather than one media professional to oversee both.
- Integrate further and ongoing technical trainings for productions to elevate quality further.
- Train all participants to the project, and especially all media professionals in the CGA approach.

**Partnerships**
- Ensure mechanisms to build project ownership among partners and stakeholders, develop a flyer and a communication tool (PowerPoint, video…) presenting the project, the objectives, and the activities, and present it before all activities.
- Consider a planning/management committee of Search/MRTV senior management that meets regularly on certain key decisions.
Use the MOI network to ensure smooth and prompt mobile screening permission from local authorities and other administrative support required for the project implementation.

Create a Facebook page with restricted access to members selected and allowed by Search (i.e. training beneficiaries and production partners). Use this Facebook page as a platform where all productions are uploaded and accessible to members. Use it as an experience-sharing platform as well.

Overall

- Consider a longer timeline for the same kind of project and activities.
- Consider a next project cycle with an increased number of target areas.
- Consider opportunities to provide further social cohesion and CGA trainings to youth population and to media professionals.
1. Background Information

Introduction

In Myanmar, decades of military rule have created an environment where deep distrust is seen across ethnic, religious, social and political dividing lines, and where fostering fear of the ‘other’ has created an environment in which violence can easily be triggered. This has been played out amongst the predominantly Buddhist population mainly through rumours and hate speech against Muslims. Institutionalization and structural violence towards minorities - ethnic minorities, and especially Muslim groups - extend into the beliefs, mindsets and attitudes of the country’s population. While spoilers remain a threat to the country’s transition, there is space to support resilience at a societal level. A Search rapid assessment\(^6\) showed that individuals from across divides are willing to foster personal connections, however, once issues become ‘group’ issues, then willingness to engage breaks down, stereotypes and ‘othering’ perpetuates, and ethnic nationalism or religious extremism manifest.

Consequently, Search developed “Let’s Think, Let’s Change: promoting cultural diversity through popular culture\(^6\)”, a project aimed at addressing these issues, funded by the then Peace Support Fund (now known as the Paung Sie Facility). Phase I took place from June 2016 to July 2017 and 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 discussed the impact of negative stereotyping and encouraged listeners to question and challenge rumours and negative biases that prevail in society. The project locations were North Okkalapa, in Yangon, and Lashio, in Northern Shan State, selected through identified criteria such as diversity and divided ethnic, religious, and social communities disposed to trust deficits, negative stereotyping of the ‘other’, and hate speech, previous history of inter-communal violence and economically and geographically key cities in Myanmar’s transition\(^7\). Search worked with media professionals, celebrities, and youth leaders as influencers, providing them with knowledge and tools to foster alternative positive narratives in the social imagination.

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

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

This project was rooted in the following theory of change: “If popular culture constructively challenges existing negative narratives and stereotypes of the ‘other’ that fuels 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”.

Phase I ended in July 2017 and its final evaluation showed that the project had significant impact, although listeners retention could have been better\(^8\). The considered theory of change proved efficient so far and the


\(^{7}\) “Community Information Management to Reduce Inter-communal violence: Project Inception Report\(^*\)”, January 2016, Shiva Dhungana.

\(^{8}\) Listenership survey and reflective review, “Let’s Thinking that, Let’s Change: Promoting Diversity through Popular Culture\(^*\)”, June 2017, Jason Miller.
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evaluation overall showed there were room and needs for a Phase II providing some adaptations following the lessons learnt and recommendations of the evaluation.

Consequently, Phase II was designed and adapted from Phase I, based upon the feedback and demand of its partners, community members and stakeholders in Myanmar. Adjustments were made as a result of the “Listener Survey and Reflective Review” conducted in June 2017, taking into account this review’s key evaluative results, specifically by engaging youth, creating a televised version of Let’s Think, Let’s Change, targeting the older generation through radio, and targeting institutions to support sustainability. There are three key requests\(^9\) driving this project extension:

- To provide continued Space for Dialogue between youth and government
- To continue Let’s Think, Let’s Change and develop further new and innovative media formats using shorter bitesize episodes.
- To target other government institutions and educational establishments to support multiplication and sustainability especially for the listening and dialogue circles

Phase II aligns with Search Myanmar’s 3-year strategy\(^10\) finalized in 2017 that supports the democratic transition and social cohesion in country by:

- engaging the public in the ongoing peace process
- building resilience to the triggers of violence
- bridging government and citizen divides

Phase II also supports the Paung Sie Facility’s goal (formerly Peace Support Fund) to enhance social cohesion in Myanmar by supporting locally driven, catalytic initiatives and ideas. The overall goal of phase II is: “To promote and accept diversity as a social norm in Myanmar, contributing to social cohesion and inter-communal harmony in Myanmar.”

**Project Overview**

The project was implemented in Yangon Division and Shan State. The target areas were Lashio and Greater Yangon (North Okkalapa, Hlaingthayar and Insein). Lashio is the largest town in Shan State, with 323,405 habitants, 209,137 of whom are between 15-64 years and are of politically and economically active age. Buddhist and Muslim Shans, the Wa, Ta-ung, Chinese and Burman peoples, amongst others, live in Lashio according to the most recent data available\(^11\). It was already a target area for Phase I and has been very thoroughly documented by Search\(^12\). In 2013, Lashio saw anti-Muslims riots when a mosque, an orphanage and shops were burnt down. The city hosts migrant workers from central Myanmar and other parts of Shan State, as well as internally displaced persons due to armed conflict between ethnic armed groups and the Tatmadaw, which escalated during 2018. Lashio is the Centre of the Tatmadaw’ North-East Command - its main base is in Northern Shan State – resulting in a large army population. In 2015, Ma Ba Tha, with offices in Naung Pain, a town on the road from Lashio to Mandalay and where the population is predominantly Muslim, had some 5000 members in Lashio alone.

---

\(^9\) 20170927_Phase II _PSF - FINAL APPROVED (2)
\(^10\) Myanmar Strategy 3-pager
\(^11\) BaselineData_Census_Dataset_Township_MIMU_16Jun2016_ENG
\(^12\) AZ_RCA_SFCG_Final, 2017, AZ_Survey_SFCG_FINAL, 2017, Rapid_Assessment_Report-September 2017
North Okkalapa was the second target area in Phase I. However, due to the direct request of project stakeholders and communities that were approached during the Phase I evaluation, Search included two additional townships in Yangon, Hlaingthayar and Insein. Being the former capital city as well as the economic hub of the country, Greater Yangon hosts “internal migrants” from all over the country who come mostly to look for the jobs and opportunities they don’t find in their native areas. This “wild” unplanned and unorganized urbanization creates spaces for more pronounced inequality and social stratification as well as poverty and increased crime. These elements feed feelings of insecurity, inequality, and discontent manifesting as distrust and hatred of “the other”. Phase I showed that in Greater Yangon, with an increasingly fragile local government and weak conflict mitigation structures, personal conflicts are manifesting into group/identity-based conflicts, leading to intensification of local level conflicts that fuel the narratives towards ‘othering’ as willingness to engage breaks down, stereotypes and ‘othering’ perpetuates, and ethnic nationalism or religious extremism manifests.

The proposal for Phase II mentions that these areas were selected with the following criteria:

- Areas vulnerable to renewed eruptions of inter-communal violence
- Ethnically and politically diverse with significant political and economic divides
- Areas with contested land, inward migration giving rise to ‘othering’ of ‘outsiders’ resulting in social tensions
- Areas with complex inter-communal tensions (inter-religious, inter-ethnic, inter-social, and exacerbated by proximity of armed tensions)
- Previous history of violence, or susceptible to narratives stemming from other parts of the country

From all research studies they could access (not limited to the those conducted by Search only), from KII and FGDS inputs, the evaluators fully confirm that Lashio, North Okkalapa, Hlaingthayar and Insein match the criteria.

The overall expected impact is to promote and accept diversity as a social norm in Myanmar, contributing to social cohesion and inter-communal harmony in Myanmar.

**With three expected outcomes:**

- **Outcome 1:** Youth, government, educational leaders, and media professionals have increased skills and knowledge to implement project activities that foster social cohesion
- **Outcome 2:** Public understanding of the importance of collaboration and respect across divides has been increased
- **Outcome 3:** State/citizen, interethnic, and interreligious positive interaction and trust has increased

**Then the outputs to reach these outcomes are**

- **Output 1.1.** Mobilized and trained target youth to implement participatory research and provide factual information about conflict and social cohesion issues
- **Output 1.2.** Increased knowledge and skills of government officials and media professionals in fostering social cohesion to support creation of media outputs
- **Output 2.1:** Produced, broadcast and disseminated TV and radio show episodes to the target areas
- **Output 3.1:** Trained and mentored target youth in facilitation and mediation skills
- **Output 3.2:** Increased community dialogue and exchange interactions from across divided lines

---

13 Numbering follows an Outcome, Output, Activity pattern. Outcome 1 gives Outputs 1.1, 1.2, and Output 1.1 gives Activity 1.1.1, Activity 1.1.2, etc.
The primary target groups for the project are:

- 50 youth Facilitators (aged 18-35) in greater Yangon and Lashio who are active in their communities. It is important to mention that the project defines “Youth” as “people between the ages of 18 and 35”, following other work conducted by Search and an in-depth analysis of the concept in the “Viewership and Listenership Survey Lashio & North Okkalapa” made in February 2017
- 12 celebrities (Key Influencers) famous and with influence in Myanmar who support and amplify positive messaging on diversity
- 40 Media professionals from MRTV. Through the LTLC production, the MRTV team is capacitated in media for social change
- 20 Government representatives: under LTLC, SEARCH connects with the Department of Social Welfare to support its learning on social cohesion, and engaging dialogue between youth and the government
- 10 Educational Institutions: Search has already partnered, collaborated or coordinated with these institutions in previous projects. 1-2 educational youth leaders were invited to participate in the research phase (outcome 1) and the facilitated dialogue phase (outcome 3) from each institution.

The secondary target group for the project are community members, including ex-combatants, artists, media producers, local leaders, civil society members, women, and other relevant stakeholders from the target areas and the general public nationwide who view/listen to MRTV.

The beneficiaries target is an estimated 3,000,000 persons from the general public, youth and older generation, viewing the television, radio show or social media and/or participating in community dialogues.

The activities leading to the outputs are:

Firstly, target groups gain skills and connections to identify and understand key conflict issues in target areas. All target groups are trained in the Common Ground Approach (CGA) to equip participants in conflict transformation and foundational skills for dialogue and inclusive engagement and communication. Then the target groups develop a key message map to draw out messages around shared issues to target the two separate audience groups: Youth through the TV production and older generation through radio drama. The messages in both formats are aligned around common themes. Finally, following Search’s global and Myanmar results that when media outputs are combined with facilitated dialogue the impact of the media outputs are increased, a mobile screening activity is conducted by youth around the media outputs to engage diverse communities. Youth are trained in facilitation and receive mentoring to prepare the mobile screening sessions.

1.1.1: Selection/Mobilisation of Youth: 52 youth are trained (26 from Lashio and 26 from Yangon, (Hlaingthayar, Insein, North Okkalapa). Youth are selected as 15 from target areas and 10 from educational institutions.

1.1.2: Training for Youth Researchers: Prior to commencement of the research the 50 youth (25 from Lashio/25 from Yangon) are trained in 1) research techniques (3 days) and 2) the Common Ground Approach (3 days).

---
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1.1.3: Research and baseline: The field research (7 days per target area) is led by an international consultant familiar with Search’s approaches and tools and works with the national Search team and coordinates with Search’s Institutional Learning Team.

1.2.1: Social Cohesion training for government is held for MRTV under the Ministry of Information from both television and radio departments. The training is framed around the importance of Social Cohesion as a measurement for trust in change processes of government. The Common Ground Approach is included to provide core skills to support effective dialogue, listening, and conflict transformation approaches, and collaborative actions, and to support the work of MRTV within its institutions, with partners and through its media work, especially with different ethnic, religious and social groups. 26 MRTV staff are trained (from television and radio) through 1 x 3 days training. The second training was held with MMPDD (now called MFDC-Myanmar Film Development Center) staff under the Ministry of Information (MOI) in Yangon for 3 days at the MMPDD office. The 26 staff members were from the administration, censorship, finance, post-production team and senior level officials, to mainstream social cohesion into their work routine. As they are working with different political parties such Union Solidarity Development Party (USDP) and National League for Democracy (NLD) to broaden the social cohesion culture.

1.2.2: National Curriculum Summit: 6 youth facilitators from Lashio, 6 youth from Yangon, 6 celebrities, 10 MRTV, 4 Media professionals who are contracted for the PSA and the Search team (4 persons) attend a 2-day workshop with a total of 26 persons. During the workshop, they work on the key issues identified from the research activity 1.1 that need to be tackled to support social cohesion in Myanmar, and to be addressed through the media programming. The message map for the TV and radio production are produced.

1.2.3: Format-Development Workshop: Using the message map from activity 1.2.2, the format development workshop develops and details each of the television and radio episodes. 2 key youth representatives (from both Lashio and Yangon - total 4) are invited to join the workshops to support resonance of the storyline with the target audience and 12 media professionals from MRTV (6 from TV/6 from radio) as well as 4 Search staff and a media consultant. A Search consultant is recruited to lead the workshop, to support quality control and to facilitate MRTV staff’s capacities to weave the CGA process throughout the storylines. Each episode of the TV and radio are created around similar themes. Facilitator guides are developed (under activity 3.1.1) to encourage family interaction between youth and parents on topics relevant to their communities. Out of this 7-day activity, the storyboards for radio and television are produced.

2.1.1: TV Production: A televised version of Let’s Think, Let’s Change is produced. Responding to feedback from phase 1, and also to facilitate their broadcast via social media, there are 8 episodes of 12-minutes. Key issues identified from the research (activity 1.1.1) and the curriculum summit (activity 1.2.2) and teased out through the formatting workshops (activity 1.2.3) are used to form the creative content for each episode. Also responding to feedback from phase 1, the episodes are self-contained dramas using a mixture of storytelling and vox pop. A broadcasting plan is created, agreed and signed with MRTV.

01. Media Pre-production Training was held by an International Media Consultant to an acting Line-producer and an acting Assistant Director from MRTV for 3 days in Naypyitaw/Tekkon, to train the pre-production process of TV & Radio productions.

02. Media Technical Training by a local Media Trainer, conducted on the request of the Director General Myint Htway of MRTV, to 23 MRTV staff who became as acting crew members for the TV & Radio productions. It was held in Naypyitaw/Tekkon before commencing the media productions, to grade their technical skills up in filmmaking, audio recording, production and post-production through a 3-day training.
2.1.2: Radio Production: Let’s Think, Let’s Change: Let’s Think, Let’s Change, building on learning from phase I, continues as a radio drama version of the radio talk show. The radio drama, with the same thematic storylines as the TV series, is developed to target the older generation and to support them in understanding issues affecting youth. This activity also comes from the key learning points from phase I. 12 episodes of radio drama, no longer than 10 minutes, are developed and broadcast. A broadcasting plan is created, agreed and signed with MRTV.

2.1.3: Promotion and dissemination: A broadcasting plan is agreed with MRTV and a marketing and dissemination plan developed, with MRTV and target groups, to support promotion of the shows. 2 PSAs of 2 minute each, and 2 theme songs of 5 minutes each, targeting different generational populations, are produced to increase visibility and publicity of the productions. DVDs of the TV and radio productions, the PSAs, and theme songs are produced, and T-shirts, stickers, posters and banners are produced to support the youth mobilisers. These are disseminated through the youth mobilisers, at the MRTV roadshows, and provided to celebrities to support the marketing of the show.

3.1.1: Design of Facilitator Manual: 1 facilitator guide is produced, with 500 copies published, to support the youth facilitators to use the TV and radio productions in creative ways to promote critical thinking and dialogue.

3.1.2: ToT trainings: Led by the Search team, youth facilitators selected from Phase I of the project and the research enumerators (representatives from local youth networks and educational institutes) are trained through a 1 x 5-day training (50 youth: 25 Lashio/25 Yangon- for 1 x 5-day training in Lashio and a 1 x 5-day training in Yangon) in facilitation techniques using the media outputs and the facilitator manual (activity 3.1.1) to train the youth to be able to facilitate dialogue and hold spaces for topics to be discussed at the community level with community members across divides, including ethnic, religious and inter-generational.

3.1.3: Exchange workshop: is held at the end of the project at a youth camp in Bagan to bring the youth from Lashio and Yangon together for a 3-day workshop with 72 participants (19 youth from Lashio, and 24 from Yangon), 6 from MRTV and 23 Search staff to identify key successes and learning from the project and to analyse feedback from the talk show. MRTV and MSW are invited to also participate in this event and to support joint reflection and learning of the project.

3.2.1: Mobile screening - trained facilitators from activity 3.1.2 host community screenings of LTLC television series or radio program and facilitate community dialogues around the themes and questions featured in the show. The facilitators are supported to identify communities in the target areas to lead the viewership sessions. 96 mobile screenings and dialogues are held targeting over 1000 persons.

3.2.2: Mentoring to Facilitators – the Search team provides mentorship to the facilitators during the screenings. They provide coaching during the roll-out sessions, to support the facilitators’ learning and development. In accordance with the issues identified by the message map, local service providers in target areas are identified to connect to community members. 50 youth in teams of 2-3 lead 4 dialogue sessions each with a total 24 of mentoring sessions held (12 in each target area).

