

RADIO DRAMA SERIES “OUR STREET”

A Focus Group Evaluation
Conducted in Simferopol and Sevastopol, Crimea
3–5 October 2002

Prepared for Search for Common Ground, Washington, DC and
Ukrainian Center for Common Ground, Kyiv, Ukraine

CONTENTS

Executive Summary	1
Introduction.....	4
I. Observer’s Report	6
II. Moderator’s Main Findings	12
A. Use of Information Sources	12
B. Perceptions of “Our Street” and Assessment of Program Content	13
C. Assessment of Program Format and Presentation	16
D. The Role of “Our Street” in Eliminating Negative Stereotypes and Teaching Methods for Resolving Conflicts	18
E. Prospects for Broadcasting the Serial on the Radio.....	19
F. Ethnic Relations Assessment Using the Bogardus Scale.....	20
G. Conclusion	21
III. Detailed Description of Research Results	23
A. Use of Mass Media	23
B. Perceptions of “Our Street”	26
C. Assessment of the Content of the Serial	28
D. Assessment of Program Format and Presentation	39
E. The role of “Our Street” in Eliminating Negative Stereotypes and Teaching Methods for Resolving Conflicts	42
F. Prospects for Broadcasting “Our Street” on the Radio.....	44
G. Issues/Problems Urgent for the Crimean Population.....	45
H. Ethnic Relations Assessment Using the Bogardus Scale.....	45
IV. Appendix	48
A. Respondent Demographics	48
B. Bogardus scale data.....	49
C. Attitudes toward different ethnic groups	51

Project Manager: Jaroslaw Martyniuk

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Search for Common Ground (SGC) Office in Washington, D.C. commissioned InterMedia to carry out a series of focus groups to evaluate a radio drama series “Our Street” developed and produced by the Ukrainian Center for Common Ground (UCCG). InterMedia designed the study in accordance with SCG’s specifications and contracted the Kyiv-based marketing research firm Taylor Nelson Sofres (TNS) to carry out four focus group discussions in Simferopol and Sevastopol Crimea in early October 2002. The purpose of the focus groups—one with young (15 to 19 year old) Ukrainians and Russians and one with young (15 to 19 year old) Crimean Tatars in each city—was to solicit feedback on thirteen 15-minute episodes of programming and to explore the impact of the programming on stereotypical views. All participants were required to complete a home listening exercise before taking part in focus group discussions lasting approximately two hours each. Thirty-two (32) individuals took part in the group discussions.

- On the whole, the focus group participants reacted positively to the radio drama series “Our Street.” The radio program achieved its main objectives: it focused listener attention on inter-ethnic issues and problems and succeeded in delivering the cluster of interrelated messages that it intended to deliver—for example, that ethnicity should serve neither as a basis for conflict nor as a barrier to resolving conflict situations. “The most important thing about a person is his soul, not his nationality” and “there are no bad nations, there are bad people” were some typical comments in both the Russian-Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar groups.
- Most participants also found the series helpful in dealing with a wide array of problems confronting them in their daily lives, including such issues as inter-ethnic relations and inter-generational differences. Some participants indicated that listening to the drama series exposed them to specific ways to deal with potential conflicts and introduced them to skills that might be helpful in resolving various disagreements.
- The majority of participants displayed a favorable attitude toward the series content and noted that the problems addressed by the drama series were urgent and needed to be addressed. A notable exception was the Russian-Ukrainian group in Sevastopol, whose reactions to the drama series were decidedly negative. But Sevastopol is a special case—the majority of the city’s population consists of active or retired personnel from the military and security services, the Russian language is nearly universal and there are fewer Crimean Tatars than in Simferopol—and not necessarily representative of attitudes of the target group in Crimea as a whole.
- On the whole, the Crimean Tatar respondents were more outgoing and articulate than their Russian and Ukrainian counterparts, and were more attuned to inter-ethnic issues. In contrast, the Russian-Ukrainian groups felt that the radio serial

raised issues other than inter-ethnic themes, such as relations with parents and others. They also felt strongly that problems such as crime, drugs and poverty were more important than ethnicity-related issues.

