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Executive Summary

The Republic of Macedonia has made progress in advancing social cohesion between ethnic and religious groups since the signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement, which brought the 2001 ethnic conflict to an end. Despite this, political and ethnic tensions have grown in recent years. Rising ethnic nationalism, inequitable representation of ethnic communities in public administration, decline in media and judicial independence, and increased political polarization have increased segregation throughout the country. In addition to the Macedonian and Albanian ethnic groups, the country is also home to other minorities such as Turks, Roma, Serbs, Bosniaks, and Vlachs. The ethnic, religious, cultural and political tensions between these groups are putting severe strain on the social fabric of the country. The dynamics of polarization at the national level have a profound impact at the local level, with many communities characterized by mistrust and fear.

Segregation in schools remains widespread and is a factor that is eroding social cohesion. In public preschools in Macedonia children from various ethnic communities commonly attend separate classrooms and study in their own languages, ingraining mono-ethnic thinking. Although inter-ethnic education for young children is key to expanding opportunities for dialogue in the long-term, preschool education in Macedonia is marginalized and neglected. There is a lack of continued, institutionalized professional development of the preschool teachers that will build their capacities for working in multicultural environments. Though Macedonia and the international community have invested in interethnic education, gaps in this system remain and pose a risk of continuing the generational trend of ethnic and religious tension.

If underlying ethnic, religious, and social tensions are not addressed, there is a risk of these divides being magnified and continuing to flare in response to ethnic, political and social shocks. A widespread shift in public attitudes, driven by Macedonia’s younger generation, in favor of peace and inter-ethnic integration is required for the country to thrive in the long-term.

The Advancing Social Cohesion Project is a four-year project which builds on and expands USAID’s and Search’s previous work in the area of interethnic education in Macedonia. The overall goal of the project is to improve the relationships among children and youth across ethnic, religious and social divisions. The achievement of this goal is based on two mutually supportive objectives:

---

1 International Crisis Group, “Macedonia: Ten Years After the Conflict, Europe Report No 212”
2 International Crisis Group, “Macedonia: Defusing the Bombs, Crisis Group Europe Briefing No 75”
3 Successful education in the early childhood is “one of the critical long term answers to the problem of violence in the society, since […] patterns of violence and aggressive behavior in adolescents and adults can be traced to behavioral and social problems in early childhood.” United Nations Economic and Social Council. Early Childhood Development. 2009 http://webapps01.un.org/ivp/p/frontend/policy.action?id=1644&tab=intiative
i) strengthening interethnic interaction among children and advancing intercultural education in public kindergartens and primary schools; and

ii) increasing public awareness of positive ethnic integration and social cohesion.

The main purpose of this study was to collect baseline data for specific project indicators on interethnic relationships, social cohesion, and the perceptions of intercultural education and the lived experience of various stakeholders, especially the students and the teachers. The geographical scope of the baseline study is the multiethnic local communities in Skopje (Karposh, Chair, and Gazi Baba), Kumanovo, Tetovo, Gostivar, Kicevo, Struga, Debar and Radovish.

Methodology

The baseline study used a mixed method approach of data collection. It used a public opinion poll (among community members), a survey of teachers teaching grades 1-3 and FGDs with students aged 13-19—from primary schools, grades 7, 8 and 9 and high school students. Secondary sources such as census reports, other state agencies’ data, studies by other NGOs and think tank institutes were also reviewed.

For the qualitative survey, a combination of non-probability multistage purposive sampling was used to decide sampled municipalities and the proportionate sample size for each ethnic group, while a random quota sampling technique was used to select specific respondents from each ethnic and gender cluster. The total sample size calculated for the survey was 1549, with 613 Macedonians, 513 Albanians, 147 Turks, 126 Romani, 74 Serbs and 24 Bosniaks.

A total of 37 focus group discussions were carried out in 10 municipalities involving 564 students aged 13-19 from Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish, Roma and Serbian ethnic groups. For the teachers’ survey, a snowball sampling method was used to identify teachers (teaching grades 1-3 only) to be interviewed. Even though we distributed survey questionnaires to all teachers in each target municipality, only 94 teachers from 7 schools turned in the answered questionnaires. Despite consistent efforts to carry out FGDs and teachers’ survey in all 10 municipalities, the study team had to compromise in some of the municipalities because of the unavailability of selected target group members.

Key Findings

The baseline study collected data on people’s perspectives on social cohesion, interethnic relationships, intercultural environments and activities in schools, students’ and teachers’ understanding of the concept of intercultural education, cultural diversity in schools, common challenges faced by youth and communities, television viewership and people’s assessments on the quality of TV programming currently presented on Macedonian television.

The findings from the public opinion poll in all 10 municipalities indicate that a majority of people tend to agree that social cohesion should exist in their municipality. The ethnicity disaggregated data revealed that Macedonians, Roma and Serbs are slightly more positive about the need for social cohesion in their communities as compared to Albanians and Turks. This indicates that the Albanians and Turks still carry the grievances of the ethnic conflict in 2001 slightly more than other ethnic communities.

Although a little more than half of the respondents said that they trust people from other ethnicities/religions/cultures, there is still a significant portion of the population struggling to trust “other” people residing in their communities and neighborhoods. The ethnically mixed municipalities with a larger ethnic Macedonian population (such as Gazi Baba and Karposh in Skopje, and Radovish) are places where
people trust “others” more than the municipalities with a larger ethnic Albanian population (Tetovo and Gostivar), indicating their views about the need for improved social cohesion in their communities.

The baseline study revealed that despite having some grievances against each other from the past, the ethnic Macedonian population does not express them in their everyday life. This is demonstrated by the fact that an overwhelming majority of ethnic Macedonians have friends from other ethnic groups. However, when diving deeper into the relationship dynamics, it becomes apparent that most people have only a few people (up to 4) from other communities with whom they can share their personal matters.

The insights from the FGDs reveal that the level of interaction and communication between and among students depends on the school structure, the existence of out-of-school activities, or the location of places for going out. In towns such as Tetovo, Kumanovo and Kicevo, students reported going to separate places for leisure time from their school. There were also incidents where some radical youths would criticize and ridicule other youths who were meeting peers from different ethnic communities. However, the baseline also found, in general, a strong desire among youths to make friends from across divides and to interact and collaborate with each other.

Most of the teachers surveyed reported that, in general, the relationships among students from across divides are good in their schools and that there is a trend of improvement. It was also revealed that the basic understanding of the concept of intercultural education is better among the students than among teachers in primary schools. This may need further exploration to understand the reasons behind this finding.

The study revealed that a large majority of the respondents (83%) in Macedonia watch television. A majority of the respondents said that they watch and prefer mostly TV drama/serials, followed by documentaries and news. TV programs in a reality show format are not yet well known amongst the respondents, since reality shows are not currently aired on Macedonian television. However, during the FGDs, respondents from among the youth said that they prefer to watch programs that include comedy, interaction and fun, which is promising for the reality show format.

The majority of respondents prefer to watch TV on weekends in the evening. The baseline study found that days other than Saturday and Sunday, and time slots other than the evening, are not suitable for broadcasting a program that aims to disseminate a message on social cohesion and community reconciliation across the country to a large number of people.

The study found that Kanal 5 and Sitel, which have 16% viewership each, are the two most popular TV Channels in Macedonia followed by Telma (10.5 %) and AlSat M (12%).

The majority of people in Macedonia are not aware of any TV program on any of the national channels for youth on interethnic relationships and collaboration. This was also confirmed by the focus group discussions with students. A majority of the youth said that due to a lack of quality TV programs targeting youth in Macedonian, they mostly watch foreign TV channels. The younger generations are more interested in getting involved in fun-filled, out-of-school activities, developed in consultation with youth. TV programs, such as Nashe Maalo and Tintimintiri were found to be popular among the younger generations. This is insightful for designing the format and content of the project’s TV program.

Lastly, the analysis of the qualitative data provides interesting and detailed insights about youth involvement in community affairs. Most youths stated that they are passive followers and not active actors in their communities. Such a tendency among the youth is attributed to different external and internal factors, such as the high level of internet and social media usage, lack of interest and motivation to get

---

4 Co-produced by Common Ground Productions and Children's Television Workshop (now Sesame Workshop), Nashe Maalo (“Our Neighborhood”) is the first Macedonian children's television program created to promote intercultural understanding and to impart conflict resolution skills pertinent to children's everyday lives.
involved in community activities, lack of intergenerational communication and collaboration, lack of support and respect by parents and teachers and a lack of institutional opportunities provided by local and national authorities/agencies, among others. Despite this fact, a majority of the students expressed willingness to participate in activities if adequate opportunities are provided.

**Recommendations**

The baseline study provides a number of findings useful for the adjustment and fine-tuning of project strategies and activities during the implementation phase. They are as follows:

- Ensure Albanian and Turkish individuals are selected to participate in project activities, since they have a relatively lower level of trust in people from other communities.

- Organize regular multi-stakeholder dialogues with representatives of Macedonian, Albanian and Turkish communities in order to reduce the prevailing lack of trust and evident prejudice against each other.

- Explore the opportunity for developing more activities for schools with separate ethnic shifts or with mono-lingual instruction, i.e. joint activities for students from Macedonian and Albanian schools.

- Through capacity building or awareness raising activities for primary school teachers, enhance the understanding and importance of intercultural education and its impact on the life of young children and youth.

- Organize activities that facilitate the building of intergenerational relationships and collaboration among children/youth and adults.

- Considering the very low awareness of the Macedonian public about reality TV shows, there is a need for assessing the format of the envisioned reality TV show before making the final decision about the TV program and its actual content.

- Do not solely depend on teachers’ recommendations in the process of recruitment of students for the TV program, because students pointed out certain biases by teachers in selecting students for similar projects in the past.

- TV Kanal 5 and Sitel are the two most popular TV channels, so the project should aim to broadcast its TV program on one of these two channels or on both so as to maximize outreach.

- The project should air the TV program on weekends in the evening.

- There should be extensive promotional activities about the TV program so people are aware of it when it is broadcasted across the country.

- The show should be of an edutainment nature in its format and content, so it can become popular among all age groups of people.

- Support activities that promote cultural diversity and inclusive cultural practices among students, so that they can learn about other cultures, ethnicities and religions.
● Support activities that contribute to a positive shift in young people’s attitude and behavior towards members of other communities.