2. Methodology

Objectives

The overall objective of this Final Evaluation is to extract lessons for program improvement and ascertain the potential for scaling the project up in the future, to see what worked well and what the challenges were. The
evaluation was conducted from November 27th to December 31st. It is conducted in a participative way and tries to take into account all kind of inputs, quantitative from the survey, qualitative from the KII and the FGs and the desk review, by cooperating closely with Search team. The evaluators hope that this work will also eventually be useful to support professional development and learning for the team members.

The audience of this evaluation is made of two groups:
1. primary users of the evaluation - the Search Myanmar country team and PSF
2. secondary users - program partners, specifically MRTV, government counterparts, and Search colleagues outside of Myanmar, and other INGOs/LNGOs working on similar issues

Data Collection and Analysis
As LTLC targets Greater Yangon (North Okkalapa, Hlaingthayar and Insein) and Lashio, Shan State, the data collection considers the same target areas. Data for the evaluation was collected using the following methods.

➢ Desk review, focus group discussions (FGDs), and key informants’ interviews (KIIs).
➢ Viewership and Listenership survey conducted during 9-17 December 2018.

Quantitative data collection:
The evaluation included a listenership and viewership survey as part of the final evaluation. The sample size for the survey was calculated using 95% confidence level and 5% confidence interval. Most sample size calculators\(^\text{16}\) suggest a sample size of 385 respondents for a population of 1,870,000 people. Consultants added 100 respondents as control group sample size from Thaketa township and then considered a 10% non-response error. This gave a final size of 534 respondents, rounded to 540 to allow a larger size for the Lashio sample.

The consultants used a control sample to measure the impact of Phase II. They chose Thaketa township as the control sample site, as it is a socially mixed area with inward migration and a diverse population profile is expected to be found. Another point is that Thaketa is a township of Yangon and consequently easy to access for the field researchers.

Thaketa being the control sample must not outstrip the 4 project locations but must be large enough to be comparable. Thus, the evaluation team allocated a sample size of 100 for the control location. Then, even if Lashio is smaller than North Okkalapa or Hlaingthayar, it seemed interesting to have a larger sample here to be able to compare Lashio and Greater Yangon as two distinct areas. The distribution of sample size for the three project locations is calculated based on locational priority (Lashio) and population proportion (other three locations).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lashio</td>
<td>323,405</td>
<td>164,893</td>
<td>158,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlaingthayar</td>
<td>687,867</td>
<td>365,005</td>
<td>322,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insein</td>
<td>305,283</td>
<td>159,125</td>
<td>146,158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{16}\) www.surveysystem.com; www.raosoft.com; www.qualics.com, etc.
Table 1: Sample size for the listenership and viewership survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Listeners</th>
<th>Viewers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Okkalapa</td>
<td>333,293</td>
<td>176,953</td>
<td>156,340</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaketa</td>
<td>220,556</td>
<td>113,266</td>
<td>107,290</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,870,404</td>
<td>979,242</td>
<td>891,162</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All calculations and sizing were done with the advice and help of the ILT. Considering the demography, consultants relied on the 2014 census data as there has not been any new census or even official local update since. The consultants also developed a questionnaire for the survey (Annex 1-Questionnaire in English). They adapted the questionnaire from the “Listenership Survey and Reflective Review” to include viewership. They made this choice to produce listenership data that could eventually be used for a consistent comparison with Phase I results. The questionnaire was initially developed in English, sent to Search for review and comments, and once all these comments were incorporated, it was translated into Burmese by the national consultant and then reviewed by Search to double check that the translation of some key concepts (dividing lines, for instance) was accurate (Annex 2-Questionnaire in Burmese). The International consultant then developed an Excel workbook to enter and analyse the data (Annex 3-Survey file).

6 field researchers (FR) were recruited (4 in Yangon (3 women, 1 man), 2 in Lashio (1 woman, 1 man) to conduct the survey on the field. They received a 2-days survey orientation and training (Annex 4- Survey orientation and training plan). People from Lashio came to Yangon to join the training. During this session, field researchers were oriented on the survey, why this survey is being done and how the survey should effectively be carried out. After the orientation the researchers were provided an opportunity for pre-testing the survey questionnaires (Annex 4) of both the questionnaire and the excel file to be used for the data analysis. They were also given the clustered sample size to make the survey inclusive of gender, age, religion/ethnicity.

In Yangon, each field researcher had a quota of 100 answers to collect over 7 to 10 days on the field; in Lashio, each FR had a quota of 70 answers over 5 to 7 days. Evaluators designed a process to adjust data to the required sample: the FRs had to enter the collected data in the excel file every evening and then send the file to evaluators so that they could check the balance (gender, age, religion, ethnicity) and consequently request adjustment if needed. The FRs tried to cover the target areas where the mobile screening took place as much as possible (see below table 2).
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Table 2: Quarters where the mobile screenings took place

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter 4, Quarter 5, Quarter 7, Quarter 9, Quarter 12</th>
<th>North Okkalapa (Kyauk Yae Twin Quarter, A Than Lwint Yone Street, Pantanaw Street, A Wine Kyi Quarter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ei Nai Quarter, Nyaung Pin Pagoda Tar Pone (Basic Education Primary School) teachers</td>
<td>Hlaingtharyar (16th Quarter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 10 (Hearing Center)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 8 (Nay Chi Private High School) (Cherry Pyone, Myanmar Blind People Association)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For safety, the FRs were instructed to work as pairs, even if each FR conducted his/her work independently on the ground but physically at a short distance. They were also provided a credential letter to show to authorities upon request. Every day, they had to send a message to the evaluators to tell them where they intended to go. They took a picture of themselves with the newspaper of the day in their hands, in front of an easily recognized place of each township to prove they went to the right place.

**Qualitative data collection:**

Qualitative data come from 5 Focus Group Discussions (25 participants from Yangon, 15 from Lashio), 19 Key Informant Interviews (4 from Lashio, 3 from Nay Pyi Taw, 12 from Yangon) and a desk review of 50 documents, 12 radio episodes and 8 TV episodes. The size and number of FGDs and KIs were discussed and agreed with Search team. All FGDs were conducted in Burmese by the national evaluator and then translated into English. Some KIs were conducted by the international consultant in English. The participants were identified jointly: the evaluators mentioned the category of participants they wanted and for what data collection tool (FGDs or KIs) and Search, following these instructions, selected, contacted and organised all FGDs, and contacted or provided contacts for all KIs. The evaluators contacted the KIs themselves, as it seemed easier for everyone in terms of their schedule. The consultants developed a matrix with all required data entries to follow up with both the FGDs and KIs. The matrix was uploaded to google drive and could be accessed by the Search team and the evaluators.

During all KIs and FGDs, the evaluators followed a standard questionnaire (see Annex 5 - KII/FGD questionnaire). However, as all meeting were semi-structured, the evaluators did not always ask all the questions in sequence or to strictly stand by this framework. Whenever they could, they let people speak freely and they tried to get a free flow of conversation during the FGDs as much as possible.

The FGDs were (see also Annex 6: List of the FGD participants):

- The 1st FGD, in Yangon involved beneficiaries of the Social Cohesion training (MMPDD, youth facilitators, MRTV…)
- The 2nd FGD, in Lashio, involved Youth Facilitators.
- The 3rd, in Lashio, involved beneficiaries of the Mobile screen activity
- The 4th, in Yangon, involved the media production team
- The 5th, in Yangon, involved audience/community of the program
The KI (Annex 7: List of the KII participants) and the FGDs covered all activities of the project and were selected from among:

- Search project staff
- The 52 Youth Facilitators who benefitted from the various trainings during the project
- The 12 celebrities (Key Influencers) who support and amplify positive messaging on diversity
- The 40 media professionals who worked with SEARCH to produce LTLC
- The 20 Government representatives who benefitted from the Social Cohesion training
- Participants of the National Curriculum Summit
- Participants of the Format-Development Workshop
- Participants of the Promotion and dissemination program
- Participants of the design of the Facilitator Manual
- Participants of the Exchange Workshop
- Participants of the Mentoring to Facilitators program
- Members of some of the 10 Educational Institutions Search has already directly partnered, collaborated or coordinated with in previous projects
- PSF

The evaluators also conducted a thorough desk review considering that there were 50 documents, 12 radio episodes and 8 TV episodes to review (see also Annex 8 - List of the documents included in the desk review). It is important to note that Search staff always tried to provide any documents that the evaluators requested, as much as possible.

**Limitations**

The evaluation was carried out with a very tight timeline: the evaluation had to be conducted from November 27th to December 31st, some with multiple milestones (questionnaire and survey) which we knew would take time to develop, translate and implement, in addition to the desk review of 50 documents and 20 episodes of radio and TV programs of 10 minutes each. Even if the evaluation team members shared the workload between them, they could not thoroughly read and digest all the desk review documents before they designed the questionnaire. This may have weakened the survey. If the evaluators would have had more time, they would have been able to further adjust and tailor the questions.

On the ground, the FRs noticed that some of the areas they were asked to survey, following the list of places where the mobile screenings were organized\(^\text{18}\), were not fully in the township considered, like A Than Lwint Yone Street which is actually in Mayangon. They also faced some difficulties on the ground, aggressive attitudes from some respondents and lack of attention from others, that might have impacted some of the answers.

Despite Search project staff doing their best to help the evaluators and answer their requests, they were also very busy during the end of the year period. In addition, the DM&E officer left Search in October so there was no one specialised to provide the various participants lists, “pre- post” test questionnaires or other monitoring data. These elements delayed some of the documents’ delivery with impact on the evaluators’ organisation and on the findings as well.

Lastly, due to the cultural sensitivity and decades of suppressive political culture, it is not easy for Myanmar people to talk openly, especially about sensitive topics like the ones the project aimed at, nor is it a cultural norm to debate openly. The experienced national consultant’s ability to conduct meetings and interviews in

---

\(^{18}\) Quarter list of Mobile screenings, document 4.8 from the Desk Review
Myanmar allowed the FGDs and KII to be fruitful. However, it is still possible that some of the participants provided the responses that they thought the interviewer wanted to hear (which is a common social norm) or just avoided sharing an answer that was different from that of others. This of course could impact the findings. To help people feel more at ease to speak, evaluators always mentioned that the interviews were anonymous and that no one will be quoted under his/her name.
3. Findings

The evaluation used two major data collection approaches. The qualitative data was collected based on the evaluation criteria outlined in the Terms of Reference, namely relevance, effectiveness, coordination/coherence, sustainability and opportunities for scaling up. Similarly, the quantitative data collection was carried out to capture the viewership and listenership rates of the TV/Radio programs. The analysis of qualitative data is complemented by the relevant data and analysis from viewership/listenership surveys. The conclusion and recommendations are derived from both qualitative and quantitative data and corresponding analysis.

The evaluation was guided by the questions developed following the OECD-DAC criteria of evaluation, according to the ToR.

- **Relevance** assess whether the project is in line with local needs and priorities (as well as donor policy)
- **Effectiveness** measures the extent to which an activity achieves its purpose, or whether this can be expected to happen on the basis of the outputs. Implicit within this criterion of effectiveness is timeliness.
- **Coordination/Coherence** assesses the need to assess how the project implementation team communicated, coordinated and collaborated with each other. It also looks into how the different project components complement each other to generate a cumulative result.
- **Sustainability** measures how the initiatives started by the project, the results generated by the project or the institutional mechanisms created by the project sustain beyond the life of the project.

### Relevance

The evaluation found that the project strategies and interventions are relevant to the current conflict dynamics and local needs for building peace in their localities. This has been vindicated by the statements of the interviewees during the evaluation process. “Our country is in a bad situation. There are conflicts everywhere, so I believe the objectives and messages of this project are very relevant for Myanmar”, said one of the KIIs. To support this opinion and to consider how relevant the project is considering the overall conflict dynamics in target townships, the is the “Rapid Assessment Report” (09/17), the “Myanmar Community Information Management Report” (03/16), the “Rapid Conflict Assessment: Lashio & North Okkalapa” (02/2017), and the “Youth-led Participatory Research” (May 2018) were conducted, which amply document the sensitive conflict situation in project target locations, as well as the State/Divisions that they belong to. During the FGDs in Lashio, participants mentioned the drug problems as a major issue of violence and they linked it with the lack of job opportunities in the area. Drug problems were the main topic of the radio series in the project and one of the key topics of the TV series, and they were widely discussed during the mobile screening sessions held by the youth facilitators in their communities. An FGD participant said: “In Lashio, we don’t have proper job opportunities for the young people. After graduating, you can’t find a job. So many people are being pushed into the drug industry, where you can make money easily. I didn’t know about LTLC before the activity and I found it very useful to have the mobile screening dialogue to talk about these topics”. This is consistent with the “Myanmar Strategy 3 Pager” summarizing Search Myanmar’s 3-years strategy which mentions that Search will “address the root causes of violence” and will do it “collaborating with local communities and partners, media professionals, and key influencers”. The “Search Myanmar Program Overview” explains that since 2014, “Search has conducted detailed conflict mapping and capacity building trainings for actors and media professionals and produced short films, radio dramas and one TV drama series that bring stories from the ground up, grapple with key conflict drivers and provide positive portrayals of ethnic, religious, and social minority groups”. This experience drives the LTLC phase II.
Hlaingthayar was added in Phase II following a request from local partners and the “Listenership Survey and Reflective Review” (June 2017) recommendation that “additional project areas should be included, with a greater geographic coverage in each of those areas”. Participants of the FGDs in Yangon also mentioned that in Hlaingthayar there was a need for social cohesion activities. Hlaingthayar was also the control sample area of the “Listenership Survey and Reflective Review”. All of these elements that make it a logical choice. Considering that Insein is close to Hlaingthayar and forms “Greater Yangon” with North Okkalapa and Hlaingthayar makes this choice of target area. logical as well.

Regarding the conflict dynamics, it is important to note that the project was developed just before and started a month after the August 2017 crisis in Rakhine State that led to 700,000 persons self-identifying as Rohingya to flee to Bangladesh. The crisis triggered a further escalation in the already critical Rakhine conflict, further fuelled the rise of Buddhist nationalism and ‘othering’ towards Muslims in 2018, and contributed to current tensions and fear among the population in discussing religious issues across the country.

The selection of the youth and their trainings (SC, CGA, mentoring) were well designed and this is measured by the youth’s capacity to fully and successfully conduct the mobile screening activities at the end of the project. Some youth regretted that they could not practice enough during the mentoring sessions. The mobile screening of the TV series was highly relevant according to the KII and FGDs where participants widely mentioned that there conversations during the sessions that facilitated dialogue around various issues of concern among stakeholders and amicable solutions were found. The SC and CGA trainings were praised by all participants in the FGDs, both youth facilitators and media professionals, to be highly useful for facilitation and even a ‘life changer’, according to one KII. The facilitator’s manual developed for the screenings is easy to use with a clear training structure and a wide range of exercise suggestions. When applied during the ToT training for the youth, it proved efficient.

Regarding community members’ and other stakeholders’ perceptions of the project and its activities vis-à-vis their needs, there was a positive response from the KII and FGDs participants. “The training of social cohesion is very useful for me and it will be useful throughout my life. My department’s [MOI] main focus is the library and accordingly I have to deal with all kinds of people in my work. I need good communication skills. In this sense, the SC training organized by Search was very useful for my working environment”. This quote of an FGD participant has been echoed throughout all FGDs and many KIIs. Both project and activities are well perceived by stakeholders, both by youth facilitators and media professionals. Another KII respondent appreciated that “the activities were very flexible to implement”. However, among media professionals, there has also been some concerns about the “Format Development Workshop” and Radio and TV Production. Some other participants said that “the Format Development Workshop and the media productions were not adapted to their needs as they were expecting more technical inputs.” The original design of Search was to support ‘content’ production recognising that other agencies such as JICA are investing heavily in technical support. However, to solve this immediate issue, Search provided an added activity, the “Media technical training” dedicated to TV (recognising that the radio team had received technical training in Phase 1). However, media professionals also mentioned that their needs in radio program production techniques were not fulfilled. Considering that the project focused on content development, and adjusted to include extra technical capacity building during implementation, this can be considered for future projects. It is recommended to align expectations from the outset. During the production, the international expert recruited for both radio and TV focused mainly on TV and did not spent enough time on radio production. MRTV radio staff said about this – “One day, the international expert was telling us to do something, the following day he had already forgotten.

---

19 https://www.unocha.org/sites/unocha/files/JRP%20for%20Rohingya%20Humanitarian%20Crisis%202018.PDF
what he had said and he was asking for something else. We were lost and discouraged” said one FGD participant. Still, it is important to mention that in Phase I of LTLC, radio was the only media involved and that MRTV staff received radio training at that time.