- Overall the Russian-Ukrainian groups tended to minimize the inter-ethnic issues. The Russian-Ukrainian group in Sevastopol was particularly “immune” to ethnic themes. They tended to focus on more “lofty” or universal themes (friendship, love, mutual understanding). Nevertheless, it was apparent that the participants were more aware and more concerned about ethnic issues than perhaps they wished to let on. The nationality question in Crimea, it appears, competes with other serious problems such as crime, drugs and high unemployment, issues that have the effect of overshadowing inter-ethnic problems.

Evaluation of Content

- During the focus groups, participants were also asked to rate the content and presentation of the drama series on a ten-point scale. With respect to content, two patterns emerged: (1) the groups in Simferopol appreciated the series more than the groups in Sevastopol, with ratings of 8.8 and 6.2, respectively; and (2) the Tatar groups, on the whole, were more pleased with the series than the Russian/Ukrainian groups, with ratings of 8.4 and 6.6, respectively.
- The lower scores in Sevastopol, according to observers, reflected the special outlook and attitude of these peoples living in this closed city (described above): they tend to be critical of all things coming from the outside. By contrast, Simferopol is a more ethnically balanced and diverse place whose population reflects a more tolerant attitude.
- The Tatar groups reacted more positively to the drama series than the Russian/Ukrainian groups, most likely because they related more closely to the situation in the drama. The Tatars appeared to demonstrate a stronger emotional association with the plot, as well as greater empathy with some of the characters.

Style and Presentation

- The majority of the focus group participants thought that the plot was easy to follow and that it evolved naturally and logically, albeit somewhat slowly at the beginning. The participants also liked the voices of most actors. Mentioned specifically were the voices for the characters Vlad, Dilyaver and Anya. Some voices, however, were criticized. Among them were the voices of the characters Alex, Nina’s mother and Marina. According to the participants, these characters’ personalities were not particularly likable, their intonations were inappropriate and their acting lacked improvisation.
- Some participants found the repetitious musical theme irritating. This was probably because participants listened to all the episodes in one or two sittings at home, which did not reflect a “real” situation in which the target audience will be exposed to only one episode per day.

- Some of the participants thought that “Our Street” needs updating insofar as the so-called street dynamics and slang are concerned. The overall feeling was that the problems that were portrayed are real enough, but that this is not quite the way things happen on the street.
- Overall, with respect to program style and presentation, the participants rated the presentation of “Our Street” relatively favorably. On a ten-point scale, the average presentation score for all four groups (7.2) was only marginally lower than the score for programming content (7.5).

Impact of “Our Street” on Participants

- To measure the possible impact the radio drama series may have had on the participants, InterMedia employed the *Bogardus* method to measure the social distance between various ethnic groups—including the mutual perceptions among Ukrainians, Russians and Tatars. Participants were asked how close they felt to another ethnic group **before and after** they had listened to the entire radio drama series.
- Results suggest that after listening to “Our Street,” the participants’ perceptions of distance (on a 6-point *Bogardus* scale) between the groups in question decreased, in some cases measurably. The results varied by group but, on average, it can be stated that the Ukrainian and Russians felt somewhat closer to Tatars after hearing the drama series.
- The change in attitudes of the Crimean Tatars toward the Russians, and especially the Ukrainians, was even more pronounced: the Tatars viewed the Russians and Ukrainians in a more favorable light. Some of this change may be attributed to the way the radio drama plot unfolded, especially those moments where a few Russian-Ukrainian characters helped the Tatars in difficult situations.
- Overall, the focus groups showed that the radio drama could facilitate the major goals of the project—the cultivation of inter-ethnic understanding among young people of the Crimea, the prevention of conflicts in the local multicultural environment, and the teaching of basic conflict resolution skills. Under the influence of these programs, the focus group participants took an interest in ethnic groups other than their own and expressed a desire to understand them better.
- Furthermore, the series enhances the attractiveness of positive human values such as love, friendship and “good.” The series also provides insight into the role of emotions in a conflict. For instance, listeners recognized the importance of comprehending a situation before responding to it, and of trying to resolve a conflict peacefully rather than attempting to overcome the opponent.
- Finally, the participants responded favorably to the possibility of broadcasting “Our Street” on the radio in Crimea.