● The project should work with youths to bring positive thinking and promote non-adversarial approaches (such as dialogues) to resolving their misunderstandings/disputes.
1. Background Information

Project Overview

Advancing Social Cohesion in Macedonia project employs a result-driven approach for the implementation of project activities. The overall project goal is to improve relationships among children and youth across ethnic, religious and social divisions, so the people of Macedonia will be better able to work together to withstand ethnic, social, and economic shocks without resorting to violence. This goal will be achieved through two mutually supportive objectives and related key results:

Objective 1: Strengthen inter-ethnic interaction among children and advance intercultural education in public preschool kindergartens and primary schools

- Result 1.1: The capacities of the preschool and primary school teachers to deliver intercultural/multicultural integrated education are increased;
- Result 1.2: Healthy relationships are created amongst children and parents from different ethnic backgrounds, including across religions and gender lines.
- Result 1.3: Intercultural education is strengthened institutionally across the country.

Objective 2: Increase public awareness of positive ethnic integration and social cohesion

- Result 2.1: Youth of Macedonia have increased awareness and understanding of demonstrable successful models of positive ethnic cohesion.
- Result 2.2: Diverse youth have increased confidence and trust across ethnic divides to constructively resolve conflict in a non-adversarial and non-violent way.
- Result 2.3: Youth of Macedonia are exposed to positive role models from both their own communities and from refugee communities.
The project is based upon a proven People-to-People (P2P) approach which is supported by the premise that strong, positive relationships will improve inter-ethnic integration and mitigate potential crises that could result from social, political or economic shocks. It finds its foundation in SFCG’s Common Ground Approach of bringing people together across dividing lines through non-adversarial and inclusive engagement to improve ethnic relations in Macedonia. The project will bring a range of stakeholders together in a constructive, gender sensitive and safe way to support a generational change in favor of social cohesion and peace:

1) Young children of different ethnicities and religions: Young boys and girls from different ethnic and linguistic schools will come together for community outreach activities with the support of Open Fun Football School.

2) Parents, teachers, and school administrators: Selected parents of children enrolled in intercultural education programs will come together through a parent volunteer program, developed in a participatory manner so that teachers, parents, children and the kindergarten management can share their expectations and create guidelines on how such intercultural education can be linked to everyday children activities.
3) Youth of different ethnicities and religions, including vulnerable groups: For the reality TV show *Rise Up!,* a balance of youths will be selected in regards to gender, social, religious, and ethnic background to ensure diversity. Vulnerable groups, such as refugees and disabled persons, will be specifically included. Youths will not only interact in the Common Ground workshops, but also onscreen throughout the series, promoting a positive image of P2P in action.

4) Youth and community stakeholders: The diverse youths participating in the TV series will directly collaborate with local authorities and businesses to overcome a challenge that their community is facing. As these relationships strengthen, the youths will be perceived more positively by these stakeholders, and the youths will perceive working with other interethnic boys and girls with more confidence.

**Theory of Change**

The project is rooted in the following theory of change (TOC):

“if **Macedonian children and youth positively interact and develop stronger relationships across ethnic, religious and social divisions,** then **Macedonia will be better able to work together to withstand ethnic, social and economic shocks without resorting to violence,** because **improved attitudes, relationships, and experiences of cooperation among young people will facilitate cooperation across the social divisions of Macedonian society, yielding greater social cohesion and opportunities for collective action to overcome future shocks**”.

Our theory of change is anchored in USAID’s “Inside-Out Peacebuilding”\(^5\) and “Attitudes towards Peace”\(^6\) TOC families and it utilizes a strategy of humanizing the “other” through inclusive, inter-ethnic contact amongst children and youth. This project’s theory of change reflects existing gaps and opportunities in inter-ethnic programming in Macedonia. Current initiatives miss key segments of this target population that are critical for generational shifts and fail to couple in-person, educational programming with broad-based media efforts that jointly create changes by utilizing a *key people* and *more people* approach.

This project believes that education and media activities implemented jointly to strengthen relationships across ethnic and religious divides will produce both institutional and attitudinal change. Search proposes to assess the uptake of the program at the institutional level (as reflected in the adoption of the approach by schools and teachers) as a proxy indicator for its perceived effectiveness among the in-class target population. We additionally anticipate measuring the attitudinal results among the general population through public opinion research and surveying, informed by Search’s two decades of experience of measuring the effectiveness of media strategies in fostering attitudes conducive to social cohesion.

**2. Methodology**

**Baseline Study Objectives**

The goal of the baseline study is to *establish an understanding of the state of interethnic relationships, social cohesion, perceptions of intercultural education and the lived experiences of youth in*

---


\(^6\) ibid: 8
Macedonia. The baseline study measures perceptions among teachers about the role of intercultural education, as well as among local communities of youth and youth perceptions about their role in addressing ethnic conflict locally and nationally. Furthermore, it assesses the critical issues facing the youth of Macedonia today, paying particular attention to the different ways that various stakeholder groups are involved in their communities and barriers to their enhanced participation, which will be used to influence project implementation strategies.

Table 1 presents the key baseline questions, corresponding target stakeholders to be interviewed, and the data collection tools. The major target groups for this study are youth, primary school teachers, and the general public.

**Table 1. Key questions to be answered through the baseline study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Research method through which the data will be collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the level of public awareness about ethnic integration and social cohesion?</td>
<td>The general public (local communities)</td>
<td>Public opinion poll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the existing level of intercommunal/interethnic trust in Macedonia?</td>
<td>The general public (local communities)</td>
<td>Focus groups with parents, focus groups with students, public opinion poll, secondary data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do people from across divides interact with each other?</td>
<td>The general public</td>
<td>Secondary data, a public opinion poll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the state of adoption of intercultural education in target schools?</td>
<td>Schools in Macedonia</td>
<td>Secondary data, internal data of SFCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the current level of knowledge of intercultural education among school teachers, school inspectors, students?</td>
<td>School teachers</td>
<td>Survey with teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do youth feel that they are respected by the community?</td>
<td>Youth (13-19)</td>
<td>Focus groups in primary and secondary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the challenges faced by youth and Macedonia?</td>
<td>Youth (13-19)</td>
<td>Focus groups in primary and secondary schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the state of the relationship among youth from across ethnic, religious and social divides?</td>
<td>Youth (13-19)</td>
<td>Focus groups, secondary data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the factors that drive youth both positively and negatively?
Youth (13-19) Focus group discussion

What are the activities that youth are currently engaged in?
Youth (13-19) Focus group discussion

What are the capacity and social needs of youth to mobilize them positively?
Youth (13-19) Focus group discussion

Geographical Coverage of the Baseline Study

The geographical scope of the baseline study includes the multi-ethnic municipalities of Skopje-Karposh, Skopje-Chair, Skopje-Gazi Baba, Kumanovo, Tetovo, Gostivar, Kicevo, Struga, Debar and Radovish. Even if the television program is broadcast across the country, the baseline study collects data from only the 10 municipalities where other intensive training and outreach activities will also be implemented. The project emphasizes communities that are multi-ethnic with mixed populations, including Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish, Roma and Serbian. Cross-generational and appropriate gender representation is critical for a clear understanding of the community context and for effective implementation of it. The baseline study has tried its best to maintain the participation of respondents from all ethnic groups in the survey as well as FGDs to make sure that the study is inclusive, and that the data collected is representative of the diverse population of Macedonia.

Data Collection and Analysis

The data collection started in late January 2018, after getting all of the official approvals for the research instruments from USAID and the government; especially, the Ministry of Education and Science in Macedonia. The fieldwork lasted 4 weeks, including the distribution of the paper-based survey.

In order to accomplish the goals of the baseline study, a combination of quantitative and qualitative tools/methods of data gathering were applied to ensure better data validity and a broader range of information having deeper analytical possibility. The proposed methods depend on the target group, the sensitivity of the information needed to be collected and the availability of time. In addition to primary sources, the study team collected secondary sources of data whenever possible.

- A quantitative survey among the community/public opinion poll
- Focus group discussions with youth (13-19)
- A short survey of teachers in primary schools
- Secondary sources (census and other state agencies’ data, special studies by other NGOs and mass media) and literature review

The data collection (both qualitative and quantitative) was done with the help of locally recruited researchers/ enumerators. An advertisement for moderators of focus group discussions and researchers/ enumerators was published between 6-12 February 2018. Based on the methodology to be used in the baseline study and the sensitivity of the topic (interethnic trust, social cohesion), the selected candidates had to fulfill the following criteria to be recruited:

- A resident of the respective targeted municipalities
- Member of the specific ethnic group in the target municipality
- Speak at least one of the languages used in the specific municipality
- Have experience in fieldwork/work with the community.

However, the number of candidates who applied for the positions of moderators and researchers/enumerators were less than the number and composition required. Taking this into account and the specific job requirements, the research team decided to recruit researchers and moderators locally with the help of local networks. The baseline study team approached local NGOs/informal groups/schools/kindergartens for recommendations for local people and recruited them after interviewing.

The quantitative data was gathered through the general public opinion poll distributed by a local team of interviewers who were responsible for surveying people using a door-to-door method. Each of the interviewers had a specific quota (number of surveys to complete) based on the previously calculated sample size (see table 2).

Regarding the focus groups discussions, the project team decided to arrange the discussions in primary and secondary schools, with students from 7, 8, 9 grades in primary schools and then students from 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th years in high schools. This is in line with the targeted age group of the baseline study (13 through 19-year-old youths).

**Sampling Methodology**

For the qualitative survey, a combination of non-probability multistage purposive sampling was used to decide sampled municipalities and proportionate sample size for each ethnic group, while a random quota sampling technique was used to select specific respondents from each ethnic and gender cluster. An effort was made to make sure that each ethnic group had representation in sample size, regardless of their population size in respective municipalities. Table 2 presents the final sample size calculated for each municipality and ethnic group. The total sample size calculated for the survey was 1549, with 613 Macedonians, 513 Albanians, 147 Turkish, 126 Romanian, 74 Serbians and 24 Bosnians.