All stakeholders interviewed considered the project’s design, implementation methodology, and process to be coherent with their needs. Community members praise the mobile screening activity – one of the FGD participants said “whether Search continues to work on this project or not, we will go on ourselves to continue mobile screenings as we have been already working on this kind of advocacy projects before. I am going to do mobile screenings of the TV series in Thingan Gyune [a township of Yangon]. From my experience, normal trainings are difficult for grassroots people to participate in. Mobile screenings and discussions are more useful for them. During the dialogue, they can share their experience to their communities easily.” The design and methodology of the project, especially Search’s intention to have all participants trained on SC and CGA, proved to be highly relevant. However, due to the very tight timeline of the project, some trainings such as mobile screenings, message mapping, mentoring felt “rushed”, according to various participants who consider they did not get enough explanations and/or support to implement the mobile screening efficiently, for instance. A KI from Hlaingthayar said: “When trying to do a mobile screening, me and my colleague faced a problem on the ground. The quarter administration officer did not allow us to organize the mobile screening of the TV show. I had to submit a formal request for permission through a letter at the Hlaingtharyar township administration office, where the officer told me it would probably take 2 weeks to get the permission. I could not wait as there was a deadline given by Search. So, I went to see the Hlaingtharyar constituency MP at the Lower House, U Win Maun, and asked him to help me. He called the township officer and supported my request. I got the permission and organized the screening in time.” This anecdote shows the positive effect of Search’s trainings: this KI asked for Search’s help but finally solved her problems herself. This kind of empowerment proves the validity of Search’s approach. The evaluation considers that the project’s design, implementation and methodology worked fine and was coherent with the need of the target areas. However, they acknowledge that in a project of this dimension, there is a need for more time for some of the strategic activities.

Effectiveness
The project was rooted in the following theory of change: “If popular culture constructively challenges existing negative narratives and stereotypes of the ‘other’ that fuel divisions and enable 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”.

Consequently, to address popular culture, Search developed 12 episodes of radio programs and 8 episodes of TV programs, 2 PSAs, and a song with a music video. All products except the song, which was only finalised on December 31st, are achieved and were broadcast (Radio, TV) on MRTV. The TV series also broadcast on DVB, Mizzima, and Channel 9 as well and there is possibility that they will be broadcast on MNTV in 2019 again and uploaded on Youtube at the project end. Search took good advantage of the “Viewership and Listenership Survey” conducted in Lashio and North Okkalapa in February 2017. The survey mentioned that Monday and Saturday were the best days to broadcast to get the larger audience and viewer share and actually the TV series was broadcast on MRTV Saturday, Sunday and Monday, 2 episodes a week, from 13/10/18 to 15/11/18, each episode broadcast twice (a first time then a replay). The radio episodes were broadcast on MRTV from 14/10/18 to 24/11/18 with the same pattern, 2 episodes each week, each episode broadcast twice (a first time then a replay), on Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday and on DVB throughout December and on Mizzima and MNTV. Output 2.1 “Produced, broadcast and disseminated TV and radio show episodes to the target areas” is achieved.
There was also a “youth-led participatory research on social cohesion in urban areas” conducted in May 2018. The research team provided CGA and Research methodology training to 52 Youth, (26 each in Lashio and Yangon). This training was “highly successful” as almost all the participants interviewed highly appreciated it. It was instrumental in developing self-confidence of the participants and developed their inquiry skills. One of the participants said: “For me, the training was very useful. Before I was very introvert and isolated, I did not dare to talk with people I did not know. If I had to talk in public, I was very nervous. But thanks to the project training and the research, I improved a lot. Now I can talk to people I do not know, and I became more open, I am more confident. Now I try to share my knowledge with my friends”. The research provides factual information about conflict and social cohesion issues as it was expected with output 1.1. “Mobilized and trained target youth to implement participatory research and provide factual information about conflict and social cohesion issues”.

The media products were created in association with 33 Youth facilitators, media professionals and celebrities who during a “National Curriculum Summit” jointly worked to design a message map of the core drivers of conflict and negative narratives and stereotypes of the ‘other’ that fuel divisions and enables violent conflict. According to the activity report, the main thematic areas (for message development) that emerged were “Youth and Drugs”, “Adults and Youth collaborating for peacebuilding initiatives for social harmony”, “Government and Businesspersons allocating resources equally and responsibly to all states”, “Social Media users should post verified information in an ethical (not harming, not discriminating, not provoking each other....) and rational way”, “People from different ethnicity and religion collaborate without any discrimination” and “Men and women should respect each other regardless of gender and their sexual orientation”. In the “Format Development Workshop” which followed and organized the production of the series, 5 messages were finally selected and developed into scripts and synopsis of one of each of the following thematic areas: 1) Collaboration without discrimination, 2) Diversity, 3) Social media, including sexual harassment, 4) Drug abuse, 5) Youth and adults-generational gap.

The 5 thematic messages were included in the TV series, while the radio series focused on “drug abuse” and the PSAs on “collaboration without discrimination” and “diversity”. To reach the largest possible audience, in addition to the broadcasting, Search developed a mobile screening followed by dialogue conducted by youth facilitators from diverse communities (religious, gender, disabled...). In this activity, Youth trained in facilitation and prepared and conducted 96 dialogue sessions in Lashio and Greater Yangon (North Okkalapa, Insein, Hlaingthayar), the project’s target areas. From the training reports, the production of the media products, the “Youth-Led participatory research and the youth-conducted mobile screening, the evaluators conclude that outcome 1. “Youth, government, educational leaders, and media professionals have increased skills and knowledge to implement project activities that foster social cohesion” is completed. The project indicators confirm that point. (Table 3. Below, at the end of the findings session). There were also SC and CGA trainings to MRTV and Myanmar Motion Pictures Department (MMPD) staff. The MMPD training was added at the request of the Director of MRTV, and therefore supports social cohesion training for the Myanmar Motion Pictures industry as well as MRTV.

The broadcasting of the radio and TV series spread the messages that were selected in the workshops. The survey conducted in the target areas shows that 14% of the population knew about
the LTLC radio series and 12.6% of the population knew the TV series, figures calculated with the respondents’ data of all the target areas combined (Graph 1 and 2). From the population aware of the programs, 38% listened at the radio series and 32% watched the TV series.

The “Listenership survey and Reflective Review” conducted at the end of Phase I mentions that “according to the Search Asia Regional DM&E Specialist, similar programs [to Phase I or Phase II] 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 reasonable. 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. Then indeed these rates of 38% and 32% (of the people who knew about it) are reasonable and prove the effectiveness of the LTLC program. According to the survey, 9.3% of the population either

---

20 Viewership rates of Singhadurbar (14%) among target locations and Hamro Team (10.1%) in Nepal and Sikka Team in Sri Lanka (6% among control group and 20% among project participants) are also found to be within this range.

listened or watched the series, which means more than 4.5 million Myanmar citizens. This is considering only MRTV. Broadcasting on DVB, Mizzima, MNTV and Channel 9, and MRTV 4, and posting on Facebook and YouTube will extend this reach. For example, DVB’s facebook followers alone are over 10 million.

When asked what topics they remember from the series, people mention primarily “Family and Education”, “Job Opportunities”, “Domestic Violence” and “Drugs”, which cover the main ones the series dealt with, except for “Social media, including sexual harassment”. However, this issue was broadly discussed during many of the mobile screening dialogues: one FGD participant understood from the TV “that women should take care about using social media. For instance, in the TV series, if the main female actor does not use the social media wrongly, she doesn’t get into trouble. Now I think that for a girl, she must be careful in using social media - not to put her picture online and get into trouble”. Another participant stated that “the message of the TV series is very useful. It highlights that many young people are wasting their time using social media”. A KI said that “the program shows problems between parents and children, about drugs and about couples. Viewers during mobile screening reacted a lot and discussed the points, they understood much better than before. Here in Lashio, our community has lived in a deep comfort zone, and not wanted to face the youth problems of jobs, drugs, family, or domestic violence. The TV series creates space for us to talk about these topics and to build awareness and knowledge”. Other FGD participant said that during the mobile screening dialogues he organised: “We discussed about drug, domestic violence, and social cohesion”. One FGD participant also mentioned that she talked “with a university’s student in Hlaingthayar, about social cohesion or diversity. He didn’t know anything about that, he even told me that he never heard these words before! Once I started to explain, he was very responsive and wanted to know more about that”.

Actually, among all 5 FGDs and most KIIs, there was unanimity about the quality and content of the messages. As one KI said, “considering the situation of the country, these messages are highly needed”. Another KI proves the quality of this resonance: “In Hlaingthayar, I conducted a mobile screening with youth aged 12 to 14 years. In the beginning, I was planning to show them some movie episodes but I changed my mind considering that the messages in the story were very complex for them. I had them listen to radio episode 3 and 8 instead. Number 8 tells the story of a young boy about 13 years’ old who lives with his uncle and his uncle pushes him to work. As a result, he runs away from home and he meets the wife of a drug dealer who enrols him in the drug business. He becomes a drug dealer and user himself but finally he joins a rehabilitation centre. I choose this episode as the character is the same age as the participants and the story is simple to understand: the bad impact of family problems and of using drugs. I was actually very surprised when I realised the young participants understood the messages perfectly. I thought even simple messages like that would be hard for them as they are from the very poor families. But in reality, they already know a lot about these issues and they could react and discuss about these contents. It was really impressive. For me it was also a lesson: many people tend to decide what other people are only from their appearance and their situation, as I did with these young participants. But what I understood from this story and what is one of the messages of the programs is that this is a wrong attitude”. The survey also proves that the radio and TV series favoured dialogue (Graph 5 and 6).
The above example of increased respect between communities echoes the testimonies collected among the youth facilitators, many of them trying to increase the respect among their communities with discussion and facilitations efforts as it is expected by the theory of change. A KI said “before, one of my friends showed disrespect and discriminated other people from other communities, she didn’t want to talk with people different from her. Now, after talking a lot, I convinced her this was not proper. She has changed and is more open-minded now”. The same explained that “she persuaded one of her friends to try to stop taking drugs.” From the trainings and the TV episodes, she understood better the feelings of drug users better and therefore, although she didn’t see him anymore as she thought he was dangerous, she decided to see him again. He received her well and “now they are trying together to get him back to a normal life”. Another KI explained that “after the discussion in the mobile screening, the participants understood better the problems between parents and children, about drugs, about couple life. And they also saw that there were ways to solve them by exchanging and talking. They really liked it”. Two other KIs mentioned the same idea, that before they saw the movies, they never thought of drug addicts as people with feelings or as being trapped, missing their friends and their families. Now both of them said that they realised that if drug addicts are treated well, they can change. The program created a strong awareness amongst participants of “othering” or “stereotyping” people, encouraging acceptance of individuals with their own specificities, who deserve respect and attention. For instance, a KI who organized mobile screenings said: “In the Search project there was no separate program for disabled persons. Disabled persons seldom get such opportunities. When I did a mobile screening, I invited them. This kind of discussion opportunity is really a rare thing and valuable thing for them”. The same KI explained that now “the disabled people I work with are more confident after the dialogue and are better able to exchange with others”. From the trainings received to these implementations, all establish that output 3.1 “Trained and mentored target youth in facilitation and mediation skills” is complete.

This understanding of diversity and the respect in the answers to it are also measured by the survey. To the statements “After listening to the Let’s Think, Let’s Change program, I am more accepting and trusting of people who are different from me” (77%) (Graph 7), “I learned that men and women from different cultures and religions have important roles to play in Myanmar society” (67%) (Graph 8) and “I believe that the Let’s Think, Let’s Change program has contributed to harmony in my community” (62%) (Graph 9), respondents showed significant positive response.
Both qualitative and quantitative data confirm that the project contributed to developing constructive narratives and mechanisms to deliver those narratives to challenging existing ones and that it was able to actually challenge those negative narratives and stereotypes. Consequently, the project contributed to increasing public understanding of and respect for different members of their diverse communities. In the survey, to the statement “The ‘Let’s Think, Let’s Change’ program has helped me to develop a greater understanding of the various divisions within Myanmar society”, 82% of the respondents agree or strongly agree (Graph 10). The output 3.2 “Increased community dialogue and exchange interactions from across divided lines” is complete.

However, there are not many evidences that hatred and prejudices across dividing lines have decreased in the project areas. KII and FGD participants mentioned that they didn’t dare to push the dialogue too far on some issues, religions and religious beliefs for instance. If we look at the survey, results to the question “Did the program inspire you to talk to people from other cultures and religions?” (Graph 11) has 36% of listeners/viewers of radio/TV programmes. Still, it is an encouraging impact as the target of the project was set at 40%. Some KIs and FGDs participants suggested to carry mobile screenings to Ayeyarwaddy and Magway divisions as MRTV’s viewership is stronger in these areas. This would be a way to increase the impact of the program.
From all the elements of resonance presented above and from the response measured from both qualitative and quantitative data, the evaluation concludes that outcome 2: “the public has increased understanding of the importance of collaboration and respect across divides” and outcome 3: “state/citizen, interethnic and interreligious positive interaction and trust has increased” are partially achieved. Still results are encouraging and there is obviously room to build on this in future work and activities.

Another point is that, although the TV series developed a message about social media and rumour and that indeed it resonates as the KII and FGDs participants quotes above mentioned, the impact is positive but not high as Graph 12 and 13 show. 56% of the respondents consider that the program taught them the importance of questioning the accuracy of rumours and 62% of the respondents say they check now the veracity of news and rumours before sharing them although many mobile screenings’ implementers mention that there was a lot of discussions about rumours and social medias during their sessions. If 56% and 62% are good results, they are still under the 77%, 67%, 82% other impact’s indicators reach. A way to increase the awareness about rumours and social medias would be to have more messages about it in a future program.

Considering output 1.2: “Increased knowledge and skills of government officials, media professionals and other key influencers in fostering social cohesion to support creation of media outputs”, it was found that all trainings were delivered and there was even an additional “Media Technical Training”. According to the M&E table (annex 8), the CGA/SC training was set for 24 people but finally 26 attended and the “National Curriculum Summit” was set for 18 individuals but a total of 33 media professionals, key influencers and youth actively participated in this summit. The final reports of these trainings - “Social Cohesion for Professional Development” for MRTV, 15-17 March 2018, one report by Khin Thet San, one report by Htet Htet Aung, “Social Cohesion for Professional Development” for MMPDD, 19-21 October, report by Htet Htet Aung & U Thuya Hein - reveal that all their objectives were met and that most of the trainees’ expectations were fulfilled. The CGA report from the trainers also mentioned that an increase in knowledge and skills were measured but the “pre-post” test questionnaires are not provided. During an FGD, a staff from MoI said “in our working environment [government office-MOI] we don’t pay enough attention to others. I didn’t care so much about others. For instance, I didn’t thank people for helping me when that happened. And that did not happen often as we didn’t see the point to help each other. Actually, I use to put my agenda first, doing things only the way I want. Now, I try to understand other’s views, not only mine. I changed the way I work. Now, before deciding anything, I always discuss with my staff, I open my door to everyone, I give people a space to express their views. I don’t behave like I am a boss and my staff just have to obey. And I happen to get new ideas coming from others and helpful in my work when doing like that”. Another MOI staff who participated in FGD said: “I understand better how to make a presentation efficiently and my personal skills are better as well. I communicate in a better way with others. I also know better how to conduct a proper research and how to
deal positively with others. Last point, now I know how to work as a team”. Given the hierarchical top down working culture in Myanmar, this is significant.

Now, according to many FGDs and KIs as well as the report, the “Format Development Workshop” turned out to be difficult. There was the clash of two different working cultures. The production ways in Myanmar are very different from the international production standards. At the international level, individuals involved in a production are highly specialised; in MRTV, most staff do a little bit of everything. Due to the timeline and the budget, only one international expert was recruited for the production of both TV and Radio products. Due to visa difficulties, this expert could not arrive as early as it was wished and he did not have enough time to understand the Myanmar context, and had to start the work immediately. As explained in the Relevance Section, production in Myanmar is very far from the international standards and the expert had to adapt. It was very difficult for him – as he explains in his report – as well as for some of the media professionals – who talked about their frustrations during the FGDs - to work together. For instance, an FGD participant said that “(The international expert) gave us tasks to do but did not give us detailed instructions on how to do them”. On the other hand, in his report, the international expert explains that on day 2, “TV group made an “unexpected shift” from a TV drama format to a live/interview format show”, then on day 3, “The TV group made another sudden overnight decision to produce a mini TV-drama series. Thus, there was a need to fast-track back to the original agenda for the TV group”. Anyway, according to another FGD participant, “we could do around 70% of what we were expected to do”.

The international expert was a skilled producer according to international standard. He knew about script writing, synopsis and planning but was not a highly trained technician even if he knew the technical basics. Therefore, he focused his teaching on its strong points. Some media professionals liked it – a FGD participant said that she learnt a lot from the international expert about script writing and it was useful for her in her job. However, some others wanted only technical support (i.e. camera, sound techniques etc) and did not enjoy other inputs. It is meaningful to note that during the shooting, when the international expert was not there anymore, the disagreement between the people who are more planning-oriented and those who favour a more technical approach surfaced in the field, as reported by 3 KIs.

The report of social cohesion training for Government staff mentions that “during the first day of the training, there was a quiet atmosphere like tension, misunderstanding and mistrust among the participants, who felt uncomfortable and had passive participation” but that by the end “the participant interest was high and they openly and freely shared their experience and comments in positive ways”. According to the trainers, “the training design meets the need of the participants. Its design focuses on the challenges of the individual and promotes a healthy relationship among the participants. Participants took the challenge and stepped out from their comfort zone, which led to new learning”. If we add this to the “Media Technical Training” and the KII and FGDs participants feedback, and also considering that from their experience in media development, the evaluators see the activities as well as their sequence as the right ones, an increase “in fostering social cohesion to support creation of media outputs”.

We can also say that “the project contributed to building capacity of radio & TV producers, youth, and media professionals in conflict transformation and social cohesion”. Examples of these are that the project participants now use their new skills and knowledge in their professional practice. A KI said that “before I accepted the idea of diversity but I did not try to find common ground that works for everyone, I just tried to stay away from others who are different from me in terms of ideas. I did what I wanted and I was an individualist. Now I have a different perspective: it is good to find a common ground, not to stay away from others”. Another respondent said, “When it comes to conflict with someone, now I know how to deal with it thanks to the SC and CGA trainings”. Another quote from a youth facilitator who attended the ToT training is:
“Thanks to the facilitation training, I know better how to deal with people. I am also more tolerant. I remember what the trainer told us and these things can be used in other trainings. Actually, I have delivered the training of facilitation techniques already twice”. “As a professional teacher, what I learnt is that it is useless to try to make students understand a concept by force. It is not because I want it that they can do it. So now I explain step by step and I am improving at that. I understand how to explain systematically”, says a youth participant in an FGD. And finally, a youth facilitator summarised in a KII: “What I understood from the training is that you cannot force other people to do what you want. If you force them, even if they follow what you said for a while, it will not last long. They will change their minds. But if you can convince them then, for instance by showing them the consequences of what they do, they will find by themselves what they should do.”

To some extent, the project was successful too in fostering dialogue among divided communities and creating an improved understanding and relationships as well as increased tolerance according to the survey (Graph 14, Graph 15) which shows that some people from the listeners and viewers made new friends from other religions or ethnicities after and that 67% of the same listeners and viewers consider that “After the LTLC program, I understand that collaboration and respect between people from across dividing lines is essential for peace”.

![Graph 14: How many new friends have you made from other religions or ethnicities since you first listened to the program?](image)

![Graph 15: After this program, I understand that collaboration and respect between people from across dividing lines is essential for peace.](image)

A KI who organized mobile screenings in Hlaingthayar said that “the people who assisted me in organizing the screening have never participated in such a discussion and never heard this kind of messages before. Usually for us, many NGOs come in Hlaingtharyar, do their work, mostly surveys, ask some questions, then give some money and then leave. That’s what my community is used to face. Now they know something different and they want to have more of this kind of discussion”.

Another good sign of the project quality and achievements is that most participants interviewed wanted to participate in more trainings, research and dialogue. Almost all youth facilitators interviewed said that they wanted to carry on activities with Search. They also showed sign of using their new skills: “Now if someone or a group invite me to come and show and discuss, I go and do”. From MRTV side, the Director of Radio definitely wants to carry on.

Finally, if we consider the overall project Goal: “To Increase the promotion and acceptance of diversity as a social norm, contributing to social cohesion and inter-communal harmony, in Myanmar”, the evaluation concludes that it is achieved, as shown by the results corresponding to the 2 indicators to measure this element: “% increased tolerance of diversity among the target beneficiaries as measured by the positive attitude shift of the target communities towards “others” (28%), and “% of people surveyed who say that they...
have had a meaningful conversation with someone from “other” ethnic, religious, socio-political identity, at least once in the last 12 months” (30%). Both targets were set to 12% which means the targets are surpassed.

**Coordination/ Coherence**

Generally, the project activities (e.g. capacity-building, dialogue, media and outreach) were sufficiently coherent to generate the desired results. For instance, the youth facilitators who organized the mobile screening and dialogue were firstly trained in Social cohesion and Common Ground Approach and then received a ToT about facilitation and a mentoring session to be able to prepare and deliver the sessions. An evidence that the activities were coherent enough is that the youth facilitators could deliver the mobile screening sessions properly, even when facing challenges. For instance, during KIIs and FGDs, some youth explained that during the dialogue they had to manage the disagreements between some participants about social media rumours or drug users but they could overcome this. The evaluators did not find any elements telling of any meaningful crisis during a mobile screening. Some interviewees reported that “sometimes there was some tensions during the dialogue but then they managed to overcome them”, often by avoiding topics they feared would be conflictual, like religion. Some facilitators did not receive training from Search but were only trained by other facilitators who attended the ToT training, which is further evidence that the activities were coherent. However, the ToT do not address specific adults’ learning process, like objectives’ selection and adaptation, learning methods adjustment for the audience and objectives (visual, auditive, kinesthetic approaches all needed, attention patterns). If facilitators are to train other people, it would be a great help for them to include this specific process in a future program.

For media professionals, the activities themselves were also sufficiently coherent. However, due to the staff turnover, MRTV staff trained in CGA/SC were not always the ones involved in the following trainings. For instance, when there were conflicts between the international expert and some MRTV staff during the “Format Development Workshop” or between different MRTV staff during the media production, a CGA approach should have been used to solve the issues. A way to avoid the impact of the turnover would then be to train all participants of the project, and especially all media professionals on the CGA approach.

However, when it appeared clearly that some MRTV staff lacked the technical skills to conduct the project, they benefited from the “Media Technical Training” and it was actually a good reaction. This is especially visible in the active participation of all stakeholders to the SC and CGA trainings. This creates a Common Ground to work with as they all know the same technics and they can therefore rely on them whenever disagreements come out. A media professional participant in an FGD told, “we quarrelled a lot on Viber as we disagree on many points. Some wanted to do things this way, some wanted to do another way. For instance, in different parts of the script, parents’ names of the two main actors were different. So, we had to discuss seriously to finally find an agreement. There was also a strong disagreement among us about how the TV series should end”. The coordination between Search Myanmar, MRTV and radio production partners, and other partner organizations while implementing the project proved sometimes challenging. A few youth facilitators said about the lack of proper explanations (for instance, clear objectives of the “Youth-led participatory research”), the lack of support for the mobile screening activity (when some youth said they asked for help and Search answered them they will help but didn’t), especially in Lashio, and felt that there was a lack of feedback or listening to their suggestions. MRTV staff and other people involved in the production, including PSA production teams, said that there were a few last-minute changes on plans from Search, which posed challenges to the team. For instance, an FGD participant said, “we decided to locate the story in Pin Laung as Search told us it wanted to show beautiful places from Myanmar in the TV series and we planned the shooting accordingly. Then we were told that there was not enough budget to shoot in Pin Laung. Then we were told that finally there was enough budget. We didn’t know what to do.” In the same FGD, one of the media persons
involved in the PSAs added that “for them as well, Search was changing its requests or decisions a lot, but it was only a two minutes-long story so it was not a big deal.” However, there some people from MRTV were very happy with Search coordination, as a KI said: “During the ‘format development training’, Search did everything we requested. They made suggestions but did not intervene, the decision was ours. I liked it”. There were, as in every partnership, some challenges working with MRTV in making decisions and retaining consistency with staff. Another point highlighted by a KI was that “the program was about drugs, so we had to interview some government departments but they did not want to answer, they did not want to let us record their voices for broadcasting. So, we had to ask permission step by step, for many steps”. Another piece of feedback from a Search staff member is that “there were so many meetings to plan everything and to solve problems. But then because of the time we spent in meetings, we could not implement things enough and that created new problems, then new meetings...”.

Considering how effective the communication between all project stakeholders was, there was a good communication and coordination between Search and Paung Sie Facility (PSF) according to a KI, as “PSF was always responsive to SEARCH requests”. Similarly, the KIIs from PSF acknowledged the good relationship between the two organisations. However, they also pointed that Search was sometimes slow in following up with its requests.

There have been some communications challenges between project participants and Search. Some of the youth interviewed mentioned that they got information too late, so “they could not organise the mobile screening properly”. From MRTV side, it is clear from the interviews that most interviewees don’t understand the project as a whole, and especially why Search is working with MRTV. They see only the production issues, not the capacity building. And those who see both do not see the link, from what the evaluators understood. Communication issues also happened between MRTV and other partners, like the Harvest Rehabilitation Centre, whose owner accepted to host some part of the TV series shooting. He accepted because MRTV asked him, but he didn’t know anything about the background and the project. “7 ladies came to visit my place, then the following day they went to my home to discuss with my mother”, he explained. He added that “he saw 20 people arriving, he didn’t know they will be so many, he didn’t know he had to organise something, like food and drinks, for them”. He said he was pleased to have them, but he also mentioned very long days working, the difficulty to order food, the fact that he needed to plan very well as the centre is in Lagu, far from the town, and that it was not easy for him to understand what all this was about. Some participants to the “National Curriculum Summit” acknowledged the quality of training but regretted that “they worked on the message map, then the training ended and after they had no more news from Search, they were not informed about what were the selected messages and what how exactly they were used” However, from some KIIs, what the consultants understand is that the former Project Manager made regular presentation to the participants but there were some participants who said that they were not able to fully grasp the presentation.

The main strength of the project is the quality of the project design, planning and execution. Despite working against a tight timeline, with ongoing conflicts in the country in a critical time and a lack of sufficient human resources, Search was able to finish the project in time with most indicators met and often surpassed. This is quite an evidence of strength. Then the commitment of the youth facilitators and their will to carry on and to share what they learnt is another strength.

According to participants of KIIs and FGDs – especially youth, MRTV staff, PSAs team, Search -, the budget was too tight for some of the activities, like the TV Production, or it did not allow to finance some needed points, like a KI explained: “Usually, if you invite a celebrity to a program, you give him/her some money. So, when we got celebrities involved in the LTLC program in our studio, we understood that we will give them something. But Search did not have money for that. So, we didn’t know how much money we should give to the celebrity.
It was quite a challenge”. Search overcame this budget issue by optimising the spending as much as it could and by requesting the donor to allow some adjustments/changes in the budget lines’ (which PSF approved).

Some interviewees made also negative comments about the “artistic” part of the project’s content, either the movies or the main visual, saying they were not “good”. But “artistic” is not easy to define and varies a lot from a community to another, from an individual to another.

Another challenge reported by many youth facilitators is that they didn’t have credentials to show to local authorities to organise the mobile screenings, so it was sometimes very difficult for them to prove who they were, what the activity would be, what the objectives were. This limited the areas reached and the possible places to hold the meetings. To solve this issue, some youth contacted their local MP, others used their new facilitation skills to persuade the local authorities and others organised their mobile screenings in monasteries as it is the head monk they had to discuss with and not the local authorities anymore.

The last big challenge, after signing the contract with PSF, Search had to recruit a new team and, as the timeline was very tight faced challenges to identify suitable team members. When starting, these newcomers were new to Search’s approach to SC and CGA, and their learning developed in parallel to the production. They quickly got involved without enough time to prepare themselves. Search overcame the challenge thanks to the involvement of its management and also to the commitment of its new staff.

**Sustainability**

This section tries to address the question: “How has the project contributed to creating a conducive environment for promoting the acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar?” As already mentioned, an estimated 4.5 million Myanmar citizens listened or viewed the LTLC program. If we consider now the impact as measured by the survey through the following statements we already met above: “After listening to the Let’s Think, Let’s Change program, I understand that collaboration and respect between people from across dividing lines is essential for peace” (Graph 7), “After listening to the Let’s Think, Let’s Change program, I am more accepting and trusting of people who are different from me” (Graph 8), “I learned that men and women from different cultures and religions have important roles to play in Myanmar society” (Graph 13), 67%, 77% and 61% respectively agreed to these statements.

These 3 statements measure the positive impact created by the LTLC project. In order to get an average, if we calculate the average of the 3 percentages (67%, 77%, 61%), it equals 68%. We can therefore consider that 4,500,000*68%=3,060,000 Myanmar citizens have been positively impacted by the project. It is of course a rough calculation but considering the added impact of broadcasting on DVB, Mizzima and other channels (with
an audience population of more than 10 million), there is no doubt about the real impact of the programs. So, the evaluation can conclude that the project contributed to creating a conducive environment for promoting the acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar.

When considering evidence that shows the shift in knowledge, attitude and behaviour has been locally rooted and will continue after the life of the project, the main evidence is the snowball effect linked to the youth participants positive attitude. Most of the interviewees expressed their intention to continue the mobile screening of the TV series, whatever scale it would be. Many admitted they had already conducted some without formally informing Search. Almost all of them wanted to have more of this kind of activities and to have it continue on a regular basis.

There were mixed results when respondents were asked about whether MRTV, radio or television producers or other concerned stakeholders had developed any sense of ownership around the goal, objectives, and strategies of the project. An MRTV Manager, when called on the phone for the interview, talked about the project as “we, we, we...”. It was clear he felt involved, but he only mentioned the trainings and the capacity building for his staff, nothing about “dividing lines” or “respect for different members of their diverse communities”. There is some ownership, but it is limited. Many media professionals acted as consumers, taking what they wanted or liked from the trainings and mentioned what they didn’t understand or what they didn’t like. Their level of engagement with the project varied and the ownership also varied accordingly. They are not totally to blame as there was some confusion or lack of clarity for them on the “National Curriculum Summit” and mostly the “Format Development Workshop.” An FGD participant said that “we didn’t even know why we were told by our manager to attend these trainings.” They didn't fully understand the rationale behind organizing these two workshops. There were also some small conflicts within the MRTV team during shooting. For instance, there was a problem/argument between the director, technician and a scriptwriter at the Harvest Rehabilitation Centre while shooting some sequences of the TV series. The scriptwriter objected to the changes made on the script without consulting him. Then among media professionals, there were also some worries about the quality of the TV series. All of these small elements are evidence of some ownership however: if these media professionals didn’t feel involved in the production and the project, they would not worry for the quality of the TV, and series. if someone argues about a script, it is because he/she feels involved in its writing, what it says and the message it sends.

**Lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up**

Considering that the overall project worked quite well, the evaluators choose to present some of the major learnings that they think Search should keep in mind and pay attention to in the future.

- Consider project design to make sure that there is enough time for implementing activities to generate the best possible result.

- The project team should foresee all the challenges and should be ready with plan B if necessary. Organizing TV program outdoor shooting during rainy season becomes counterproductive to program quality, time consuming and costly.

- While working with young facilitators, one off training or mentoring is not enough. It should be supported by follow up coaching or mentoring to produce best possible results. Ensure adequate time built into project plans for this.

- It is important to equip the youth facilitators with a formal letter of introduction while mobilizing them in the community. It will help them smoothly implement the planned activity.
- Conflict sensitivity is an important and integral part of such program and one should be fully prepared to facilitate such discussion in community. The facilitator should be fully equipped to handle sensitive issues.

- While work with Government agencies such as MRTV, the program team should maintain constant communications with different layers of leadership in those institutions. The program team should always have a multi-pronged strategy to work with government authorities. While the project did this to a certain degree, keep seeking ways to further connect across the layers of decision makers.

- Celebrities are always busy and tend to decline their participation at the last minute. So, it is important to remain in close contact with them and make sure that they do not back out at the last minute.

- It matters to avoid a gap between two phases of the same project. Search needs to be able to keep its staff involved from Phase I. Otherwise, when the Phase II starts, there is some “project’s memory” lost and this reduces the efficiency of the project.

- It is important to have clarity on the role of the partners or contractors and their specific deliverables in writing so that there is no confusion later on while developing the products. If all deliverables are documented in writing no one can argue against it or back out from it at the last minute.

- The project team must thoroughly check the quality and functionality of the products (i.e. DVDs) before dispatching them in the field to avoid a crisis while using in the field. This will help increase the credibility of the people working in the field and save them from embarrassment.

- It is important to be realistic and very detailed while developing a budget for specific activities at the design phase. It is recommended to include ample contingency budgets for media productions and to share the budget with all concerned staff in the production.

- The project made a measurable positive impact and its design works properly. There are no major changes needed. Youths as well as MRTV staff are developing some ownership which Search can build on.

**Project Indicators**

The following table summarizes the project’s outcomes and outputs indicators that were measured and recorded throughout the life of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Goal: To Increase the promotion and acceptance of diversity as a social norm, contributing to social cohesion and inter-communal harmony, in Myanmar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achieved in the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Indicators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Indicator 1:** % increased tolerance of diversity among the target beneficiaries as measured by the positive attitude shift of the target communities towards “others”

| 28% | 12% | Target surpassed. |

**Indicator 2:** % of people surveyed who say that they have had a meaningful conversation with someone from “other” ethnic, religious, socio-political identity, at least once in the last 12 months

| 30% | 12% | Target surpassed |

**Outcome 1:** Youth, government, educational leaders and media professionals implement activities promoting social cohesion as a result of the improved knowledge and skills on designing and implementing projects

| ≥25% | 25% | Regarding FGs and KII as well as the testimonies entitled “case studies”, evaluators consider the target reached |

1. **Outcome 1.1:** % of participating youth, government, educational leaders, and media professionals who have developed and implemented activities (based on their learning) that promote social cohesion in society.

| ≥25% | 25% |

Regarding FGs and KII as well as the testimonies entitled “case studies”, evaluators consider the target reached.

2. **Outcome 1.2:** # of case studies demonstrating examples of how they have applied the new knowledge and skills in their work

| ≥ 20 case studies | 20 |

The case studies reported in M&E do not show “how beneficiaries have applied the new knowledge and skills in their work”, they are more simple testimonies. But from the KII and the FGs, the evaluators collected many examples of changes and used of their new knowledge and skills from participants so they consider the target achieved.