The sample size was calculated using following formula.

\[
ss = \frac{Z^2 \times (p) \times (1-p)}{c^2}
\]

Where:
- \(Z\) = Z value (e.g. 1.96 for 95% confidence level)
- \(p\) = percentage picking a choice, expressed as decimal
  (.5 used for sample size needed)
- \(c\) = confidence interval, expressed as decimal
  (e.g., .03 = ±3%)

The sample size was calculated using a 3% confidence interval and a 95% confidence level. The actual sample size with additional 10% non-response error was 1172. However, due to the adjustment required for a smaller population, and to make their sample size meaningful, the final sample size was increased to 1549.
However, despite the initial selection of a total sample size of 1549, only 1436 samples were considered for analysis, as 113 survey questions were incomplete or not filled in because of various reasons, such as respondents stopping the survey midway through because of urgent issues, not finding target respondents from small minority groups in villages, among others. Thus, these answers were not considered for analysis. However, the baseline study team was aware of such a possibility and an additional 10% was added to the sample size while making the calculation.

A total of 37 focus groups discussions (FGD) were carried out in 10 municipalities, involving 564 students aged 13-19 from Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish, Roma and Serbian ethnic groups, with approximately 15 students in each FGD. In order to make the group inclusive, the baseline study team allowed the number of participants to exceed the ideal maximum number of participants (6-12) in a FGD. The language used for the discussion was Macedonian, Albanian or Turkish depending on the common language spoken in the respective municipality.

In order to make the FGDs inclusive, the baseline study team developed the following set of criteria for selection of youth to participate in the FGDs:

- ✓ Ethnically mixed schools
- ✓ An equal number of boys and girls
- ✓ A proportionate number of Macedonian and Albanian/Serb/Turk/Roma students

For the teachers’ survey, a snowball sampling method was used to identify teachers to be interviewed. The survey was meant only for teachers who teach students from grades 1-3, thus they were directly contacted through the schools where we also conducted focus groups discussions. We distributed survey questions to all teachers from each Municipality, but only 94 teachers from 7 schools returned the filled in survey questions. From two municipalities (Tetovo and Kicevo), we have not received the surveys back, while in Radovish, we were not able to distribute the survey questions as we could not organize FGDs in this Municipality. Radovish is a very small town in Macedonia, with one primary school in the center of the town, while another primary school is in the village next to the town. However, the Turkish and Roma community live in the village, thus the primary school inside the town is not ethnically mixed. There was not an opportunity to hear the opinions of the minority students. Therefore, it was decided not to organize the FGD with Macedonian students only.

**Table 2. Project’s locations, schools and the number of interviewed teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Gazi Baba</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Struga</th>
<th>Kumanovo</th>
<th>Karposh</th>
<th>Gostivar</th>
<th>Debar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Schools</td>
<td>PSs Dane Krapev and 25 May</td>
<td>Hasan Pristina</td>
<td>Braka Miladinovic</td>
<td>Toli Zordimus</td>
<td>Bratstvo</td>
<td>Mustafa Kemal Ataturk</td>
<td>Bratstvo-Edinstvo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limitations of the Study

The baseline study faced a few challenges. One of them was to find the desired number of respondents from specific ethnic groups. Thus, the final response rate of the survey was slightly smaller than the original calculated number due to the difficulty in finding some respondents from specific ethnic communities in target municipalities. For example, in Tetovo the survey team was unable to find 16 Serbs, although the official census data showed the Serbs population in Tetovo. Another challenge was faced in the small municipality of Radovish, where a small Turkish population lives. There is only one school. The Turkish community mostly lives in the rural areas, while the school is located in the urban center. Therefore, it was difficult to organize ethnically mixed focus groups with students. Thus, the FGD was not possible, and the baseline team was only successful in collecting data through public polling. Finally, the teachers’ survey has a small sample size of 94; the results from the survey may not be generalized for the larger teachers’ population. The study did not receive the teachers’ survey form from 2 schools, while it could not distribute survey questions to Radovish municipality. However, the data generated from this survey is still good for the target municipalities.
3. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

3.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

This section presents the demographic characteristics of the respondents, primarily focusing on the respondents of the public perception survey, followed by the teacher’s survey and the FGD participants. Out of the total sample size (1529), 1444 people answered the survey. A small deviation (not more than 1%) from the initial calculated sample size is present for each municipality due to non-response error as well as non-availability of target respondents from specific minority ethnic groups in target locations. In terms of gender, out of 1444 responders, 803 (55.6%) were female, while 625 (43.3%) were male, and 16 (1.1%) did not indicate their gender identity.

Table 4. Age groups and municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Cair</th>
<th>Debar</th>
<th>Gazi Baba</th>
<th>Karp osh</th>
<th>Kicevo</th>
<th>Kumanovo</th>
<th>Radosh</th>
<th>Struga</th>
<th>Tet ovo</th>
<th>Gosti var</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12-19</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-34</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-69</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The public survey covered respondents aged 12 to 97 years old. Table 5 shows age groups in each municipality. However, more than two-thirds (72%) of the respondents are between 20-49 years old.
In terms of education, a large proportion of the respondents has completed high school (40%) or a bachelor’s degree (37%). The level of education disaggregated by ethnicity shows that 47% of the Macedonian respondents have completed high school; 42% of the Albanians have completed a bachelor’s degree; 32% of the Turks have completed high school, while 57% of the Roma have completed primary school. The education level disaggregated by ethnicity shows that Albanians are better educated than Macedonians and the other ethnicities in the targeted communities. However, the USIP literature explaining the educational status by ethnicity (see context section page 10, paragraph 4) shows that the level of education for Albanians ethnicity is lower than for Macedonians. This trend seems to have reversed in the last two decades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of education</th>
<th>Macedonians</th>
<th>Albanians</th>
<th>Roma</th>
<th>Serbians</th>
<th>Turk</th>
<th>Bosnian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed primary school</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>337%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master/PhD Studies</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, the demographic characteristics of the surveyed teachers from 7 municipalities are as follows: in terms of gender representation, 89% of the teachers are females, while 11% are males. Regarding the ethnic background - 53% are Macedonians, 38% Albanians and 9% Turks. The survey was unable to find teachers from other minority ethnic groups. The age range is between 27 and 63 years old.

As already mentioned, the FGD participants were students between 13 to 19 years of age from grades 7, 8 and 9 in primary schools and from the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th years of high school. The gender representation was balanced in all focus groups because having an equal number of boys and girls was one of the criteria for the selection of participants in every school. Regarding the ethnic background, in every municipality/school, where it was possible to find students from minority groups, we organized a few separate discussions with them. The total number of FGDs, the number of participants per municipality and included ethnic groups are presented in the table #6:

Table 6: Focus group discussion participants by ethnicity and municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Gazi Baba</th>
<th>Karposh</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Gostivar</th>
<th>Tetovo</th>
<th>Kumanovo</th>
<th>Kicevo</th>
<th>Debar</th>
<th>Struga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># FGDs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic groups</td>
<td>Mac Alb</td>
<td>Mac Alb</td>
<td>Mac Alb</td>
<td>Mac Alb</td>
<td>Mac Alb</td>
<td>Mac Alb Serb</td>
<td>Mac Alb Turks Roma</td>
<td>Mac Alb Roma</td>
<td>Mac Alb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. People’s Perception on Importance of Social Cohesion

The baseline study assessed how people think about the relevance of social cohesion to bringing peace and harmony to their community. Respondents were asked if social cohesion should exist among members of different ethnic/religious/cultural groups in their municipality. There is a strong feeling among respondents across all ethnic groups that social cohesion is required in their community, with 87% saying “yes” and relatively smaller percentages (6.7% and 5.9%) of respondents saying “no” and “I don’t know” respectively. The ethnicity disaggregated data shows that more Macedonians, Roma and Serbians (all above 90%) feel that social cohesion should exist in their communities compared to Albanians and Turks (82% and 83% respectively). This shows that Albanians and Turks have relatively higher levels of grievances against majority ethnic groups compared to Macedonian, Roma and Serbian respondents.

3.3. Friendship across ethnic divides

In order to assess the state of inter-identity relationships among respondents, the baseline study also explored whether the respondents have friends from other ethnic/religious/cultural groups and how often they interact and communicate with each other. Firstly, of all 1444 respondents, 1250 (86.6%) said that they have friends from other communities, while 192 respondents (13.3%) said that they do not have friends
from other ethnic groups (2 missing values). Among those who reported having friends from other identity
groups, 49% meet and interact with them almost every day, while 16% do so once a week. While 13% meet/interact with them once a month, 15% do so several times a year, and 7% do so only once or twice a year.

The same question was asked during the focus group discussions with students. In order to develop content
for the TV program, it is very important to identify the frequency and type of interaction among youth from
different ethnic/cultural/religious groups. If, however, there is no interaction and collaboration between
those youth groups, it is highly valuable to identify the reasons behind that.

Regarding the segregation of students from different ethnic groups in schools and lack of communication
among the students from different ethnic and religious groups, the main insights are that the communication
depends on whether the students attend classes in one shift together or separated into two shifts
(Macedonian first shift, Albanians second shift). It also depends on whether the school has extracurricular
activities that provide opportunities for students to mingle with each other and play together. All of the
students unanimously said that they want to be a part of a class that would have students from many ethnic
groups. However, they also believe that the existence of such a class in reality is almost impossible due to
the language barrier. In relation to extra-curricular activities, it was found that primary schools have more
such activities than the secondary ones. Schools that teach only either Macedonian or Albanian languages
have more difficulties in organizing multicultural activities and the students do not have opportunities for
communicating and interacting with students from other ethnic groups. Despite the desire of majority of
the students to communicate and interact with students from other communities, there are also students who
are against it and criticize those who are willing to do so, as evidenced by this quote from a student:

“Most of us want to communicate with students from the different ethnic groups, but also we have some
friends who criticize us for learning Albanian in our school” (A Macedonian student in a primary school).

“Our school has only Albanian students, but I would like to have peers from different ethnic groups and a
mixed school. We can learn the language, have conversations and spend time together” (An Albanian
student in a secondary school).

This shows that students at all levels have the desire to meet and interact with students from other
communities.

The participants in the FGDs were also asked about their relationships with youth from other ethnic groups
or religions outside of school, during their free time. A few insights can be drawn from their answers: i)
some students have friends from another ethnic group in schools and out of school, thus the interaction is
frequent and on a close, personal level, ii) some students have friends from other groups in schools, but
when they go out for entertainment activities, there is a separation; iii) some students study in segregation
in schools, and they also go out in separate places.