**Outcome 2: Increased appreciation of diversity, collaboration and respect among community members**

| N/A | 25% | This indicator was finally not surveyed |

1. **Outcome 2.1:** % of people surveyed who can identify three basic requirements/components of social cohesion

| 36% | 40% | Not achieved |

13 persons out of the 50 people reached answer positively. It makes it 26%.

2. **Outcome 2.2:** % of listeners/viewers of radio/TV programmes who report of reaching out to or collaborating with the people from “other” communities for common community concern.

**Outcome 3: Increased positive interaction and trust across state/citizen, interethnic, and interreligious divides**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.1. Mobilized and Trained Target youth to implement participatory research and provide factual information about conflict and social cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1: % of participating youth who show increased knowledge of participatory research and CGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From desk review (training reports), KII and FGs, evaluators consider the target is achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2: # of youth (from across ethnic, religious and social divides) trained in CGA and research participate in youth led research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target surpassed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1.2. Increased knowledge and skills of government officials, media professionals and other key influencers in fostering social cohesion to support creation of media outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1: % of participating Government (MRTV) officials, media professionals and other key influencers, who show increased knowledge and skills on fostering social cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From desk review (training reports), KII and FGs, evaluators consider the target is achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2: # of government representatives (MRTV and MMPDD-now called MFDC), Media professionals key influencers trained in CGA/Social Cohesion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target surpassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3: # of youth, government representatives, and key influencers, attending the national curriculum summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 participants - at least 6 of each category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target surpassed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output 2.1. Produced, broadcast and disseminated TV and radio show episodes to the target areas
### 2.2.1: # of audience/viewers (estimated) of the media products (radio, TV, PSAs, theme song)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥4 500 000 persons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSAs were just released at the time of the evaluation; the theme songs were not. From the survey, 50 respondents out of 540 were reached by one of the programs, which is 9.3%. With a Myanmar population of 50 279 900 under the last official census (2014), 9.3*50 279 900=4 655 546 people have been reached by the programs. In fact, the figure is higher as the TV series was also broadcast on DVB and other channels.

### 2.2.2: % of viewers/listeners who remember the content of at least one of the episodes of media programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 of the 29 listeners reached and 10 of the 22 viewers remember the content of at least one of the episodes of media programs: 53%.

### Output 3.1. Trained and mentored target youth in facilitation and media use skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1: % of training participants who showed increased knowledge on facilitation and the skills how to use the media output</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2: # of youth trained in facilitation skills and the skill how to use the media outputs (disaggregated by gender)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3: # of Facilitator guide will be produced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.4: # of youth exchanging ideas and opinions at the exchange workshop</td>
<td>≥50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17 of the 18 indicators surveyed proved outcomes or outputs were achieved, most of them being surpassed; then 1 reaches 24% when 25% was the target. The conclusion is that considering this table of indicators, the “Let’s Think, Let’s Change” project is a strong success.

4. Conclusions

Most interviewees reported an overall satisfaction with the project, its design and its implementation. When asked if they would join a possible Phase III, almost all youth answered positively and most MRTV staff did the same. Social Cohesion, Common Ground Approach and Facilitation trainings were especially appreciated by all participants. If we consider the log frame and M&E plan, most indicators are achieved, many of them surpassed. The addition of video in Phase II, one of the key recommendations from Phase I, was a positive means to reach a wider population. The mobile screening was a real success (like the Listening and Dialogue Circles in the Phase I) and proved that this format of facilitated dialogues among viewers is very efficient. Some youth mentioned that “they were going to carry on doing mobile screening on their own, even without Search support” and others regretted that “there was not enough budget and time for more mobile screenings in other places. They would have liked to do more.” The main resonating topics were “Family and Education”, “Job Opportunities”, “Domestic Violence” and “Drugs”.

The project contributed to “increasing the promotion and acceptance of diversity as a social norm, contributing to social cohesion and inter-communal harmony, in Myanmar” as it aimed to. The survey showed a 28 percent increase in tolerance of diversity among the target beneficiaries as measured by the positive attitude shift of the target communities towards “others” and 30 percent viewers said that they have had a meaningful conversation with someone from “other” ethnic, religious, socio-political identity, at least once in the last 12 months. The project targets were set to 12% for both, as it is internationally accepted that anything above 10%
is a high score for such indicators.

According to the survey, 79% of the viewers agreed with the statement that “after listening to the Let’s Think, Let’s Change program, I am more accepting and trusting of people who are different from me”. Similarly, 67% of the viewers agreed with the statement that “I learned that men and women from different cultures and religions have important roles to play in Myanmar society” and 62% of the viewers said that “I believe that the Let’s Think, Let’s Change program has contributed to harmony in my community” which indicates the impact of the project.

When it comes to the expected outcomes according to the indicators set, number 1 “youth, government, educational leaders and media professionals implement activities promoting social cohesion as a result of the improved knowledge and skills on designing and implementing projects” and number 3 “increased positive interaction and trust across state/citizen, interethnic, and interreligious divides” were achieved, while number 2 “increased appreciation of diversity, collaboration and respect among community members” is not fully achieved.

All 12 radio episodes and 8 TV series were produced and broadcast at least twice on MRTV and at least (estimated) 4.5 million Myanmar citizens listened or viewed the LTLC program. This number is probably even higher as the 8 TV series were also broadcasted on DVB and other mainstream channels (Channel 9, Mizzima, etc.) as well as on social media. The facilitator’s manual has been published and disseminated. All activities have been achieved. Youth facilitators improved their knowledge and skills in a way that they now implement project content’s related activities by themselves (like facilitation or mobile screening as stated above), creating a snowball effect. MRTV staff were trained to write scripts and 33 people (when the target was only 18) have learnt to develop message maps. Even if there were some difficulties during the format development workshop and the production of the media products, some of these were linked to MRTV’s internal issues. MRTV staff improved technically according to KII and FGDs and they were faced with an international standard working approach new to them, but still achieved their first ever television drama series. This point should allow more improvement if there is a Phase III.

Coordination and communication were a real challenge for all stakeholders. This was mainly linked to the very tight timeline and to some organisational issues, for MRTV as well as for Search. The main difficulties took place during the “format development workshop” and then on the ground, during the production and the shooting of the media products. However, even if these issues were real, they should not be oversized. Firstly, because Search was able to adapt and overcome them. Secondly because the final products – Radio, Movies, PSA – reach Myanmar’s quality standards. The fact that two private channels – DVB and Mizzima – broadcast the 8 episodes of the TV series prove this, for instance.

Phase I of LTLC was already a success according to the “Listenership Survey and Reflective Review”. Obviously, Phase II reaches its goals as well. This proves the validity of the theory of change the project is rooted in. It was observed, for instance, that in Lashio many KII and FGD participants mentioned the positive effects of dialogue among communities.

However, both youth and MRTV expressed their needs for more collaboration and it is the evaluators’ analysis that there is a lot of room for improvement and scaling up. Many youth regretted the limitations of target areas. In Lashio, for instance, some suggested to also have some mobile screening in rural areas. In Yangon, some wondered why there was no such activity in Ayeyarwady or Magway divisions, as these are areas where MRTV reach is strong. Considering the context background as presented in the introduction section, it makes sense to use this reach. Another point is that the SC, CGA and Facilitation trainings were so successful that they
created a demand among youth. Many youth reported that their friends wanted to attend similar workshops because they saw the positive impact and changes on those who already attended. Youth who attended the trainings are now demanding for other opportunities to build on their capacities. Search developed a strong network with these youth organization and it really makes sense to carry on.

From MRTV side, everyone praised the SC, CGA and Facilitation trainings as the youth did. While some staff were not entirely satisfied with the production aspect of the project, other staff enjoyed it and acknowledged that they learnt a lot. It is also important to recognize the transformation MRTV is looking to and has made to transform and improve professionally, considering the isolated history of the country they operate in. This was the first time that they produced a TV drama series, so it was a challenge for them. Their style of work often differs from what is common at the international level and their organization. For example, staff are mostly not highly specialized and can be asked to implement a lot of tasks that in the common international TV production system belong to different specialized people, the organization lacks flexibility which means reaction and adjustment times are slow, according to a lot of MRTV staff, and there is a strong sense of hierarchy. On the other hand, there is a strong demand for change and this project, from the radio side management for sure, and from TV staff as well.

Due to the fact that participants of KIs or FGDs expressed their satisfaction working on this program, their personal changes as well as the changes they could implement in their communities (for the youth) or their organization (for MRTV), the evaluators think that there is a need for a scaling up. This could be in the form of the production of two other series (radio and TV) using the lessons learnt, and the amplification of the project to more target areas. From the KIs, FGDs and the survey results, the evaluators consider that there are no main changes needed to the project framework as it works efficiently.

5. Recommendations

1. Consider a longer timeline for the same kind of project and activities. For instance, it would be useful if it was possible to add one day of practice to the mentoring sessions.

2. Systematically share all TORs with the whole team.

3. Organize more mobile screening sessions. The process proves very efficient to create dialogue opportunities. In projects of similar nature in the future, there should be more mobile screenings and follow up dialogues, so as to cause a ripple effect and to reach wider audiences/viewers.

4. For the mobile screening, provide to the facilitators with USB keys with a phone friendly plug containing all the media products (TV and radio). That will allow them to transfer the media products to participants in the mobile screening session.

5. Train all participants of the project, and especially all media professionals, on the CGA approach.
6. Use the MOI network to prepare administratively the mobile screening. Indeed, MRTV as a governmental channel could be used to create connections with universities and high schools to officially hold mobile screening sessions in these learning centres.

7. Future mobile screening should be held, where possible, in secular locations to ensure participation of people from diverse communities. From the KIIs and FGDs, evaluators found that some – they could not estimate the number – sessions took place in monasteries. This limits the dialogue and expression possibilities.

8. Consider mobile screening in Ayeyarwaddy and Magway divisions as MRTV is the main channel in these areas. Similarly, it is important to bring these mobile screenings to rural areas as well.

9. Keep the pool of youth facilitators that benefited most of the training and train them to become trainers themselves. They already had a ToT in facilitation but according to the manuals, this training focuses on the skills and knowledge about SC. It doesn’t seem to address the specific process of adults’ training. In Myanmar, trainers usually favour lectures and presentation. It could be interesting to present other techniques to these youth.

10. As MRTV is a very hierarchical system, working with MRTV needs more real involvement of the top management. A steering committee could be a way to create this and to build up more ownership and to address planning and staff turnover issues through discussion and negotiation. Also negotiate a specialization approach and train some selected staff to the international standard of production process. If a future project keeps radio and video production, recruit at least 2 experts (one radio, one TV) who are familiar with Myanmar cultural sensitivity.

11. To increase the impact of the TV series, it would be interesting to conduct a research about current TV programs to understand what works, what people like and why. This should be of course done some time before starting the production process.

12. The 10-minute radio and video formats are fine as they are easy to broadcast on normal channels and on social media as well. However, Search could eventually combine and edit all the video episodes in a long movie format. The result could then be broadcast as a single long movie. That will open some new opportunities to disseminate the messages. If possible, please negotiate with main long-distance bus companies to show this movie in these buses.

13. To build ownership, develop a flyer and a communication tool (PowerPoint, video…) presenting the project, the objectives and the activities, and present it before all activities. Then have a short session of reformulation exercises that could serve as an Icebreaker and will allow Search to check that the project was properly understood.

14. One comment that resonated strongly with the evaluators is that “the project mixed disabled with non-disabled and that was a chance for the disabled as they are usually put apart”. Future project should carry on with this approach.
15. Future project should develop more messages about rumour management, fake news, and responsible social media.

16. At the communication level, follow up with participants to the project: 2 people regretted that they took part to the scriptwriting workshop but didn’t know what their work became after. Others regretted they never saw the movies. For instance, a Facebook page with restricted access where Search could upload its productions and members could share their experiences would be a useful tool.
6. Appendices

Annex 1: Questionnaire in English

LISTENERSHIP/VIEWERSHIP SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Two previous elements the Field researcher put for each line:
Date
Place

1.1 What is your age? (select one)
1.1.1 Less than 18 years
1.1.2 18-24
1.1.3 25-34
1.1.4 35 and above

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

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  

REACH FOR RADIO  

2.1 Which radio channel do you mostly listen at?  
2.1.1 MRTV  
2.1.2 Mandalay FM  
2.1.3 Cherry FM  
2.1.4 City FM  
2.1.5 I don't listen at radio (skip to 4.1)  

2.2 Have you heard about the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program?  
(select one)  
2.2.1 Yes  
2.2.2 No (skip to 4.1)  

2.3 Have you listened to the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program?  
(select one)  
2.3.1 Yes  
2.3.2 No (skip to 4.1)  

2.4 How many episodes of the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program you have listened to?  
(select one)  
2.3.1 All 12 episodes  
2.3.2 All episodes except one or two  
2.3.3 More than half  
2.3.4 Half of the episodes  
2.3.5 Only a few episodes  
2.3.6 One or two  

RESONANCE FOR RADIO
3.1 From the *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* radio program, what topic do you remember? *(select all that apply)*
- 3.1.1 Youth and Sport
- 3.1.2 Youth and Unity
- 3.1.3 Youth and Peace
- 3.1.4 Youth, Stereotypes, and Equality
- 3.1.5 Youth and LGBT
- 3.1.6 Youth and Job Opportunities
- 3.1.7 Youth and Drugs
- 3.1.8 Youth and Rehabilitation
- 3.1.9 Youth and the Benefit of Reading
- 3.1.10 Youth and Domestic Violence
- 3.1.11 Youth and Social Media Rumours
- 3.1.12 Youth and Online Charity Work
- 3.1.13 None

3.2 Did any of these topics resonate with any incidents from your personal experience in your community? *(select all that apply)*
- 3.2.1 Youth and Sport
- 3.2.2 Youth and Unity
- 3.2.3 Youth and Peace
- 3.2.4 Youth, Stereotypes, and Equality
- 3.2.5 Youth and LGBT
- 3.2.6 Youth and Job Opportunities
- 3.2.7 Youth and Drugs
- 3.2.8 Youth and Rehabilitation
- 3.2.9 Youth and the Benefit of Reading
- 3.2.10 Youth and Domestic Violence
- 3.2.11 Youth and Social Media Rumours
- 3.2.12 Youth and Online Charity Work
- 3.2.13 None

3.3 Did the *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* radio program prompted you to engage in dialogue with others about some of the issues discussed? *(select one)*
- 3.3.1 Yes
- 3.3.2 No *(skip to 4.1)*

3.4 Who did you discuss it with? *(select all that apply)*
- 3.4.1 Family
- 3.4.2 Friends
- 3.4.3 Neighbours
- 3.4.4 Colleagues
3.4.5 Other (specify)

3.5 **How often did you discuss it? (select one)**
3.5.1 After every episode
3.5.2 After most episodes
3.5.3 After some episodes
3.5.4 Rarely

3.6 **Which issues did you discuss? (select all that apply)**
3.6.1 Youth and Sport
3.6.2 Youth and Unity
3.6.3 Youth and Peace
3.6.4 Youth, Stereotypes, and Equality
3.6.5 Youth and LGBT
3.6.6 Youth and Job Opportunities
3.6.7 Youth and Drugs
3.6.8 Youth and Rehabilitation
3.6.9 Youth and the Benefit of Reading
3.6.10 Youth and Domestic Violence
3.6.11 Youth and Social Media Rumours
3.6.12 Youth and Online Charity Work

**REACH FROM TV**

4.1 **Which television channel do you mostly watch?**
4.1.1 MRTV
4.1.2 MRTV4
4.1.3 SKYNET
4.1.4 MWD
4.1.5 I don’t watch TV (skip to 6.7)

4.2 **Have you heard about A Touch of Syringe Hook series program? (select one)**
4.2.1 Yes
4.2.2 No
4.2.2.1 Listened to Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program (skip to 6.1)
4.2.2.2 Did not listen to Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program (skip to 6.7)

4.3 **Have you watched A Touch of Syringe Hook series program? (select one)**
4.3.1 Yes
4.3.2 No
4.3.2.1 Listened to Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program (skip to 6.1)
4.3.2.2 Did not listen to Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program (skip to 6.7)
4.4 How many of the episodes of A Touch of Syringe Hook did you watch? (select one)
2.3.1 All 8 episodes
2.3.2 All episodes except one or two
2.3.3 More than half
2.3.4 Half of the episodes
2.3.5 One or two

RESONANCE FOR TV

5.1 From A Touch of Syringe Hook series, what topic do you remember? (select all that apply)
5.1.1 Family and education
5.1.2 Strength and Unity
5.1.3 Women, Girls and Stereotypes
5.1.4 LGBT and Stereotypes
5.1.5 Job Opportunities
5.1.6 Drugs
5.1.7 Rehabilitation
5.1.8 Domestic Violence
5.1.9 Social Media Rumours
5.1.10 None

5.2 Did any of these topics resonate with any incidents from your personal experience in your community? (select all that apply)
5.2.1 Family and education
5.2.2 Strength and Unity
5.2.3 Women, Girls and Stereotypes
5.2.4 LGBT and Stereotypes
5.2.5 Job Opportunities
5.2.6 Drugs
5.2.7 Rehabilitation
5.2.8 Domestic Violence
5.2.9 Social Media Rumours
5.2.10 None

5.3 Did A Touch of Syringe Hook series prompt you to engage in dialogue with others about some of the issues discussed? (select one)
5.3.1 Yes
5.3.2 No (skip to 6.1)

5.4 Who did you discuss it with? (select all that apply)
5.4.1 Family
5.4.2 Friends  
5.4.3 Neighbours  
5.4.4 Colleagues  
5.4.5 Other (specify)

5.5 How often did you discuss it? (select one)  
5.5.1 After every episode  
5.5.2 After most episodes  
5.5.3 After some episodes  
5.5.4 Rarely

5.6 Which issues did you discuss? (select all that apply)  
5.6.1 Family and education  
5.6.2 Strength and Unity  
5.6.3 Women, Girls and Stereotypes  
5.6.4 LGBT and Stereotypes  
5.6.5 Job Opportunities  
5.6.6 Drugs  
5.6.7 Rehabilitation  
5.6.8 Domestic Violence  
5.6.9 Social Media Rumours  
5.6.10 None

RESPONSE

6.1 Did the Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program or A Touch of Syringe Hook series influence the way that you view people from other cultures and religions? (select one)  
4.9.1 Yes  
4.9.2 No

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

6.2.1 The Let’s Think, Let’s Change radio program A Touch of Syringe Hook TV series has helped me to develop a greater understanding of the various divisions within Myanmar society.  
6.2.2 I believe that a diverse society is a weak society  
6.2.3 We can make a difference if we work together, despite our individual differences
6.3 Did the *Let's Think, Let's Change* radio program or *A Touch of Syringe Hook* TV series inspire you to talk to people from other cultures and religions? *(select one)*

6.3.1 Yes

6.3.2 No

6.4 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 or watched *A Touch of Syringe Hook* TV series? *(select one)*

6.4.1 - More than 10
6.4.2 - 6-9
6.4.3 - 3-5
6.4.4 - 1-2
6.4.5 - None

6.5 Please indicate if you agree or disagree with the following statements. *(select one)*

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Unsure

6.5.1 After listening to the *Let's Think, Let's Change* radio program or watching the *A Touch of Syringe Hook* series, I understand that collaboration and respect between people from across dividing lines is essential for peace.

6.5.2 After listening to the *Let's Think, Let's Change* radio program or watching the *A Touch of Syringe Hook* series, I am more accepting and trusting of people who are different from me.

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

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

6.5.5 The *Let's Think, Let's Change* radio program or *A Touch of Syringe Hook* series has taught me the importance of questioning the accuracy of rumours.

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

6.5.7 I believe that the *Let's Think, Let's Change* radio program or *A Touch of Syringe Hook* series has contributed to harmony in my community.
6.6 Would you recommend listening to the *Let’s Think, Let’s Change* radio program or *A Touch of Syringe Hook* series to others? 
*(select one)*
6.6.1 Yes
6.6.2 No
6.6.3 Unsure

6.7 Thank you for your time!

**Annex 2: Questionnaire in Burmese**

ေွရဒီယ ိုေွသာတရွင ာမ်ားႏွွင္ွ ရိုပ္ွ မငသံၾကာမပရ တသတ  ာမအာမစစတမ္ွမေွကာကယူမည္ွ ေွမမခြန္ွမမ ာမ။

၁.၁ သင့္အသက္ဘယ္ေ့လာက္္ ရွိၿပီလဲ။  (ေ့အာက္ပါတွိို႔အနက္မရတစ္ခုက္ွိိုေ့ရ ြး့ ခယပါ။)

၁.၁.၁ ၁၈်ားႏွွစ္ေွအာက္
၁.၁.၂ ၁၈်ားႏွွစ္မွ ၂၄်ားႏွွစ္အတတင္ွမ
၁.၁.၃ ၂၅်ားႏွွစ္မွ ၃၄်ားႏွွစ္အတတင္ွမ
၁.၁.၄ ၃၅်ားႏွွစ္အထက္

၁.၂ သငက ဘာလွိငအမွိ လးအစ္ာြး့ ဖစ္ပါသလဲ။  (ေ့အာက္ပါတွိို႔အနက္မရတစ္ခုက္ွိိုေ့ရ ြး့ ခယပါ။)

၁.၂.၁ က ာမ
၁.၂.၂ မ
၁.၂.၃ အားလုံးသားေြးျဳး (LGBT)

၁.၃ သငက မည္သည့္ ဘာသာက္ွိို က္ွိိုြးကက္ယယံ့ိုၾက္ည္သူ့ ဖစ္ပါသလဲ။  (ေ့အာက္ပါတွိို႔အနက္မရတစ္ခုက္ွိိုေ့ရ ြး့ ခယပါ။)

၁.၃.၁ မိသားစုိးဝှက် 
၁.၃.၂ နိုင်မွား 
၁.၃.၃ ဗိုဒၶ 
၁.၃.၄ အစာမ 
၁.၃.၅ ဟငဒူ 
၁.၃.၆ ြရစယာန္ 
၁.၃.၇ ဘာသာမ 
၁.၃.၈ ဘာမွမဟိုတပ ኊ
၁၃.၂ အခြေခံစိတ်ကြိုး (ဗိုဒ္ဓနာစားပေး၊ အစားလာမိဘာသာစားပေး) ပြုလုပ်ခဲ့သော ပညာရေးအဆင့်
၂.၁၅.၁ အခြေခံစိတ်ကြိုး (ပညာရေးအဆင့်) ပြုလုပ်ခဲ့သော ပညာရေးအဆင့်
၂.၁၅.၂ အခြေခံစိတ်ကြိုး (ပညာရေးအဆင့်) ပြုလုပ်ခဲ့သော ပညာရေးအဆင့်
ယော့ရဒီယွိုအစ္းအစ္ဥ္
၂.၁: မည့္သည့္ ေ့ရဒီယွိုလွိိုင့္ြးက္ွိိုသေငအနနဲ႕ နာြးေအထာင့္ ဖစ္ဆံ့ို့ြးပါလဲ။
၂.၁.၁ မန္ ာအသံ
၂.၁.၂မ်ားႏွွလမအက္ (ဖ္) အမ္
၂.၁.၃ ယရီအက္ (ဖ္) အမ္
၂.၁.၄ စီမတီမအက္ (ဖ္) အမ္
၂.၁.၅ အ ြာမ ၂.၁.၆ မည္သည္ွေ့ရဒီယွိုလိုင္ွမက္ွမွ နာမေမထာင္ွဖစ္ပါ။
၂.၂ ေ့ကတြးၾေက္ခၚၾက့္ ပာင့္ြးလဲၾက္ဆွိိုတဲ ေ့ရဒီယွိုအစ္ီအစ္ဥကွို ောြးဖူြးပါသလာြး။
၂.၂.၁ ေ့အာက္ပါတွိို႔အနက္မရတစ္ခုက္ွိို ေ့ရြး့ို့ ခယပါ။
၂.၂.၂မဖူမပါဘူမ။
၂.၂.၃ ေ့ကတြးၾေက္ခၚၾက့္ ပာင့္ြးလဲၾက္ဆွိိုတဲ ေ့ရဒီယွိိုအစ္းအစ္ဥကွို နာြးဆင္ူမပါသလာြး။
၂.၃ ေ့ကတြးၾေက္ခၚၾက့္ ပာင့္ြးလဲၾက္ဆွိိုတဲ ေ့ရဒီယွိိုအစ္းအစ္ဥကွိုပါသည္။
၂.၃.၁ နာမဆင္ူမပါသည္။
၂.၃.၂ နာမမဆင္ူမဘူမ။
၂.၄ ေ့ကတြးၾေက္ခၚၾက့္ ပာင့္ြးလဲၾက္ ေ့ရဒီယွိိုအစ္းအစ္ဥထဲက္ ေအၾက္ာင့္ြးအရာဘယ့္ႏ့ စ္ခုက္ွိို နာြးဆင္ူြးပါသလဲ။
၂.၄.၁ ေ့အာက္ပါတွိို႔အနက္မရတစ္ခုက္ွိို ေ့ရ ြးပါ။
၂.၄.၂ ေအၾကာင္ွမအရာ အဘတ တစခု၊ ွ်ားႏွွစ ွစ္လ ፍ က န္္ာမလံွိုွမက္ွ နာမဆင္ူမသည္။
၂.၄.၃ တစ္ေက္ေွက ာွ္ေွက ာွ္နာမဆင္ူမပါသည္။
၂.၄.၄ တစ္ေက္ေွလာက္ ုနာမဆင္ွ္ဖူမသည္။
၂.၄.၅ ေအၾကာင္ွမအရာ အနည္ွမငယသာ နာမဆင္ွ္ဖူမသည္။
၂.၄.၆ တစခု၊ ွ်ားႏွွစခု ေွလာကသာ နာမဆင္ွ္ဖူမသည္။
Let’s Think, Let’s Change: promoting cultural diversity through popular culture – Phase II

Search for Common Ground | MYANMAR
2.1 လူငယ္ွ်ားႏွွင္ွအလိုပ္က ိုင္ခြင္ွ အလမ္ွမ
2.1.1 လူငယ္ွ်ားႏွွင္ွအလိုပ္က ိုင္ခြင္ွ အလမ္ွမ
2.1.2 လူငယ္ွ်ားႏွွင္ွအလိုပ္က ိုင္ခြင္ွ အလမ္ွမ
2.1.3 လူငယ္ွ်ားႏွွင္ွအလိုပ္က ိုင္ခြင္ွ အလမ္ွမ

2.2 စိုေင ာမ်ားႏွွင္ွအလိုပ္က ိုင္ခြင္ွ အလမ္ွမ
2.2.1 စိုေင ာမ်ားႏွွင္ွအလိုပ္က ိုင္ခြင္ွ အလမ္ွမ
2.2.2 စိုေင ာမ်ားႏွွင္ွအလိုပ္က ိုင္ခြင္ွ အလမ္ွမ
2.2.3 စိုေင ာမ်ားႏွွင္ွအလိုပ္က ိုင္ခြင္ွ အလမ္ွမ

2.3 ကိုတသာမပါ။
2.3.1 ကိုတသာမပါ။
2.3.2 ကိုတသာမပါ။
2.3.3 ကိုတသာမပါ။

2.4 အခာြးသူမ ာြးႏ့ င့္ ကိုက္ွိိုေ့ရ ြး့ ခယ္ေ့ပြးပါ။
2.4.1 အခာြးသူမ ာြးႏ့ င့္ ကိုက္ွိိုေ့ရ ြး့ ခယ္ေ့ပြးပါ။
2.4.2 အခာြးသူမ ာြးႏ့ င့္ ကိုက္ွိိုေ့ရ ြး့ ခယ္ေ့ပြးပါ။
2.4.3 အခာြးသူမ ာြးႏ့ င့္ ကိုက္ွိိုေ့ရ ြး့ ခယ္ေ့ပြးပါ။

2.5 အပြီးမပါ။
၃.၅.၁ စီစဉ်မှုမိုးနားမှု၏အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်များအတွက်လုပ်ဆောင်ရည်များကို (အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်)
မြန်မာအင်္ဂလိပ်စာအားဖော်ပြထားသောစာမျက်နှာများအတွက်လုပ်ဆောင်ရည်များကို (အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်)
စီစဉ်ပေးသည်။
၃.၅.၂ သို့မဟုတ်စီစဉ်မှုမိုးနားမှု၏အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်များအတွက်လုပ်ဆောင်ရည်များကို (အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်)
တစ်ခုချင်စီစဉ်ပေးသည်။
၃.၅.၃ လူငယ်များကိုအခါပါစီစဉ်မှုမိုးနားမှု၏အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်များအတွက်လုပ်ဆောင်ရည်များကို (အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်)
တစ်ခုချင်စီစဉ်ပေးသည်။
၃.၅.၄ အလွန်ပိုမိုများကိုအခါပါစီစဉ်မှုမိုးနားမှု၏အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်များအတွက်လုပ်ဆောင်ရည်များကို (အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်)
တစ်ခုချင်စီစဉ်ပေးသည်။
၃.၅.၅ လူငယ်များကိုအခါပါစီစဉ်မှုမိုးနားမှု၏အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်များအတွက်လုပ်ဆောင်ရည်များကို (အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်)
တစ်ခုချင်စီစဉ်ပေးသည်။
၃.၆.၁ လူငယ်များကိုအခါပါစီစဉ်မှုမိုးနားမှု၏အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်များအတွက်လုပ်ဆောင်ရည်များကို (အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်)
တစ်ခုချင်စီစဉ်ပေးသည်။
၃.၆.၂ လူငယ်များကိုအခါပါစီစဉ်မှုမိုးနားမှု၏အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်များအတွက်လုပ်ဆောင်ရည်များကို (အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်)
တစ်ခုချင်စီစဉ်ပေးသည်။
၄.၁ သို့မဟုတ်အခါပါစီစဉ်မှုမိုးနားမှု၏အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်များအတွက်လုပ်ဆောင်ရည်များကို (အကြောင်းအရာအစီအစဉ်)
တစ်ခုချင်စီစဉ်ပေးသည်။
အပြားတစ့်ထာက္း ဗိသာသာဇာတလမ့္ြးတတဲထဲက္ ဘေယအၾက္ာင့္ြးအရာက္ွိိုမ တမွိပါလဲ။

ဆင္ူတွိိုက္ဆွိုငမႈရ ွိပါသလဲ။ (ဆင္ူတွိိုက္ဆွိုငမႈရ ွိေ့သာ ဇာတလမ့္ြးအပွိိုင့္ြး့ႏ့ င့္ ေအၾက္ာင့္ြးအရာမ ာြးႏ့ င့္ ဆင္ူတွိိုက္ဆွိုငမႈရ ွိေ့သာ)

၅.၁.၁ မ သာမစို်ားႏွွင္ွ ပညာေွရမ

၅.၁.၂ ခြန္ာမဗလ်ားႏွွင္ွ စည္ွမလံွိုွမညီညညတ ႈ

၅.၁.၃ အမ မသမီမႀကီမမ ာမ၊ အမ ိုမသမီမငယ ာမ်ားႏွွင္ွ 

၅.၁.၄ LGBT ွ်ားႏွွင္ွ ေွရရမရ ိုမစစ္အယူအဆမ ာမ

၅.၁.၅ အလိုပ္ကိုင္ခြင္ွ အလမ္ွမ

၅.၁.၆ မူမယစ္ေွဆမေါမ

၅.၁.၇ ပန္လည္ထူေွထာင္ေွရမ

၅.၁.၈ လူမႈတကန္ရက္ေွပၚမွ 

၅.၁.၁၁ မည္သည္ွ ေအၾကာင္ွမအရာမ ာြးႏ့ င့္ ဆင္ူတွိိုက္ဆွိုငမႈရ ွိပါသလဲ။
၅.၂ မည်သည်းရာများအရာများ မှ ဆင်တူတံမရှိပါ။

၅.၃ အပြောင်းထောင်းဦးရာ ဦးဆောင်းဇာတလမ့်တို့တွင် အရာခွိ ကုမ္ပဏီများနှင့် စာရှိးအားလွန်းသူများအားလွန်းကုမ္ပဏီများတွင် ပိုးလာစေရန် စာရှိးများကောင်းအားလွန်းကုမ္ပဏီများကိုစာရှိးစေရန်လားကြောင်း ဆိုက်ကျင်းပါသလား။

(အောက်ပါတွေအနက်မရှိတဲ့ ရှိခဲ ခိုက်ရှိုးခဲ ခယ္း ပြီးချိုးစွာစွာ ကောင်းစေရာ)

၅.၃.၁ မရှိကြည့်။

၅.၃.၂ မရှိကြည့်။

၅.၄ အပြောင်းထောင်းဦးရာ ဦးဆောင်းဇာတလမ့်တို့တွင် အရာခွိ အခြေကြိုးစား ကုမ္ပဏီများအားလွန်းကုမ္ပဏီများကို ဆောင်ရွက်ခြင်းဖြင့် သင်္ကောက်ကုမ္ပဏီများကို ဆောင်ရွက်ကုမ္ပဏီများကို ဆောင်ရွက်စေရန် လားကြောင်း ပေါက်လာစေရန်လားကြောင်း ဆိုက်ကျင်းပါသလား။

(အောက်ပါတွေအနက်မရှိတဲ့ ရှိခဲ ေ့သာသူ အားလွန်းကုမ္ပဏီများကို ဆောင်ရွက်စေရာ)

၅.၄.၁ မသာမစိုင်း ၇ာမ်ားႏွင္ွ

၅.၄.၂ မသာမစိုင်း ၇ာမ်ားႏွင္ွ

၅.၄.၃ ပတ္ေန္္င္၊ အမ္ီမနာမြင္ွ ၇ာမ်ားႏွင္ွ

၅.၄.၄ လိုပ္ေွဖၚက ိုင္ကားမ်ားႏွင္ွ

၅.၄.၅ အြာမ်ားႏ့ င့္

(မည္သူမည္ေါွဖၚ ေပပမပါ)