“At school, we spend time together, but outside, during weekends we go out in different places, we
[Macedonians] have our coffee bars, they [Albanians] have their own. I don’t know why, but we don’t go
in their places” (A Macedonian student in Kicevo).

Students were also asked to share their parents’ and teachers’ opinions on having friends from another
ethnic group. Most of the answers are that their parents support them in having communications with other
students who are not part of the same ethnic community. However, the answers changed when the older
students in the secondary schools were asked if their parents would allow them to have a boyfriend/girlfriend from a different ethnic background.
“I think this question of having boyfriend is more complicated. I don’t think that my parents would allow me to marry Albanian guy, maybe Serbian but not another religion” (A Macedonian girl student in secondary school).

The statement reflects that the parents are fine with their children making friends from other communities but are not comfortable with building deeper relationships with families from other ethnic/religious/cultural groups. Thus, the acceptance of people across the divides is not deep enough.

3.4. Sharing Personal Matters with People from Across Ethnic Divides

In order to get people’s sense of comfort with people from other communities, the respondents were asked ‘with how many people from other ethnic, religious and cultural groups do you feel comfortable to share your personal matters’. This question looks into the depth and width of the trust for others. The data shows that there is still a considerable proportion of people who do not feel comfortable to share their personal matters with people from outside their ethnic/religious/cultural groups, with 460 (32.4%) out of 1419 responding to the question saying they feel comfortable with NONE. Further, even those who said they feel comfortable to discuss personal matters with people from other identity groups (45.6%) can discuss such issues with only a maximum of four people. This shows that the issues are not a common phenomenon and people only feel comfortable with a very limited number of close people from outside of their identity groups.

3.5. Level of Trust Across Ethnic/Religious/Cultural Divides

The overall goal of the project is to improve relationships among children and youth across ethnic, religious and social divisions. Therefore, the indicator set to measure the achievement of the goal is defined as “% increase in trust among community members of different ethnic, religious and social background in target municipalities.” Thus, the baseline study collected data for the indicator of trust across ten project municipalities.

The answers on the statement “I trust people from another ethnic/religious/cultural group” show that 54% (cumulated % of “agree” and “strongly agree”) of the respondents trust people from across ethnic/religious/cultural divides. Further, the data also shows that there is still a significant proportion of respondents (46%) who either do not trust (19%) people from other ethnic/religious/cultural identity or neither trust not distrust (27%). This also justifies the relevance of the project.

The data disaggregated by municipality shows that the lowest level of trust for people from across divides (30% and 38%) is in Tetovo and Gostivar, where the largest Albanian populations reside. Respondents from Gazi Baba and Karposh (in the Municipality of Skopje and Radovish respectively), on the other hand, have the highest percentage of “trust” (76 %, and 73%) for people from across ethnic/religious/cultural divides (see Annex Table 1). The municipality disaggregated data shows that the level of trust among members of different ethnic communities differs from municipality to municipality. Cities with a higher heterogeneous population and with a larger Macedonian population, such as Skopje and Radovish, have higher levels of trust, while cities with larger Albanian population have lower levels of trust. From a project implementation perspective, such information helps to adjust the implementation strategy and activities according to the prevalent conflict dynamics in each municipality.
Although the number of respondents from each ethnic group is proportionate to their population size in each municipality and some of the ethnic groups have a relatively smaller sample size, it is still very useful to look at the aggregate data by ethnicity. Overwhelming majority (91%) of Bosniak respondents trust others, while only 41% (the lowest) of the Albanian respondents, followed by 45% the Roma respondents, trust people from ‘other’ ethnic/religious/cultural identities. Almost two thirds (64%) of Macedonian respondents trust people from another identity.

In terms of youth, the participants in all focus group discussions were given an imaginary situation where they have to select a friend for the “first time”. The question which ethnic group the chosen friend would be from, if they had to select one. Logically, the most common answer was “a friend from my own ethnicity”. However, after giving the instruction that it had to be a friend from a different ethnic group than theirs the answers became diverse. One interesting insight is related to the response from Serbian students, who all decided that the imaginary friend would be a Macedonian. The Turks students had mixed answers - choosing either Macedonians or Albanians, while Albanian students very often responded with “it does not matter the ethnic background” but also putting their own ethnic background as the first choice.

“I would like to have friends from different ethnic groups, it doesn’t matter, however for this game [the question] I would say Macedonian because we have a similar culture, language and we can understand each other” (A Serbian student in secondary school).

In addition, students were asked to choose an “imaginary” neighbor. The answers were not different from the previous question. Actually, some students said that they have neighbors from other ethnic groups and that it does not pose a barrier.

“I have neighbors that are Macedonians or Roma, I don’t have problems with them. We speak to each other; go in their homes for holidays” (An Albanian student from a primary school)

Contrary to trust, people were also asked to indicate the level of agreement with the statement “I have to be careful with people from another ethnic/religious/cultural group”. The results show that 29% of the respondents disagree with the statement (with a cumulative sum of 13.3% disagreeing and 15.3% strongly disagreeing), while 46% agree (with cumulative sum of 26.4% agreeing and 20.1% strongly agreeing), which complements the level of trust (54%) as shown by Chart 7. The data shows that despite growing relationships and understanding among different identity groups, almost half of the respondents are still feeling suspicious or unable to trust people from other ethnic groups.

The data disaggregated by ethnicity shows that 47% of Macedonians agree with the statement (29.0% agree and 17.7% strongly agree) meaning they suspect people from other ethnic groups, followed by the 45% of Albanians (24.2% and 20.8%), 53% of Serbians and 51% of Roma. Similarly, 49% of the Turkish and 27% of the Bosnian respondents also agree with the statement. The data also shows that 28.6% (16.6% and 12.0%) of Macedonians, 28.3% of Albanians (15.4% and 12.9%), 26.8% of Serbs (17.1% disagree and 9.7% strongly disagree) disagree with the statement, showing their complete faith in members of other communities’ answers. For other ethnic groups such as the Roma, Turks and Bosnians, the cumulative percentage of disagreement is 25%, 30% and 27% respectively. This shows that the level of trust towards others is almost equal and there is no disparity among ethnic groups.
3.6. Public Perception of Majority/Minority Dynamics

In terms of the perception of appreciation of cultural diversity in Macedonia, the aggregated data shows that 38.1% of respondents agree (16.5% strongly agree and 21.6% agree) that cultural diversity is appreciated in their country, while one-fourth of the respondents have a neutral position (25%). However, there is a significant proportion (28.6%) of respondents who believe that diversity is not appreciated in their community (15.3% disagree and 13.3% strongly disagree).

The data also shows that Macedonians tend to agree more that ‘ethnic and cultural diversity is appreciated in Macedonia’ than the members of the minority groups. The numbers show that the percentage of Macedonians who agree and strongly agree is 55%, while this percentage is lower among Albanians (20%), Roma (21%) and Serbians (29%). Bosnians and Turks also have a high level of agreement (42% and 52%). Contrary, Albanians, Roma and Serbians tend to disagree more with the statement (56%, 61% and 46%). While the majority Macedonians said that ethnic and cultural diversity is appreciated, the minority groups think otherwise.

In addition to this, the opinions on the “different ethnic/religious/cultural groups in Macedonia have a different style of living” statement are presented in Chart 8. It is clear that most of the surveyed people (70%) tend to agree with the statement (41% agree and 29% strongly agree).

Another important aspect is the public perception on the dynamics of the minority vs. the majority groups in terms of cultural acceptance and practice. Hence, one of the questions in the poll was whether “the minority ethnic groups should adopt the majority group culture”. The data shows that the percentage of “agree” and “strongly agree” is obviously higher among majority Macedonians (38%) compared to minorities such as Albanians (26 %), Turks (20 %), Serbians (15%) or Roma (23%). However, if we look at the data reflecting the “strongly disagree”, it is quite high among Turks (43.6%), followed by Bosnians (33.3%) and Albanians (32.1%), with smaller communities of Roma, Macedonians and Serbians being relatively less resistant to the idea. Despite Bosnians being the highest proponents of social cohesion (91%, Table 7), they are quite resistant to the idea of assimilating into the majority culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>Albanians</th>
<th>Bosnians</th>
<th>Macedonians</th>
<th>Roma</th>
<th>Serbians</th>
<th>Turks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither agree nor</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Teachers from primary schools were asked a similar question about their level of agreement/disagreement with the statement: “Students from minority ethnic groups need to learn only about the majority culture”. The data from the survey shows that 14.6% of the 94 teachers surveyed agreed with the statement, with 3.6% “strongly agreeing” and 11% “agreeing”. However, more than two-thirds (68%) of the surveyed teachers did not agree with the statement (31% strongly disagreed and 37% disagreed) that minority students should only learn about the majority culture (see Chart 9). This shows that the majority of the primary school teachers believe that every culture in Macedonia should be respected regardless of its status in the population pyramid and influence on social, economic and political life.

Data disaggregated by ethnicity shows that among Macedonian teachers, only 12.5% of teachers agreed with the statement “students from minority ethnic groups need to learn only about the majority culture” (only 2.18% strongly agreed and 10.4% agreed). Numbers were low even among Albanian teachers (6.7% strongly agreed and 10% agreed). On the contrary, 33.3% of the Turkish teachers surveyed agreed with the statement. However, the level of disagreement is higher than 50% for all ethnic groups. This again shows that regardless of the ethnic background, the majority of teachers believe that imposing majority ethnic culture on minority groups will not be beneficial for the country.