၅.၅ အပြောင်းထောင်းဦးရာ ဦးဆောင်းဇာတလမ့်တို့တွင် အရာခွိ ေ့ကဆြးေ့့ႏြ့့ြးေ့့ ပာဆွိ ဖူးလင္ ၿပီမေွသာအြါတိုင္ွများႏွင္ွ

(အောက်ပါတွေအနက်မရှိတဲ့ ရှိခဲ ေ့သာသူ အားလွန်းကုမ္ပဏီများကို ဆောင်ရွက်စေရာ)

၅.၆ ပတ္ေန္္ အလွန်းများ မည္သည့္ ေအၾက္ာင့္ြးအရာအစ္းးးႏွင္ွ
၆.၂ ကြော်ခြင်းများ၏ မိုးမြင်မှုများကို ဆိုရာတွင် အများအားဖြင့် မတူညီမှုများကို အသေးစိတ်ပြုပါသည်။ ဗိုလ်ချုပ်မှားကြောင်း များကျပ်နေပါတယ်။ ဗိုလ်ချုပ်လိုက်ခြင်း၌ အများအားဖြင့် အိုက်ချမှုများကို ရှာဖွေရန် အစား မဖွံ့ပိုးပေးမှုကို ပြပါလိုက်သည်။ အကယ်၍ ပြောင်းလဲမှုများကို မဖျင်မဖျင်ရှိလိုတော့မှာ ကျွန်တော်များနှင့် အားလုံးအတွက် အားလုံးစွာ ရှေးတိုင်းပြုလုပ်ခြင်းဖြစ်သည်။ ထို့အပြင် ပြောင်းလဲမှုများကို မဖျင်မဖျင်ရှိလိုတော့မှာ ကျွန်တော်များနှင့် အားလုံးအတွက် အားလုံးစွာ ရှေးတိုင်းပြုလုပ်ခြင်းဖြစ်သည်။ မြန်မာ လူမျိုးများ၏ အခြေအနေအဖြစ် မတူညီမှုများကို အားလုံးစွာ ရှေးတိုင်းပြုလုပ်ခြင်းဖြစ်သည်။ ထို့အပြင် ပြောင်းလဲမှုများကို မဖျင်မဖျင်ရှိလိုတော့မှာ ကျွန်တော်များနှင့် အားလုံးအတွက် အားလုံးစွာ ရှေးတိုင်းပြုလုပ်ခြင်းဖြစ်သည်။

6.၂.၃ စိတ်ချိန်များကို ဖော်ပြလျက်ရှိရန် အားလုံးစွာ ရှေးတိုင်းပြုလုပ်ခြင်းဖြစ်သည်။ ထို့အပြင် ပြောင်းလဲမှုများကို မဖျင်မဖျင်ရှိလိုတော့မှာ ကျွန်တော်များနှင့် အားလုံးအတွက် အားလုံးစွာ ရှေးတိုင်းပြုလုပ်ခြင်းဖြစ်သည်။

6.၃ စိတ်ချိန်များကို ဖော်ပြလျက်ရှိရန် အားလုံးစွာ ရှေးတိုင်းပြုလုပ်ခြင်းဖြစ်သည်။ ထို့အပြင် ပြောင်းလဲမှုများကို မဖျင်မဖျင်ရှိလိုတော့မှာ ကျွန်တော်များနှင့် အားလုံးအတွက် အားလုံးစွာ ရှေးတိုင်းပြုလုပ်ခြင်းဖြစ်သည်။

6.၄ စိတ်ချိန်များကို ဖော်ပြလျက်ရှိရန် အားလုံးစွာ ရှေးတိုင်းပြုလုပ်ခြင်းဖြစ်သည်။ ထို့အပြင် ပြောင်းလဲမှုများကို မဖျင်မဖျင်ရှိလိုတော့မှာ ကျွန်တော်များနှင့် အားလုံးအတွက် အားလုံးစွာ ရှေးတိုင်းပြုလုပ်ခြင်းဖြစ်သည်။
၆.၅.၆ အာဆို၍ ဗိသုကာလုပ်ငန်းမင်းကန်သို့ ပြုလုပ်ရန်အတွက် အစိတ်အပိုင်း အဆင့်များကို ပြုလုပ်ရန် ဒီဇိုင်းရှင်

၆.၅.၇ အာဆို၍ ယခုအခါက ဗိသုကာလုပ်ငန်းမင်းကန်သို့ ပြုလုပ်ရန်အတွက် အစိတ်အပိုင်း အဆင့်များကို ပြုလုပ်ရန် ဒီဇိုင်းရှင်
Annex 3: The survey file
Annex 4: The Survey Orientation & Training Plan

SURVEY ORIENTATION & TRAINING

Day one: Thursday, December, 6th

10:00: Welcoming of the Field researchers
10:15: Introduction to the “Let’s Think, Let’s Change” project. Presentation of the tasks to perform
10:45: Presentation of the questionnaire.

During 15 mn, the Field Researchers read the questionnaire.
During 90 mn, the consultants answer the questions, adjust the questionnaire if needed (omissions, spelling...), including some blank implementation (consultant fake responses in order to test all questionnaire’s possibilities)
12:45: Presentation of afternoon duty: FR pairs and each pair is assigned an area (Thaketa, North Okkalapa, Insein) where to implement as many questionnaires as they can during 3 h

The objectives are:
● Check on the field if there is any problem or question left with the questionnaire
● Check the capacity of the FR to implement it
● Allow the FR to calibrate time with questionnaire and understand how much time they will need to carry the whole task

Allow the FR to eventually face problems and solve them or report them to the consultants for discussion and solution
Test the FR ability to work together
13h15: Lunch
14h00 to 17h00: Work on the field

Day two: Friday, December, 7th

09:00: Welcoming of the Field Researchers
09:15: Debrief of yesterday’s field work. Correction of the questionnaire. Recommendations according to the issues faced
10:00: Presentation of the Excel file the FR will have to use and fill after each work day
10:30: Test. The FR fill the Excel file with the results they collected the day before so they understand how it works and they practice under supervision. Corrections and explanations are given every time the FR face a problem
11:30 Tea Break
11:45: Test exercise continue
12:30: Safety recommendations and processes to follow. Consultant explain the samples rules (number/area, gender balance, age distribution...) and provides letter credential
13:30: end of the Orientation and Training

Annex 5: The KII and FGD Questionnaire

QUESTIONNAIRE FROM EVALUATION MATRIX
General questions

- How the KI took part in the project? What role?
- What activities did the KI took part in?
- How does the KI understand these activities? What does the KI thinks were the objectives of these activities? Eventually elaborate then on the KI understanding of the project as a whole.
- Does the KI think these activities were useful? Why? Do the KI have examples to give to illustrate his answer?

The project tries to solve problems:

- Can the KI explain what kind of problems?
- Does the KI think the activities he/she took part in help solve these problems? How? Of considering these activities, does the KI consider there should be more? Less? Why? Does the KI have suggestions for improvement of the activities?
- Does the KI think the people around him/her have been impacted by the project? How? Examples?
- Does the KI feel that he/she has increased skills and knowledge to implement project activities bring more social cohesion?

If KI is from the Media:

- Does the KI feel that his/her knowledge, skills, capacities have increased due to the project? Especially in conflict transformation and social cohesion? Does he/she feel now able to foster social cohesion in his/her work? Especially for creation of programs? Does he want to put social cohesion in his/her work, creation?
- How were the TV and radio show episodes disseminated to the target areas?
- Does the KI have now more willingness to participate in activities and research linked to social cohesion (e.g. trainings, campaign, dialogues, etc)?
- Does the KI feel the activities design, contents, organisation were proper to get results?
- How was the coordination between all partners?
- For instance, how was the communication?
- What were the strengths and challenges of the partnership? How were the challenges overcome? Are there any lessons learned that could be applied to future partnerships and coordination/collaboration?

If KI is from the Youth Facilitators:
Does the KI feel that his/her knowledge, skills, capacities have increased due to the project? Especially in conflict transformation and social cohesion? Does he/she feel now able to foster social cohesion in his/her work?

Does the KII feels that activities made positive changes, for instance more trust and communication, among state/citizen and ethnic and religious groups? Please provide examples and case studies.

Does the KII feels that the project helps different people to be together? Does it make people accept more diversity? Is there any evidence for that? Does the KI think this will last after the project?

Does the KI have now more willingness to participate in activities and research linked to social cohesion (e.g. trainings, campaign, dialogues, etc)?

Does the KI feel the activities design, contents, organisation were proper to get results?

How was the coordination between all partners?

For instance, how was the communication?

What were the strengths and challenges of the partnership? How were the challenges overcome? Are there any lessons learned that could be applied to future partnerships and coordination/collaboration?

For SEARCH:

Does the KI feel that his/her knowledge, skills, capacities have increased due to the project? Especially in conflict transformation and social cohesion? Does he/she feel now able to foster social cohesion in his/her work?

How were the TV and radio show episodes disseminated to the target areas?

Does the KI have now more willingness to participate in activities and research linked to social cohesion (e.g. trainings, campaign, dialogues, etc)?

Does the KI feel the activities design, contents, organisation were proper to get results?

How was the coordination between all partners?

For instance, how was the communication?

What were the strengths and challenges of the partnership? How were the challenges overcome? Are there any lessons learned that could be applied to future partnerships and coordination/collaboration?

For PSF:

Does the KI feel the activities design, contents, organisation were proper to get results?

How was the coordination between all partners?

For instance, how was the communication?
What were the strengths and challenges of the partnership? How were the challenges overcome? Are there any lessons learned that could be applied to future partnerships and coordination/collaboration?

### Annex 6: The FGDs Participants list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Thematic</th>
<th>Participants’ name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07.1 2.20 18 2-4 pm</td>
<td>Focus Group 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>Aung Thura Win</td>
<td>Youth (Nyein Foundation)</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yee Yee Aye</td>
<td>Youth (Own Business)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thazin Hlaing</td>
<td>Youth (Peace Maker)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phyo Thiha Kyaw</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye Aye Thwe</td>
<td>Motion Picture Development Branch</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye Moe Moe Myint</td>
<td>Information and Public Relations Department</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San San Htwe</td>
<td>MRTV (TV)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San San Wai</td>
<td>MRTV (Radio)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.1 2.20 182 2-4 pm</td>
<td>Focus Group 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lashio</td>
<td>Youth Facilitators</td>
<td>Thu Ta</td>
<td>Youth (Change)</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thuzar Min</td>
<td>Youth (Infinity)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thuzar Nyo</td>
<td>Youth (Rainbow)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ahkar Soe</td>
<td>Youth (NSSYN)</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kyaw Zin Tun</td>
<td>Youth (LMC)</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Htwe</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phyo Phyo Mon(Phyo Lay)</td>
<td>Youth (Lashio Tomboy and Lesbian Group)</td>
<td>LGBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phyo Ma Ma Tun</td>
<td>Youth (Youth Interfaith)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Thematic</th>
<th>Participants' name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lashio</td>
<td>Mobile screening</td>
<td>Ma Thida</td>
<td>Community beneficiaries (LCC)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kyi Nu Shwe Sin</td>
<td>Community beneficiaries</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arkar Min Oo</td>
<td>Community beneficiaries</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daw Bawk Yar</td>
<td>Community beneficiaries</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pyae Kyaw Oo</td>
<td>Community beneficiaries</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nyan Linn Zaw</td>
<td>Community beneficiaries</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lashio</td>
<td>Mobile screening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aye Moe Thu</td>
<td>Community beneficiaries</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Media Production</td>
<td>Kaung Myat Thu Kyaw</td>
<td>Hnin Si Yin Kwin Production</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aung Chan Lu</td>
<td>Film Director of a PSA, Hnin Si Yin Kwin Production</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yuzana Khaing</td>
<td>MCA Production</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Wati</td>
<td>Film Director of a PSA and Music Video, MCA Production</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nilar Win</td>
<td>Editor/Scriptwriter from MRTV(TV)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thuzar Kyaw</td>
<td>Lighting Technician from MRTV(TV)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Su Mon Aung</td>
<td>MRTV(Radio)</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>Actor for TV production</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Mobile screening</td>
<td>Shwin Lann Theint</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Iang</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hsu Myat Thwe</td>
<td>Community beneficiaries</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 am</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Yangon</th>
<th>Mobile screening</th>
<th>Yair Yint Phyo</th>
<th>Youth (Facilitator)</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Mobile screening</td>
<td>Phyo Swe Seth</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Mobile screening</td>
<td>Htun Htun Htoo</td>
<td>Community beneficiaries</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Mobile screening</td>
<td>Kaung Aye Zan</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Mobile screening</td>
<td>Myat Hmue Thwe</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Mobile screening</td>
<td>Lin Lin Kyaw</td>
<td>Community beneficiaries</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 7: The KII Participants list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Participants name</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position in project</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.12.2018</td>
<td>Lashio</td>
<td>Daw Nilar Win</td>
<td>09-24319060</td>
<td>School Teacher (12-Q, Lashio)</td>
<td>Barrister</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.12.2018</td>
<td>Lashio</td>
<td>Daw Mye Thazar</td>
<td>09-40372889</td>
<td>Golden Pearl Disable Center (Project Manager)</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.12.2018</td>
<td>Lashio</td>
<td>Hnin Htay Hein</td>
<td>09-15365840</td>
<td>Golden Pearl Disable Center (Project Assistant)</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.12.2018</td>
<td>Lashio</td>
<td>Myat Nyo</td>
<td>09-25672298, 09-39/78/457</td>
<td>Member of Lashio Tomboy and Lesbian Group</td>
<td>Facilitator and Youth who assisted in script writing</td>
<td>LGBT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.12.2018</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Aung Win Nanning</td>
<td>09-143054372</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.12.2018</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Cho Cho Aung</td>
<td>09-790589057</td>
<td>Founder of Active Women Development Initiative (AWDI)</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12.2018</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Sai Ye Myint Hnin Aung</td>
<td>09-5140673</td>
<td>Song Writer and Music Producer</td>
<td>Film director of music video, composer of theme song</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.12.2018</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Hnin Jui Ko</td>
<td>09-77094594, 09-49390554</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Non-actor, LGBT in TV production</td>
<td>LGBT (male)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12.2018</td>
<td>Nyaungshwe</td>
<td>Bhi Khant</td>
<td>09-42070030</td>
<td>MRTV</td>
<td>RadioUserService</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12.2018</td>
<td>Nyaungshwe</td>
<td>Zin Nyein Eli</td>
<td>09-15428547</td>
<td>MRTV</td>
<td>Scriptwriter/Editor/Producer in TV production</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12.2018</td>
<td>Nyaungshwe</td>
<td>U Zin Yar</td>
<td>09-25107903, 09-775004</td>
<td>MRTV</td>
<td>Director of Radio broadcast</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.12.2018</td>
<td>Nyaungshwe</td>
<td>Daw Mya Thu /Zin Aung (never answered her phone or email)</td>
<td>09-490236, 09-775977</td>
<td>MRTV</td>
<td>Director of TV broadcast</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12.2018</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Sut Mya</td>
<td>09-15434406</td>
<td>SFOG</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.12.2018</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Khin Nan Mya</td>
<td>09-4100154</td>
<td>SFOG</td>
<td>Director of Programs</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12.2018</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Win Naining</td>
<td>09-25065100</td>
<td>SFOG</td>
<td>Media Coordinator</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.12.2018</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Hnin Myat Naining</td>
<td>09-45304640</td>
<td>SFOG</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.12.2018</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Khin Myo Myo Gyi</td>
<td>09-45298595</td>
<td>PSF</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.12.2018</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Hnin Myo</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PSF</td>
<td>Project Officer</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.12.2018</td>
<td>Yangon</td>
<td>Tin Tin Lat</td>
<td>09-44311452</td>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>Viewer and listener</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 8: The Desk Review Documents

**DESK REVIEW DOCUMENTS**

1. **SEARCH strategy and priorities in Myanmar:**
   1.1. Myanmar Strategy3-pager (pdf)
   1.2. Search Myanmar Program Overview (pdf)

2. **The project in Phase I, June 2016 to July 2017:**
2.1. SEARCH Myanmar Conflict Analysis - February 2015 (pdf)
2.2. DCA Consortia Rapid Conflict Assessment Final (pdf)
2.4. Peace Support Fund – “Debunking Stereotypes and Rumors through Popular Culture”-SEARCH - Phase I – Final Logframe (doc)
2.5. Proposal PSF – SEARCH - “Let’s Think, Let's Change: Promoting Diversity through Popular Culture”, Phase I (doc)
2.7. Viewership and Listenership Survey, Lashio & North Okkalapa, February 2017 (pdf)
2.8. Three Rs Framework (doc)
2.9. Radio production with:
   2.9.1. The 12 radio programs (vlc)
   2.9.2. The 12 scripts for the radio programs (doc)

3. The Phase I evaluation and the Phase II preparation, June 2017 to December 2017

3.1. Listenership survey and reflective review, “Let’s Think, Let’s Change: Promoting Diversity through Popular Culture”, June 2017 (pdf)
3.2. Rapid Assessment Report-September 2017 (pdf)
3.3. “Let’s Think, Let’s Change, Let’s See: Promoting Diversity through Popular Culture” - Phase II - Approved Logframe (doc)
3.4. Proposal PSF – SEARCH - “Let’s think, let’s change: Promoting Diversity through Popular Culture” - Phase II” - Final version, 2017 (doc)
3.5. 20170927_Phase II _PSF - FINAL APPROVED (2) (pdf)
3.6. “Start Up Deliverables - including DM&E framework, logframe, risk analysis”, including 8 documents:
   3.6.1. Cover letter (pdf)
   3.6.2. Detailed Activity Plan for First Quarter (doc)
   3.6.3. Let’s Think Lets Change Logframe II - Submission 15 January (doc)
   3.6.4. MYA 506 Risk Analysis updated (doc)
   3.6.5. Overall Work Plan (doc)
   3.6.6. PSF FINAL DM&E Framework_MYA506 (doc)
   3.6.7. Staff Development Plan (doc)
   3.6.8. Strategic Approaches – Notes (doc)

4. The Phase II implementation:

4.1. “Quarterly reports” (starting March 2018) with:
   4.1.1. SEARCH- 1st Quarterly Report (doc)
   4.1.2. SEARCH- 2nd Quarter Narrative Report (PSF) (doc)
   4.1.3. SEARCH- 3rd Quarter Narrative Report (PSF) (doc)
   4.1.4. Quartely_log_frame_Update (xls)
4.2. “1.1.2 Training for Youth Researchers”, including:
   4.2.1. CGA Training Report Lashio (doc)
   4.2.2. Finalised Training report on CGA(Yangon) (pdf)
   4.2.3. Training Report on Facilitation Guide-Lashio (pdf)
4.3. “1.2.2 National Curricula Summit”, March 2018, with:
   4.3.1. Curriculum Summit (Message Map) Report (doc)
   4.3.2. Message Map_Curriculum Document_Let’s think Let’s change _FINAL (doc)
4.3.4. Schedule_National Curriculum Summit_Let's Think, Let's Change-Myanmar_Final (doc)
4.4. “1.2.3 Format Development Workshop”, May 2018, with:
  4.4.1. SB workshop report 07 May edited (pdf)
4.5. Youth-led participatory research on social cohesion in urban areas - Final report, May 2018 (pdf)
4.6. “2.1.1 TV Production” with
  4.6.1. All 8 TV episodes (vlc)
  4.6.2. All 8 TV episodes scripts (in English) (doc)
4.7. “2.2.2 Radio Production” with
  4.7.1. All 12 Radio elements about Youth & Drug (vlc)
  4.7.2. All 12 Radio programs scripts (doc) (in Burmese)
The movies, radios, PSAs were also delivered as DVDs
4.8. Quarter list of Mobile screenings
4.9. SC2_Framework (pdf)
4.10. SC2-Facilitator-Guide_English (pdf)
4.11. SC2-Participant-Guide_English (pdf)
4.13. The Common Ground Approach - Training Modules (pdf)
4.14. FINAL Budget B - PSF Phase II Budget_27112017 F – FINAL (pdf)
4.15. LTLC_Analysis (xls)
4.16. DVB Broadcasting Plan in 2018 (doc)
4.17. Final_Evaluator_ToR (pdf)
Annex 9: The DM&E monitoring table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity 1</th>
<th>Activity 2</th>
<th>Activity 3</th>
<th>Activity 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/01/2023</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2023</td>
<td>110%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/2023</td>
<td>120%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/2023</td>
<td>130%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>105%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Activity 1: Cultural Exchange Event
- Activity 2: Artistic Performance
- Activity 3: Community Workshops
- Activity 4: Online Course
Annex 10: Demographic characteristics of the respondents

The Viewership/Listenership Survey of LTLC Programs

540 people were surveyed for this evaluation over 5 areas: Hlaingthayar, Insein, Lashio, North Okkalapa, Thaketa

The age, gender, belief, ethnicity and education profiles of the respondents are the following:

Numbers on the graph are the number of respondents for each category

The survey was done during working hours. Consequently, even proceeding randomly, in some places some age categories were more likely to be found or to take the time to answer, like in Hlaingthayar where older people were more available. In Lashio, surveying close to the University resulted in a highest 18-24 years’ old response. Otherwise, even if they are not equal, the data patterns are sufficiently consistent to be comparable.
According to Table 1, there are more women than men in all target areas. Thus, in Thaketa and Lashio there could have been 1 or 2 more women respondents and 1 or 2 less men. However, the differences are tight and gender balance is statistically respected between women and men. We can note there are seldom positive answers to LGBTIQ. It is still very difficult in Myanmar to openly identify as LGBTIQ. Interestingly, it is in Lashio where most people did it as it was already in the “Listeners survey and Reflective review” of June 2017.

All of the major religions are represented in the survey. All areas considered together, the vast majority of respondents are Buddhist (89%), although Christians (6.3%), Muslims (2.4%), and Hindus (1.2%), are also represented. This matches almost exactly the country official data and is a validation for the quality of the data collected.

The two graphs below describe the respondent’s ethnicity, distributed either by location (Graph 4) or by ethnicity (Graph 5):

---

22 According to Myanmar Ministry of Immigration and Population (2016). “2014 Population Census Dataset by Population and Township”, 89.8% of the national population is Buddhist, 6.3% are Christian, 2.3% are Muslim, and 0.5% are Hindu. [http://themimu.info/census-data]
The Bamar are the majority, followed by Kayin, Kachin, Shan, Ta’ang and Rakhine. All ethnicities surveyed are present. Lashio is by far the most ethnically diverse location, where Bamar are still the majority but not as overwhelming as in other target areas.

Most respondents are educated and graduated from Middle School to Bachelor degree. However, there is also a sizable number of respondents with only a Primary School level education.

**Annex 11: Evaluation Terms of Reference**

**Consultancy: Institutional Learning - Final Evaluator**

Asia – Yangon, Myanmar

Search for Common Ground (Search) Myanmar seeks an experienced international or national consultant to conduct a final evaluation of its project “Let’s Think, Let’s Change: promoting cultural diversity through popular culture.”

**I. Context**

The Organization

Search Myanmar's approach is to support locally led processes at different levels of society in order to transform local level conflict. Search Myanmar has been supporting an inclusive peace process at the local level...
level, social cohesion nationwide, and supporting people across Myanmar to contribute to positive change through skills building and trust building, working with a multitude of stakeholders, including government, the private sector, the media, and civil society including women, youth and minorities. Search Myanmar works with local partners across seven states and three regions and is at an exciting stage reaching new levels of growth, scaling up its programmatic work, team, office and operations to support its strategy in country and to support Myanmar in its priorities of peace, development and democratic change. (https://www.sfcg.org/myanmar/).

The Project
Search is entering the final stages of a 12-month project, “Let’s Think, Let’s Change: Promoting Diversity through Popular Culture: Multimedia for Modern Myanmar-Phase II”. The overall goal of the project is to promote and support acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar, contributing to social cohesion and inter-communal harmony in Myanmar. The first phase of “Let’s Think, Let’s Change” was implemented from July 2016 to June 2017. The current phase of the project has been funded by the Paung Sie Facility (PSF) and began in December 2017. For this project, Search has partnered with Myanmar Radio and Television (MRTV)–the most widely accessible state-owned television and radio station in Myanmar.

The project has taken a multi-pronged approach to changing social norms through community-based work led by youth leaders, a multi-media campaign, television public service announcements (PSAs), a TV drama series, and a radio reality show.

The 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 enable 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 specific objectives/outcomes of the project are:

Outcome 1: Youth, government, educational leaders, and media professionals have increased skills and knowledge to implement project activities that foster social cohesion.

Outcome 2: The public has increased understanding of the importance of collaboration and respect across divides

Outcome 3: State/citizen, interethnic and interreligious positive interaction and trust has increased.

Existing Data: The evaluation team will have access to all existing project information, data, and reports from both Phase I and Phase II of the project

II. The Final Evaluation

Goal, Approach, and Scope
The final evaluation will reflect on the Phase II –12 months from 11th December 2017 to 10th December 2018. The intent of the final evaluation is to extract lessons for program improvement and ascertain the potential for scaling the project up in the future. The evaluation will be coordinated by the Search Myanmar Director of Programs and the entire process will be overseen by Search’s Institutional Learning Team (ILT).

The geographical scope of the evaluation is Lashio (Northern Shan State), and three townships in Greater Yangon– North Okkalapa, Hlainthaya, and Insein. An additional location with similar socio-political
characteristics but outside of the project’s geographical reach will be selected with input from the Project Team and consultant(s) to function as a control sample.

Audience
The primary users of the evaluation will be the Search Myanmar country team and PSF. Secondary consumers of the evaluation will include program partners—specifically MRTV4 staff, government counterparts, and Search colleagues outside of Myanmar.

Evaluation Implementation Information
The evaluator(s) will be managed primarily by Search Myanmar’s Director of Programs with technical assistance from the DM&E Coordinator and oversight by ILT. The consultant team will arrange all logistical arrangements and Search will assist in communicating with stakeholders.

Methodology
The evaluation is meant to produce information and make recommendations that are sufficiently valid and reliable based on data and analysis. The detailed methodology for this evaluation will be developed by the evaluation team in consultation with the Search Team and approved by ILT. The methodology should be designed to allow for comparison against the baseline and other research that has been conducted over the project’s lifetime, and incorporate both qualitative and quantitative methods of data collection and integrate these data in the report.

Search welcomes innovative evaluation methodology (ies) from the evaluation team. The team should propose a methodology that responds to the evaluation questions and objectives, detailing how results will be captured. However, one important aspect of this study is the viewership/listenership survey of TV and Radio programs. The evaluation team may want to use the 3-R (Reach, Resonance and Response) Approach among the target populations. The 3-R Approach is a Search-developed media monitoring tool that measures the geographic and demographic coverage of the media programs (Reach), how the media programs’ messages resonate with viewers/listeners (Resonance) and the how the viewers/listeners Responded and initiated actions because of the influence of the messages delivered through the media program. The viewership survey will use an appropriate sample size (based on 95% confidence level and 3% margin of error) for both target groups in project locations and a control group outside of the geographic reach of project activities, but with similar socio-political characteristics.

Evaluation criteria and questions
The evaluation questions are based on the OECD-DAC criteria for evaluating conflict prevention and peacebuilding programs, namely: relevance, effectiveness, coordination/coherence, and sustainability. The evaluation specifically focuses on drawing lessons learned and scaling up opportunities for the future.

Relevance
How relevant is the project considering the overall conflict dynamics in target townships? Were the activities well designed to achieve the desired objectives and results?
What are community members’ and other stakeholders’ perceptions of the project and its activities vis-a-vis their needs?
To what extent is the project’s design, implementation methodology, and process coherent with the needs of the people in the target areas?

Effectiveness
Did the project’s Theory of Change prove valid?
How has the project contributed to developing constructive narratives and mechanisms to deliver those narratives in challenging the existing negative narratives and stereotypes?
To what extent has the project contributed to increasing public understanding of and respect for different members of their diverse communities?
Is there any evidence that hatred and prejudices across dividing lines has decreased in the project areas?
Were the outcomes of the project achieved? To what extent did the project’s activities contribute to this?
To what extent has the project contributed to increasing knowledge and skills of target stakeholders in implementing project activities that foster social cohesion?
How successful was the project in fostering dialogue among divided communities? Have there been specific examples of improved understanding and relationships? Has there been increased tolerance as a result of the project initiatives?
To what extent has the project contributed to increasing positive interaction/communications and trust among state/citizen and ethnic and religious groups across divides?
How did the project contribute to building capacity of radio & TV producers, youth, and media professionals in conflict transformation and social cohesion?
How did the project improve the target beneficiaries’ willingness to participate in activities and research geared towards supporting social cohesion (e.g. trainings, campaign, dialogues, etc)?

Coordination/Coherence
Were the project activities (e.g. capacity-building media and outreach) sufficiently coherent to generate the desired results?
How was the coordination between Search Myanmar, MRTV and radio production partners, and other partner organizations (if any) while implementing the project?
How effective was the communication between all project stakeholders?
What were the strengths and challenges of the partnership? How were the challenges overcome? Are there any lessons learned that could be applied to future partnerships and coordination/collaboration?

Sustainability
How has the project contributed to creating a conducive environment for promoting the acceptance of diversity as a social norm in Myanmar?
Is there any evidence that shows the shift in knowledge, attitude and behavior has been locally rooted and will continue after the life of the project?
Have MRTV leadership or the radio and television program producers or other concerned stakeholders developed any sense of ownership around the goal, objectives, and strategies of the project?

Lessons learned and opportunities for scaling up
What are the best practices and key lessons learned? Is there the potential to scale up the project initiatives?
Did this project do anything new that others are not doing?
Does it add value to the process of building positive relationships between people from different backgrounds in Myanmar? If so, in what way?

Key Listenership/viewership Survey Questions
What is the Reach, Resonance and Response of the TV and Radio Program across the target population?
Reach: What is the geographic and demographic reach of the TV/Radio Programs?
Resonance: Did the issues and stories discussed in the media programs resonate with the real-life experiences of the listeners/viewers? Were people about to relate these discussions with their personal life and challenges? Did it catalyze any knowledge and/or attitudinal changes among respondents?
Response: Did the listeners/viewers take any action that was inspired by the “Let’s Think, Let’s Change” project? Did it bring any behavior changes among people from across dividing lines?

Deliverables

The evaluation deliverables should be written in English. They are as follows:

Inception Report with evaluation design and work plan completed within 7 days of signing the contract. The inception report should provide a detailed explanation of the methodological approach, data collection tools, sampling frame, timeline, and logistical requirements. The inception report and the data collection tools/questions require formal approval by the Senior Regional Regional DM&E Specialist for Asia and Macedonia before starting the data collection process.

Survey
Develop survey questionnaires in English and translate into Myanmar language for listenership/viewership survey.
Identify field researchers in each state, provide them one-day orientation on administering the survey.
Pilot the 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.
Compile, enter, and analyse data using SPSS or similar statistical software.
Generate a tabulation plan based on the questionnaire.

Qualitative Data Collection
Develop the criteria for Key Informant Interview (KII) and Focus Group Discussion (FGD) participants.
Oversee the creation of invitation lists for both KII and FGDs.
Conduct/oversee the KII and FGD sessions.
Compile, enter, analyse, and interpret data using appropriate method/approach.
Generate a qualitative data sheet for meaningful interpretation of the data.

Verification workshop with the project team—and possibly project participants—to present the preliminary findings and verify the collected information and data. Specific deliverables could include a PowerPoint presentation, slide deck, 1-2 page brief, or any other method preferred by the consultant(s).

First draft of the evaluation report. The consultant(s) should submit first draft of the evaluation report analyzing and integrating both qualitative and quantitative data. The report is subject to review and approval by Search Myanmar and ILT. The review and feedback may consist of multiple rounds depending on the quality of the report. The raw data collected and photographs taken during the evaluation should be handed over to Search Myanmar. The consultant is also expected to submit a short listenership/viewership survey report in addition to integrating the listenership/viewership data into the evaluation report.

Final evaluation report: The report should be written and fully edited in English (max 35 pages). Search will share the template for both evaluation report and the Listenership/viewership survey report to the consultant.

Presentation of key findings to key stakeholders and partners translated into Myanmar language. Specific deliverables could include PowerPoint presentation, slide deck, 1-2 page brief, or another method preferred by the consultant(s).
Duration and Working Days
Search estimates the working days for this evaluation to be approximately 20-30 days spanning duration between November 2018 - December 2018. There may be opportunity to extend into January and February.

Tentative Deadlines and Timing
*The evaluation timeline is dependent upon the TV program air dates, which are currently under negotiation. All dates are subject to slight modification during the recruitment and inception phases.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce inception report, including the methodology and data collection tools</td>
<td>7 days from the signing the contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection (to begin roughly 2 weeks after completion of the TV broadcast)</td>
<td>Two weeks after the approval of the inception report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verification workshop to present the preliminary findings and verify data</td>
<td>Four days after the field work is completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft evaluation report of around 20-25 pages, excluding annex</td>
<td>Ten days after the field work presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final report incorporating comments by Search in word and pdf.</td>
<td>Five days after receiving feedback from Search on the draft report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of interview notes, filled in questionnaires, audio-visual materials generated during the field work</td>
<td>With final report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Application Information

Requirements of Evaluation Team
The following skills and experience are expected of the consultant(s):
- Experience in quantitative and qualitative research on media and peacebuilding;
- Ability to travel to different project target areas (Lashio, North Okkalapa, and other control areas);
- The team should include at least one local team member to facilitate communications, conducting qualitative research, and logistics;
- Experience in carrying out project evaluations in conflict transformation and peacebuilding;
- Experience in media programming and/or evaluation;
- Familiarity of conflict-sensitive project management;
- Proficiency in English;
- Good analytical and writing skills, including the ability to clearly present findings, draw practical conclusions, and develop lessons learned.

The evaluation team is bound respect Search’s evaluation standards, found in Search’s evaluation guidelines: https://www.sfcg.org/ilt/evaluations/ and other ethical evaluation standards practiced elsewhere.

To Apply
To apply, interested candidates should send the following items to our career portal:
Cover letter and CV including reference contact information;
Separate technical and financial proposal with clear methodology and detailed cost projection.
Application materials must be submitted by 30 September 2018. Shortlisted applicants will be contacted the following week to continue with the selection process and should be prepared to provide a writing sample from an evaluation (or research) report written by the applicant in English.