The teachers’ survey also included a question on their perception of intercultural education in schools. In response to the statement “when a school has students predominantly from one ethnic group, there is no need for intercultural perspective/education”, a large proportion of teachers (65.5%) disagreed (with 49.4% disagreeing and 16.1% strongly disagreeing). However, it is to be noted that of the 94 teachers, 34.5% do not fully support intercultural perspectives/education in schools. The following chart shows that most of the surveyed teachers support intercultural perspectives in schools.
Data disaggregated by ethnicity shows that the level of disagreement with the statement and support for intercultural perspective/education is high in all groups of teachers. More than two thirds (68.8%) of the Macedonian respondents disagree (58.3% disagreed and 10.4% strongly disagreed), followed by Albanian teachers (63.6%) and Turkish teachers (50%). It is worth highlighting that the proportion of respondents who strongly disagree is highest among Albanian respondents (24%), compared to 10% among Macedonians and 16.7% among Turks, corresponding with the fact that the Albanians have a higher level of education among all ethnic groups in Macedonia. However, the level of agreement with the statement that there is no need for intercultural perspectives/education is high among Turk respondents (50%) followed by Albanians (45.5%) and Macedonians (18.8%). From a reconciliation perspective, the data generated by Table 8 is quite important. The percentage of Albanian respondents who strongly agree with the statement (24%) is an alarming one. Similarly, there is a significant proportion of Macedonian respondents (21%), who are still uncertain about their stance on the statement, showing their vulnerability in sensitive situations. This data indicates that the majority ethnic group (Macedonians) are more liberal in thinking about others compared to minority groups (Turks and Albanians). However, in order to draw concrete conclusions, further analysis may be needed.

Table 8. Teachers’ Perception on the Need for intercultural perspectives/education by ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>Albanians</th>
<th>Macedonians</th>
<th>Turks</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inter-identity trust was measured through one’s openness to allow their children to marry into another ethnic group. The baseline survey included a question on the level of acceptance of the respondents of someone from their community who is married to a person from another ethnic/religious group. The results for the statement “people accept if a man from one ethnic group marries a girl from another ethnic group and vice versa” show that the level of agreement is 20% (with 12.9% agreeing and 7.2% strongly agreeing), while the level of disagreement is quite high with 25.4% disagreeing and 30.5% strongly disagreeing. In terms of religion, the rigidness on interreligious marriage is even higher with the results showing that 39.1% respondents “strongly disagree”.

One of the most important questions in the teachers’ survey was: “Do you believe that the relationship among students of different ethnic backgrounds has strengthened in your school over the past year?” This question provides indirect information on the “% of cited improved relationships among students from different ethnic/religious/cultural backgrounds”. The results show that more than half (52%) of the 94 teachers said that there exists a culture of interaction among students.

3.7. Intercultural/Interethnic Perspective in Education

In order to assess teachers’ perspectives and acceptance of inclusive culture, their level of agreement or disagreement was analyzed through their response to the statement: “Every student has the right to learn about his/her culture in school”. Despite their lack of understanding of the concept of intercultural education and how it impacts the lives of young people in Macedonia, the analysis of the respondents’ answers shows that 93.2% of the surveyed teachers agree with the statement (with 50% agreeing and 43.2% strongly agreeing).

Based on the ethnic background of teachers, 88% of Macedonian teachers believe that every student has the right to learn about their culture in school. Numbers were even higher among minority ethnic groups
(Albanians and Turks) with 100% of the respondents, albeit from a relatively smaller sample, agreeing with the statement.

Another statement was included to assess the teachers’ perspectives on the need for students’ exposure to other cultures. For the statement: “every student needs to have the opportunity to learn about cultures other than their own”, 94.2% teachers agreed (56.3% agreed and 37.9% strongly agreed) while only a small proportion of teachers did not agree with the statement.

80% of the surveyed teachers agreed with the statement: “schools should support group activities that promote diversity in culture, language and religion”, with 43% agreeing, 37% strongly agreeing, and 10.5% disagreeing. However, on developing a school curriculum for students, 83.3% of the teachers surveyed believe that “schools should have one general curriculum for all students regardless of their ethnic background” (45.4% agreed and 38% strongly agreed) while only 6% disagreed with the statement, showing strong preference among teachers for a uniform and common curriculum across the country. However, it is important to explore ways of creating a common curriculum which is also inclusive and promotes diversity among students.

Most of the teachers surveyed (56%) believe that it is difficult to add cultural elements in all teaching units. When asked to rate their level of agreement with the statement: “For teachers, it is difficult to add cultural elements in every teaching unit”, 27.6% agreed while 28.7% “strongly agreed”, with only 17% saying that it is not that difficult to do so. The data indicates that organizations or projects aimed at integrating intercultural elements in school teaching should not be overambitious and must consult school teachers and primary education experts before developing programs that incorporate intercultural elements in teaching units.

A qualitative analysis of the teachers’ responses to the questions regarding multicultural education shows that there are a variety of responses not directly related to the components of intercultural education or its role in youth life. More common are descriptive answers of some projects related to the topic or school activities implemented by the teachers. They were unable to articulate a general explanation of the concept of intercultural education or any of its components. When asked, “What is the role of intercultural education in youth’s life?” they could not articulate their views on the question. Some of the answers from the teachers were:

- “Better life”
- “It has a big role in the education of youth”
- “Care about their own national and cultural identity”

In order to infer the level of knowledge about intercultural education, students were asked what they know about intercultural education and how they would assess their school in terms of providing intercultural/interethnic education. Some students (even in primary schools) described intercultural education as “learning about other cultures”, “learning together with other students about their culture, history and tradition”, while some students associated the meaning of the term with “project” and “project activities”. Interestingly, a few students mentioned teachers skipping lessons on ethnic groups in Macedonia and asking students to “read it at home if they are interested”. Based on students’ responses, some schools were ranked high on incorporating intercultural education, while others (especially, secondary schools) were ranked low.
3.8. Youth’s experiences, perceptions and opinions on active contribution in their local communities, leadership confidence and factors that influence youth actions

Students were asked to describe their schools and classes in terms of diversity, especially along ethnic lines. Separation along linguistic lines was the most apparent. For instance, Albanian classes more often have only Albanian students, while the Macedonian classes include Macedonians, Serbians (in Kumanovo), and Roma (since there is no Roma-speaking program at any educational level). Turkish students (in Gostivar and Kicevo) undertake classes either in their mother tongue or in Macedonian. Almost all students reported that they would like to be part of a mixed class, but they expressed concerns about their ability to understand each other due to the language barrier.

An important aspect of the baseline study was to collect information about the specific challenges youth face in their active participation in the community and their confidence in being agents of change. The most prominent challenge highlighted by respondents was the high usage of internet which inhibits young people to be active in their community. As a result, passivity in almost every aspect of community participation was very often reported as a key challenge. The FGD participants, despite their awareness of the negative consequences of high level of internet and social media usage, continue to engage in it.

Regarding questions about youth activities and their self-esteem, most young people said that they are not active in their communities and they ascribe that passivity to a lack of interest. Only a few examples of active participation in projects or informal groups were noted. In terms of gender differences, passivity and use of internet were equally high in both groups. The only difference observed was in the activities they undertook during their free time, with boys engaging in sports activities such as football or basketball and girls mentioning coffee time and reading books.

Examples of positive change and activism included the influence of certain teachers, situations where they extended empathy towards others, the possibility of socializing and not having to engage in classes and extracurricular activities. One example from the secondary school in Debar demonstrates the influence that teachers can have on students’ active involvement:

“We have an amazing professor who teaches us how to be active not just in school but outside the school as well. Because of him, we have participated in different projects, organized several initiatives in our municipality. When he invites us, it is not possible to not be part of something he proposes. He knows how to motivate students” (a secondary school student).

Examples of students wanting to be active but not having the opportunity or the skills/resources to engage in their communities also came up. There were two examples of Roma students (from Gostivar) who reported being “left out” by teachers while selecting students to participate in extracurricular activities.

“We don’t participate in those school projects because teachers always select the same students, they don’t select us. I don’t know why, but we are not even informed about such activities being implemented in the school” (a primary school student in Gostivar). Students believe that the social dynamics are the main cause of such discriminatory behavior.

Young people gave examples of alcohol consumption and frequent cigarette smoking as negative behavior, leading to physical fights. These negative behaviors were pointed out by both secondary as well as primary school students. FGDs with students revealed that boys are usually more involved in violent behavior (commonly physical fights between boys), while there was no mention of girls being involved in such behavior. Almost all of the students, irrespective of their gender, expressed their willingness to engage in activities such as donations, local environmental initiatives, etc. if they were invited.
In terms of knowledge and skills required for active involvement in the community, two types of answers were most common – 1) one group of students who think that young people have enough capacities and skills for changing their communities but are not interested in implementing those changes; and 2) one group of students who think that, due to the political dynamics and the behavior of the older generation, young people do not have real opportunities to make a change in society - a clear indication of poor intergenerational relationships. Based on their responses, we cannot determine gender differences in terms of confidence or skills for community participation and leadership, although girls seemed more vocal in sharing their opinions on the topic. In almost all FGDs, they were the first to respond to this part of the question.

3.9. Television Viewership

One of the project activities planned for the second year of the project cycle is the production and broadcast of a reality TV show for youth. Before kicking off the recruitment of participants and the production of the reality show, the project team will decide on the concept of the show, the TV format, TV channel(s) for broadcast and other media related details. In order to fulfil these requirements, the public opinion poll had a separate section on viewership preferences to identify the most watched TV programs, channels and timing. Similarly, there were a few questions in the teachers’ survey and students’ FGDs to get a deeper insight into TV viewership habits as well as their opinion on existing TV programming in Macedonia. The following part of the baseline report provides an analysis of the data gathered to assess TV viewership in Macedonia.

The first question on TV viewership was whether respondents watch TV or not. The data shows that 83% of the respondents watch TV.

![Chart #5: Do You Watch TV?](chart.png)

The same question was also asked during the FGDs with students. It was important to identify youth preferences on TV programs because they are the primary target audience for the reality TV show. Most of
the youth included in the discussions stated that they watch TV, although there were a few students who said they prefer social media as a news source. The following table provides information regarding the TV viewership habits of respondents in the 10 target municipalities.

**Table 9: Frequency of watching TV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>municipality</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>often</th>
<th>very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>57.94%</td>
<td>26.17%</td>
<td>15.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debar</td>
<td>39.36%</td>
<td>39.36%</td>
<td>21.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazi Baba</td>
<td>23.75%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karposh</td>
<td>54.65%</td>
<td>37.21%</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicevo</td>
<td>54.17%</td>
<td>38.54%</td>
<td>7.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumanovo</td>
<td>46.12%</td>
<td>40.78%</td>
<td>13.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radovish</td>
<td>70.97%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>12.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sruga</td>
<td>44.63%</td>
<td>42.15%</td>
<td>13.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetovo</td>
<td>55.23%</td>
<td>36.63%</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gostivar</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that 54% of the respondents (of the 83% TV viewers) watch TV often or very often, while the remaining 46% only watch it rarely. However, there are five municipalities, namely, Radovish (71%), Chair (58%), Karposh and Tetovo (both 55%), and Kicevo (54%) that have a higher proportion of the population rarely watching TV compared to Gazi Baba (76%) and Debar (60%), where respondents watch TV often or very often. In addition, the results show that usually the father (39.9%) or the children (25.9%) have control over the selection of the TV channel.

In response to the question “Which **type of TV format do you mostly watch?**”, data shows that TV drama/series are the most popular TV program format for most respondents, with 30% respondents saying that they watch TV drama/series regularly, followed by documentary (21.5%), news (11%) and reality TV shows (4.5%). This is an alarming piece of data that reality TV shows are not a popular format of TV programs among the respondents from the 10 target municipalities. However, it must be noted that there is no reality TV show broadcast on Macedonian channels at the moment. Nevertheless, further investigation is required before taking a decision on the production of the reality TV show to make sure it will be liked by the target population in Macedonia once it is broadcast.

Data disaggregated by age presents similar results. For youth (13-19 age group), the most-watched TV format is TV drama/series (52.3%) and documentary programs (20.7%). Gender disaggregated data shows that for males the most watched TV format is documentaries (24.9%) and TV drama/series (19%). For females, TV drama/series (38.0%) and documentaries (16.7%) are the most popular.

Responders were also asked to indicate the most preferred day and time slot for watching TV. The aggregated data shows that most respondents prefer to watch TV on Sundays (27.6%) followed by Saturdays (20.3%). However, 17% respondents said that they watch TV throughout the week, while less than 5% respondents said they prefer to watch TV during Monday - Thursday, with a slightly higher rate for Fridays (7.1%). Data also shows that 81.3% of the respondents prefer watching TV in the evenings. The responses do not differ so much at the municipality level. Only a few outliers were noted in the aggregated data. For example, in Gostivar and Chair the most common answer was “all days”, while in the remaining 8 municipalities, weekends (Saturdays and Sundays) were preferred.

Regarding the preferred TV channels, the data shows that TV Kanal 5 and TV Sitel are the most watched (16.5 % each), together with TV Telma (10.5 %) and TV AlSat M (12%) as a single preferred option.
Secondary data analysis revealed the lack of youth-oriented educational programs. For the project team, it was pivotal to identify current TV programs aimed at youth on topics relevant to the project’s goal in order to explore gaps and intervention opportunities. The baseline study analyzed people’s knowledge of existing TV programs targeting youth and interethnic collaboration/communication. The data from the public opinion poll showed similar trends to those in previous research studies, with 78% of the respondents saying there is no TV program for youth on national channels, and 88% saying there is no program on Macedonian TV channels that promotes interethnic communication and collaboration. Those who reported that there is a TV program for youth (22%) were asked to rate the quality of the program. 18% of these respondents rated it as excellent, 37.2% as good, 38% as average, and 3.3% ranking it as poor/“not good” quality.
Student respondents provided similar feedback during the focus group discussions, with mention of only one show - *Tintimintiri*. While the FGD participants described the show as interesting, they also mentioned the lack of portrayal of an educational character. Some students mentioned having seen ‘*Nashe Maalo’* on some of the local Macedonian channels.

Regarding their preferences with respect to the theme of the programs, shows focusing on youth, social interactions and multiculturalism were mentioned. It is interesting to note that students from “Bratstvo”, a primary school in Skopje-Karpos, were of the opinion that multiculturalism should not be "enforced" upon youth. While students mentioned movies and TV series as their preferred format, there are no reality shows for young people which shows the lack of such a format on the television channels. Gender differences were also reflected with girls mentioning that they would like to watch “comedy shows” and boys mentioning “fun and interactive” shows.

In the teacher’s survey, they were also asked if they watch intercultural TV programs for youth. The data shows that 77.5% of teachers do not watch such TV programs, while 22.5% said they do. However, none of them were able to identify even a single youth-oriented intercultural TV program.

---

8 *Nashe Maalo* (“Our Neighborhood”) is the first Macedonian children’s television program created to promote intercultural understanding and to impart conflict resolution skills pertinent to children’s everyday lives. ... Five seasons were produced and broadcast on multiple television stations in Macedonia from 1998 to 2003. For a short video clip, please follow: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2Cnd0hwfr7w.
4. Conclusions

The baseline study generated data from three different data collection tools: the public perception survey, primary school teachers’ survey and FGDs with students in primary and secondary schools. The information collection focused on people’s perspective on social cohesion, interethnic relationships, intercultural environment and activities in schools, students’ and teachers’ understanding of the concept of intercultural education, cultural diversity in schools, common challenges faced by youth, television viewership, and people’s assessment of the quality of TV programs currently being aired on Macedonian television channels.

The findings from the public opinion poll in all 10 municipalities indicate that a majority of the people agree on the need for social cohesion in their municipality. Data disaggregated by ethnicity revealed that Macedonians, Roma and Serbs are slightly more positive towards the need for social cohesion in their community compared to Albanians and Turks, indicating that the latter have held on to the grievances arising out of conflict slightly more than other communities.

Despite more than half of the respondents expressing trust in people from other ethnicities/religions/cultures, there is still a significant proportion of the population in Macedonia that is struggling to trust “other” people residing in their community and neighborhood. Trust between communities was higher in heterogeneous municipalities with a large Macedonian community (such as Skopje-Gazi Baba, Skopje-Karpash and Radovish) as compared to municipalities with a larger Albanian population (Tetovo and Gostivar). This finding reflects the opinion pattern noted earlier on the need for social cohesion where a larger proportion of people residing in communities that expressed lesser trust towards “others” reported that social cohesion is less important, compared to those who reside in communities with relatively higher trust levels.

Results from the baseline study demonstrate that despite having some grievances, Macedonian respondents often do not express these in public. This is demonstrated by the fact that an overwhelming majority of the respondents across ethnicities continue to establish and sustain relationships across dividing lines. However, the deeper the relationship dynamics are, the thinner they become, as shown by the fact that most of people have only a few people (maximum 4) from other communities with whom they can share their personal matters.

Information obtained through FGDs reveals that the level of interaction and communication between students depends on the school structure, the existence of out-of-school activities and places of socialization. However, in few towns such as Tetovo, Kumanovo and Kicevo, students reported the practice of separating places of leisure, for instance, “having separate coffee bars”. Some students also mentioned incidents where radicalized youth criticized and ridiculed those who met peers from other communities. However, despite such practices, the baseline study found that there is a strong desire among youth to interact and establish relationships with peers across ethnic divides.

While most teachers surveyed reported a positive trend in improved relationships among students from different ethnicities, the baseline study also found that the basic understanding of the concept of intercultural education is better among students than teachers in primary schools. This may need deeper analysis in order to determine the causal factors underlying this trend.
The viewership information revealed that approximately 83% of the respondents in Macedonia watch television. However, the preferred format reported was TV drama/serials, followed by documentaries and news. Reality shows did not seem to be very popular among the respondents. This could be due to the fact that there are no reality TV shows currently being produced and aired on any of the Macedonian TV channels. The project team will have to consider the implications of this viewership pattern in order to achieve the stated project goals of promoting reconciliation in Macedonia through broadcasting a youth-oriented TV reality show. Additional marketing may have to be undertaken to address such challenges.

Most people in Macedonia are not aware of any youth-oriented TV programs on interethnic relationships being aired on any of the national channels. Due to the lack of quality TV programs targeting youth, students reported that they mostly watch foreign TV Channels. The baseline study found that Kanal 5 and Sitel (16% each) are the two most popular TV Channels in Macedonia followed by Telma (10.5%) and AlSat M (12%) as a single preferred option. A majority of the respondents prefer to watch TV on weekends and in the evenings. Thus, the project should consider this data prior to broadcasting the show in order to reach a large number of people across the country and to disseminate social cohesion and community reconciliation messages.

Lastly, the analysis of the qualitative data in the baseline study provides detailed insights on youth involvement in the targeted communities. Most of the youth consider themselves passive followers instead of being active actors in their communities due to various factors, such as the high level of internet and social media usage, lack of interest and motivation to get involved in community activities, lack of intergenerational communication and collaboration, lack of support and respect from parents and teachers, and lack of institutional opportunities. Despite such challenges, a majority of the students expressed their willingness to participate in activities, provided they have the adequate opportunities. TV programs such as Tintimintiri and Nashe Maalo were found to be popular among young people. This could be insightful information when deciding the format and content of the TV programs.
5. **Recommendations**

The baseline study provides findings that may be useful for project strategy adjustments and activities design during the project implementation phase. The recommendations are derived based on the findings from the study and are meant to serve the project implementation team and those looking to implement similar programs on promoting interethnic/religious/cultural reconciliation in Macedonia.

- Taking into account that respondents from different municipalities have a different perception towards the need for social cohesion and their level of trust towards ‘others’, it is important to consider the number of participants selected from different ethnicities for different activities, with a special focus on Albanians and Turks who reported relatively lower levels of trust.

- The project team should focus on organizing regular multi-stakeholder dialogues between representatives from Macedonian, Albanian, Turk and other communities so that the prevailing lack of trust and prejudice can be reduced.

- In line with the variation in the level of trust at the municipality level, the project team should ensure an adjustment in the intensity of the project activities in every municipality and with the specific ethnic community. Using such strategies will help increase the level of trust across ethnicities/religions in those municipalities where the current level of trust and mutual respect is lower compared to other municipalities.

- Considering the willingness of young people to assimilate with peers from other identity groups, it is recommended that the project team explores the opportunity to create more activities in those schools that have separate shifts or are not ethnically mixed by including two schools (for instance, a Macedonian school and an Albanian school together). Such activities will provide an opportunity to those students who usually do not get to interact and collaborate with students from other ethnic groups.

- The project team needs to focus on enhancing the understanding of the concept of intercultural education and its impact on the life of youth. This could be done through capacity building trainings and awareness campaigns, IEC materials, and regular sharing and discussion platforms for primary school teachers.

- Activities that facilitate intergenerational relationship building and collaboration, designed in consultation with the youth to increase their level of ownership in the project, should be organized.

- The project team should design activities that help young people and the community at large to engage in constructive activities that bring a positive shift in their attitude and behavior towards others.

- The baseline study found that there is a tendency among young boys to engage in physical fights with each other. The project should work with the youth to encourage positive thinking and promote non-adversarial approaches (e.g. dialogues) of resolving their disputes.

- Considering the lack of produced reality TV shows in Macedonia, the project team needs to assess the feasibility of broadcasting a reality TV show before taking a final decision on the format and content of the show. The project team should explore the possibility of changing the format of the TV program to a TV drama/series or short films, since the children’s programs Tintimintiri and
Nashe Maalo were found to be popular among the younger generation. However, if this is not possible, the project team should include some component of comedy and/or fun-filled activities, such as music or dance competitions, since the youth mentioned their preference for the same.

- The recruitment of participants for the TV show could be done through educational institutions depending on the target age group of students. However, the team should not fully depend on teachers for facilitating the recruitment process because students reported discriminatory practices by teachers in selecting student participants for similar projects in the past.

- The baseline study found that two TV channels, Kanal 5 and Sitel, are the two most popular TV channels. The project team should aim to broadcast the TV program on one or both of these two channels to ensure maximum reach. Similarly, YouTube and other social media platforms could be effective mediums to ensure maximum possible viewership of the program.

- Since the majority of respondents prefer to watch TV on weekends and during the evenings, the TV program should be aired in the evening during weekends.

- The team should undertake an extensive publicity campaign to promote the TV program so that people are aware of it when it is broadcast across the country.

- The TV show should include edutainment in its format and content so that it is popular among all age groups.

- The project team should design activities that promote cultural diversity and inclusive cultural practices among students by working with schools and teachers to ensure that the school curricula are designed in a way that provides students exposure to all ethnicities, religions and cultures in Macedonia.
6. Appendices

Annex 1: Survey Tools

Public Opinion Poll First level sorting of results

1) DEMOGRAPHIC INFO
Gender: male 44 %, female 56%
Age: age range 12-97, more than 2/3 (72%) between 20-49 years old

Municipality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Cair</th>
<th>Debar</th>
<th>Gazi Baba</th>
<th>Gostivar</th>
<th>Karpo</th>
<th>Kicevo</th>
<th>Kumanovo</th>
<th>Radovo</th>
<th>Struga</th>
<th>Tetovo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>9,07</td>
<td>7,06</td>
<td>11,43</td>
<td>11,57</td>
<td>7,27</td>
<td>7,41</td>
<td>15,03</td>
<td>9,14</td>
<td>8,86</td>
<td>13,16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Macedonian</th>
<th>Roma</th>
<th>Albanian</th>
<th>Serbian</th>
<th>Turk</th>
<th>Vlach</th>
<th>Other [Bosnian]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>41.05</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level of Education:

- Completed primary school -15 %
- Completed high school -40 %
- Completed Bachelor’s Degree-37 %
- Master/PhD studies -7 %

QUESTIONS ABOUT SOCIAL COHESION

1) The term social cohesion for the purpose of this survey means coexistence among people, trust among members from different ethnic/religious/cultural groups and cooperation among diverse ethnic/religious/cultural groups. Do you think that social cohesion should exist among members of different ethnic/religious/cultural groups in your municipality?

- Yes -87%
- No-6.7 %
- I don’t know -5.9
2) Do you have friends from a different ethnic background than yours?
   ▪ Yes - 86.6 %
   ▪ No – 13.3 %

If yes, how often do you socially meet with friends from another ethnic background?
   ▪ once or twice per year - 7 %
   ▪ several types in a year - 15 %
   ▪ once per month - 13 %
   ▪ Once a week - 16 %
   ▪ Every day - 49 %

3) With how many people from another ethnic/religious/cultural group you are free to discuss personal matters?
   ▪ None - 32.4 %
   ▪ 2-4 - 45.60 %
   ▪ 5-9 - 9 %
   ▪ 10-15 - 3.95 %
   ▪ 16-20 - 5.64 %
   ▪ More than 20 - 2.75 %

4) On a scale from 1 to 5, please indicate the level of agreement with the following statements [read the statement to the responder]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATMENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I trust people from another ethnic/religious/cultural group</td>
<td>10 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>26 %</td>
<td>31 %</td>
<td>24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to be careful with people from another ethnic/religious/cultural group</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1= strongly disagree
2= disagree
3= neither agree nor disagree
4= agree
5= strongly agree

5) On a scale of 1 to 5 please indicate the level of agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATMENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic and cultural diversity is appreciated in our country</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>20 %</td>
<td>23 %</td>
<td>22 %</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different ethnic/religious/cultural groups in Macedonia have different style of living | 5% | 7% | 18% | 41% | 29%  
Minority ethnic groups should adopt the majority group culture | 29% | 19% | 23% | 17% | 13%  
People accept if a man from one ethnic group marries a girl from another ethnic group | 31% | 25% | 24% | 13% | 7%  
It is okay in my religious community if a girl marries a boy from another religious community | 39% | 21% | 20% | 12% | 8% 

1= strongly disagree  
2= disagree  
3= neither agree nor disagree  
4= agree  
5= strongly agree 

SECTION ON TV VIEWERSHIP PREFERENCES 

1) Do you watch TV?  
   • Yes -83%  
   • No – 17%  

2) Which Macedonian television channel do you mostly watch? Please select one of the proposed answers:  
   • MRTV -7.23%  
   • Kanal 5 -16.5%  
   • Telma – 10.5%  
   • Sitel- 16.5%  
   • 24 Vesti -9.88%  
   • Alfa-2.65%  
   • AlSat -12%  
   • NOVA TV  
   • Other [please specify]  

3) Who in the family usually has control over the selection of TV channel?  
   • The father -40%  
   • The mother -18%  
   • The children -26%  
   • The grandparents -10%
4) How often do you watch TV?
   - Rarely - 46%
   - Often - 40%
   - Very often - 13%

5) When do you mostly watch TV?
   - Morning - 6%
   - Afternoon - 9%
   - Evening - 82%

6) On which day do you mostly watch TV?
   - Monday - 4.75%
   - Tuesday - 1.95%
   - Wednesday - 2.97%
   - Thursday - 2.46%
   - Friday - 7%
   - Saturday - 20.3%
   - Sunday - 27.6%

7) Which type of TV format do you mostly watch?
   - Documentary - 22%
   - TV drama/series - 30%
   - News - 11%
   - Political Debates - 7%
   - Morning contact shows - 5%
   - Reality TV shows - 5%

8) Are there any TV programs for youth on our national Macedonian TV channels?
   - Yes - 78%
   - No - 22%

9) If yes, please list up to three: Tintirimintiri

10) How do you evaluate the quality of those programs?
    a) Excellent - 18%
    b) Good - 37%
    c) Average (neither good or not good) - 39%
    d) Not good - 3%
    e) Not good at all - 2%

11) Is there any TV program on inter-ethnic collaboration?
● Yes – 12%
● No 88%

12) Could you please list one or more such TV programs? – Tintirimintiri, Nase Maalo

Focus Groups Discussion Guide

Facilitator’s welcome, introduction and instructions to participants.

WELCOME and thank you for taking time to participate in this discussion. You have been invited to participate because your opinion is very important to us. I am aware that all of you have other activities during the day as well, so I won’t take much of your time.

INTRODUCTION: This focus group discussion is designed to assess your current thoughts and feelings about youth social cohesion in Macedonia. The focus group discussion will take no more than one hour. May I tape the discussion to facilitate its recollection? (if yes, switch on the recorder)

ANONYMITY: Despite being taped, I would like to assure you that the discussion will be anonymous. The tapes will be kept safely in a locked facility until they are transcribed word for word, then they will be destroyed. The transcribed notes of the focus group will contain no information that would allow individual subjects to be linked to specific statements. You should try to answer and comment as accurately and truthfully as possible. The other focus group participants and I would appreciate it if you would refrain from discussing the comments of other group members outside the focus group. If there are any questions or discussions that you do not wish to answer or participate in, you do not have to do so; however please try to answer and be as involved as possible

GROUND RULES

● The most important rule is that only one person speaks at a time. There may be a temptation to jump in when someone is talking but please wait until they have finished.
● There are no right or wrong answers
● You do not have to speak in any particular order
● When you do have something to say, please do so. There are many of you in the group and it is important that I obtain the views of each of you
● You do not have to agree with the views of other people in the group
● Does anyone have any questions? (Answers).
● OK, let’s begin

INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS

1) How would you describe your school in terms of ethnic/religious/cultural diversity?
2) How would you describe your class in terms of ethnic/religious/cultural diversity? 2.1. If it’s more homogenous or heterogeneous, why do you think is like that?
3) What is your opinion about attending bilingual classes at school? 3.1. Do you see yourself as part of such class?

MAIN DISCUSSION GUIDING QUESTIONS

Questions about their school and school activities in terms of interethnic interaction

[Aim: to collect information about the frequency, type and factors that influence the interethnic interaction among youth]

4) Do you have the opportunity to interact with students from different ethnic/religious background in your school? 4.1. If yes, how? 4.2. If not, why?

5) Some students more often have communication with students from another ethnic/religious background. What about yourself: do you prefer communication with students from different ethnic/religious background?

6) If you have to decide to have or not an Albanian/Macedonian/Roma/Turk/Serbian friend, what would be your choice? Why? [ask separately for each ethnic group]

7) Imagine you have the opportunity to choose who will be your neighbor. Which ethnic group will you prefer? Why?

8) Does your school provide it provide opportunities for school/extra curriculum activities among students from diverse ethnic/religious background? 7.1. If yes, can you please give me some examples. 7.2. If not, why not? 7.3. Would you like to be part of such activities? [please count how many yes and how many no]

9) What are the usual opinions of teachers in terms of interethnic communication among students? 8.1. Do your teachers encourage such communication and interactions?

10) What are the usual opinions of parents in terms of interethnic communication among students? 9.1. Do your parents encourage such communication and interactions?

11) What do you know about intercultural/interethnic education in Macedonia? 11.1. If you don’t know anything, are you interested in learning about and/or participating in it? 11.2. If not, why?

12) How would you assess your school in terms of providing intercultural/interethnic education?

Questions about youth’s abilities to get involved in their communities

[Aim: to collect info about the current level, challenges and factors of youth’s abilities and confidence to get involved in their communities]

Now we will move to some general questions regarding youth in Macedonia. Please feel free to share personal examples/experiences, etc. without mentioning names.

13) How does youth in your community spend their free time? 13.1. How do you spend your free time?

14) Could you share some examples of social activities in which youth in Macedonia mostly engage in? 14.1. Is the same for boys and girls? 14.2. If not, can you give some examples of both groups?
15) What are the relationships between youth from different ethnicities and religions in your community?
16) In your opinion, what drives youth in your community, both positively and negatively? 15.1. Could you list some factors that drive youth in Macedonia? 15.2. Is it towards a positive or negative direction? 15.3. Why? 15.4. Is the same for boys and girls? 15.5. If not, can you give some examples of both groups.
17) What is needed for driving youth positively in your society?
18) Do you think youth in Macedonia have enough capacities and knowledge to be actively involved in their communities? 17.1. What about interethnic activities?
19) What is your opinion about youth’s confidence in changing the society or their communities? 19.1. Do you feel confident that you can make changes in your community? 19.2. If not, why do you think is that? 19.3. What do you need to be more confident?
20) Sometimes, youngsters explain the lack of engagement in social activities as a result of the low levels of respect for youth by the community, while some youngsters do not connect respect with their level of engagement. What are your opinions on that? 20.1. Do you feel respected by your community/society?
21) What are some of the most common challenges faced by the youth in your community? 21.1. Is the same for boys and girls? 21.2. If not, can you give some examples of both groups? 21.3 Any suggestions how to overcome those challenges? 21.4. How can schools or other relevant institutions help?

CONCLUDING QUESTIONS
Before ending our discussion, I would like to hear your opinions regarding educational TV programs in Macedonia

22) How would you evaluate the current TV programs in terms of intercultural/interethnic content?
23) Do you think there is a lack of such educational programs for youth, or there is enough?
24) What would you like to watch on TV related to interethnic integration and social cohesion?
25) Do you have something to add?

Conclusion
● Thank you for participating. This has been a very successful discussion
● Your opinions will be a valuable asset to the study
● We hope you have found the discussion interesting
● If there is anything you are unhappy with or wish to complain about, please speak to me later
● I would like to remind you that any comments featuring in this report will be anonymous

Survey with teachers

INTRODUCTION
Thank you for taking time to participate in our research study. We really appreciate your participation and contribution to the study because your point of view is very important to us. The survey is designed for
gaining insights and information regarding social cohesion in targeted municipalities. The survey is very short and it will take only 5-7 minutes of your time. Be assured that all data will be kept in the strictest confidentiality. Only aggregated data will be reported.

**DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Location and name of school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-school teacher/ primary school teacher</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements on the empty box.
   1 = strongly disagree
   2 = disagree
   3 = neither agree nor disagree
   4 = agree
   5 = strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every student has the right to learn about his/her culture in school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every student needs to have the opportunity to learn about other cultures different from his/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from minority ethnic groups need to learn only about the majority culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools should support group activities that promote diversity in culture, language and religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools should have one general curriculum for all students no matter of their ethnic background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For teachers, it is difficult to add cultural elements in every teaching unit

When a school has students predominantly from one ethnic group, there is no need for intercultural perspectives/education

Schools and teachers should organize cultural dialogues between parents from different ethnic/religious groups more often

1. How do you describe the intercultural education in your kindergarten or school?

2. Could you list at least one component of the intercultural education?

3. What is the role of the intercultural education in youth’s life?

4. As compared to previous years, do you believe that the relationship among children/students of different ethnic backgrounds has strengthened in your kindergarten/school over the past year?
   - Yes,
   - No, it is the same as before
   - No, it is worse than before
   - I am not sure/Don’t know

5. Have you ever watched an intercultural education TV program for youth on local or national channels?
   - YES
   - NO
   If yes, which one? _______________________[write the name of the program(s)]
5.1. If you have watched, how would you rate the quality of those intercultural programs?

a) Excellent
b) Good
c) Average (neither good or not good)
d) Not good
e) Not good at all

6. Do you watch any particular educational TV program aired on national or local channel nowadays?

- YES
- NO

6.1. If yes, which one? On which channel?

_______________________[write the name of the program(s) and the channel]
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TERM S of REFERENCE

Moderators and interviewers for Baseline Assessment of the Project

“Advancing Social Cohesion in Macedonia”

Search for Common Ground (Search) Macedonia is carrying out a baseline assessment for its “Advancing Social Cohesion in Macedonia,” a USAID funded project focused on deepening social cohesion among different ethnic communities in Macedonia.

Introduction

Search for Common Ground (Search) ([www.sfcg.org](http://www.sfcg.org)) is an international peacebuilding organization that strives to transform the way the world deal with conflict, away from adversarial approaches and towards collaborative problem-solving. Search is working in over 40 countries across Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and the USA. Search works with governments, civil society, state institutions, youth, media
organizations and other stakeholder groups to promote peace, reconciliation, tolerance, and collaboration across dividing lines.

The search began its program in Macedonia in 1994 and aims to support collaborative relationships and increased social cohesion among the diverse ethnic communities in Macedonia.

Search is implementing a 4-year project titled “Advancing Social Cohesion in Macedonia.” This project expands on Search’s previous work in interethnic education in Macedonia through the training of educators, pedagogical students, government inspectors, and parents. It also works towards improving public awareness of social cohesion through the use of mass media -, particularly reality television.

The overall goal of the project is to strengthen democratic values and deepen social cohesion between different ethnic communities across Macedonia.

The project has two specific objectives:
1. Strengthen inter-ethnic interaction between children and advance intercultural education in the public preschool kindergartens and primary schools;
2. Increase public awareness of positive ethnic integration and social cohesion

The Baseline Assessment
The goal of the baseline study is to establish an understanding of perceptions of intercultural education and the lived experiences of youth in Macedonia.

The baseline study will measure perceptions amongst the educational stakeholders about the role of intercultural education, as well as local communities of youth and youth perceptions about their role in addressing ethnic conflict locally and nationally. It will furthermore assess the critical issues facing the youth of Macedonia today, paying particular attention to the different ways that male and female youth are each involved in their communities and barriers to their enhanced participation, which will be used to influence project design during implementation.

The Baseline Assessment comprises two major functions to be reported as a single report.
1. Perception Survey
2. Critical issues facing youth in Macedonia

Geographical Scope of Baseline Study and Project Target Groups
The geographical scope of the baseline assessment will be multi-ethnic communities in Skopje (3 municipalities), Kumanovo, Tetovo, Gostivar, Kicevo, Struga, Debar, and Radovish.

The target groups for the proposed actions are youth from different ethnic and religious communities between 13-19 years (for the focus groups) and the general public - adults above 14 years (for the survey). The project will emphasize communities that are multi-ethnic with mixed populations, including Macedonian, Albanian, Turkish, Roma, and Serbian. Cross-generational and equal gender
representation is critical for a clear understanding of the community context and for effective implementation of subsequent activities. For the purpose of the public opinion poll, interviewers will follow the following calculated quota sample size for each municipality and ethnic group.

**Methodology**
The Study’s methodology is designed by the DM&E Specialist and the Macedonia country team. The methodology includes the following approaches:

a) Inclusiveness—the methodology should ensure to include a wide range of viewpoints
b) Mixed-method approaches—both qualitative and quantitative methods are included in the methodology.

**Key Areas of Data Collection and Key Baseline Questions**

**Key baseline questions**
- What is the level of public awareness about ethnic integration and social cohesion?
- What is the existing level of intercommunal/interethnic trust in Macedonia?
- What is the current state of interpersonal relationships among parents from across divides?
- How often people from across divides interact with each other?
- What is the current level of annual performance review of target school teachers?
- What is the state of adoption of intercultural education in target schools?
- What is the current level of knowledge intercultural education among school teachers, school inspectors, students?
- How much youth feel that they are respected by the community?
- What are the challenges faced by youth and Macedonia?
- What is the state of the relationship among youth from across ethnic, religious and social divides?
- What are the factors that drive youth both positively and negatively?
- What are the activities that youth are currently engaged in?
- What is the level of annual performance review of target school teachers?

**Roles and responsibilities**

- **Moderators**
  During the period of data collection, the moderator will be responsible for the following:
  
  - assist in the preparation and organization of the focus group if necessary
  - facilitate a focus group discussion in the targeted municipality
  - record the discussion and keep the audio materials until the end of the study
  - produce a transcript of the discussion
  - send the transcript to the project team

- **Interviewers**
  During the period of data collection, the interviewers will be responsible for the following:

  - To assist in arranging the distribution of the paper-based survey in the targeted municipality
- To survey a certain number of adults in the targeted municipality
- To assist in sending back the filled surveys to the project team

**Duration, deadlines, and timelines**

The following timeline will be followed:
- All interviewers will be given a period of one week from the day of distribution in order to complete the quota for the survey

**Support from Search**

The baseline assessment team will have access to following documents:

- Background materials (Project briefing, Torso, proposal, log frame, etc.)
- Preparation meeting with the team
- Questionnaire for the survey
- Focus group discussion guideline
- The logistical arrangement including travel

### Annex Table 1. Level of trust by municipality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Debar</th>
<th>Gazi Baba</th>
<th>Gostivar</th>
<th>Karposh</th>
<th>Kicevo</th>
<th>Kumanovo</th>
<th>Radovish</th>
<th>Struga</th>
<th>Tetovo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>7.37%</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>18.40%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>5.76%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>8.47%</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>14.74%</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
<td>10.47%</td>
<td>1.54%</td>
<td>7.63%</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>35.20%</td>
<td>23.16%</td>
<td>13.94%</td>
<td>30.06%</td>
<td>19.05%</td>
<td>25.71%</td>
<td>31.94%</td>
<td>23.85%</td>
<td>25.42%</td>
<td>31.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>28.00%</td>
<td>27.37%</td>
<td>35.76%</td>
<td>23.93%</td>
<td>35.24%</td>
<td>35.24%</td>
<td>32.46%</td>
<td>32.31%</td>
<td>37.29%</td>
<td>21.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>17.60%</td>
<td>27.37%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>14.11%</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td>19.05%</td>
<td>19.37%</td>
<td>40.77%</td>
<td>21.19%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>