INTRODUCTION

Research Objective

The study's primary objective was to assess the overall efficiency of the episodes of the specialized radio programs in the series "Our Street." Other objectives of the research were as follows:

- To assess the overall efficiency of the episodes in terms of content and presentation
- To study the participants' response to the characters, design, plot pattern, etc.
- To determine what information the participants learned from the program; to identify the efficiency of the didactic message/address of the episodes
- To determine the attractiveness of the style, format and presentation of the programs, with the purpose of making better programs of this sort in the future
- To identify the participants' views on the nature of relations between different ethnic groups—Slavs and Tatars—before and after they heard the program episodes;
- To determine the effect—beneficial/constructive or adverse/counterproductive—produced by the program "Our Street" on the participants' attitudes and behavior; and
- To reveal the entire spectrum of the participants' responses (favorable and unfavorable) to the content and presentation (form/style) of the selected radio drama episodes with the purpose of providing guidance for future program improvements.

Methodology

Four focus group discussions, each comprised of eight participants, were held on 3–5 October 2002. Two focus group discussions were held in Simferopol, and two were held in Sevastopol. In each city, ethnic Tatars comprised one focus group and ethnic Russians and Ukrainians comprised the other focus group. The composition of the four focus groups is detailed in the table on the next page. Focus group discussions lasted approximately two hours.

Before the focus groups discussions all participants were given cassettes or CD containing the 13 episodes of the radio drama series "Our Street." In addition all participant were required to fill out short pre-group and post-groups questionnaires, both of which contained a Bogardus social distance measure.

Two observers were present during the groups: Dr. Roman Solchanyk of Rand Corporation and Dr. Roman Kowal, Director of Ukrainian Center for Common Ground.

Composition of the Focus Groups

No	Date	Participants' profile	City	Time
1	3 Oct	Ethnic Russians and Ukrainians (aged 15–18); 5 Russians, 3 Ukrainians; male vs. female ratio: 50:50; 2 rural-area respondents	Simferopol	17:00
2	4 Oct	Ethnic Tatars (aged 15–18); male vs. female ratio: 50:50; 2 rural-area respondents	Simferopol	16:00
3	5 Oct	Ethnic Russians and Ukrainians (aged 15–18); 5 Russians, 3 Ukrainians; male vs. female ratio: 50:50; 2 rural-area respondents	Sevastopol	12:00
4	5 Oct	Ethnic Tatars (aged 15–18); male vs. female ratio: 50:50; 2 rural-area respondents	Sevastopol	15:00

I. OBSERVER'S REPORT

By Roman Solchanyk

Study Description and Background

TNS Ukraine conducted four focus group sessions—two in Simferopol and two in Sevastopol—for the Ukrainian Center for Common Ground (UCCG) during the course of 3–5 October 2002 in order to determine the effectiveness of a projected radio drama/serial titled “Our Street.” The primary and overall objective of the radio program is to facilitate inter-ethnic understanding, conflict prevention in a multicultural context, and conflict resolution among young people in Crimea, an autonomous republic within Ukraine.

It should be noted that Crimea, given its history, is precisely the one region in Ukraine with potential for serious inter-ethnic hostility. In the briefest of terms, a complex set of issues revolves around the role and status—political, economic, social, and, indeed, historic—of the Crimean Tatar minority in Crimea, which is estimated to account for about 12 percent of the peninsula’s population. (The results of the recently concluded first post-Soviet census are not yet available.)

The Crimean Tatars were forcibly deported en masse (together with other national minorities) from Crimea in 1944. Beginning in the late 1980s, they have been returning from exile in Central Asia to what they consider to be their historic homeland. The Russian majority in Crimea (67 percent, according to the 1989 Soviet census) as well as the Ukrainians (25.8 percent) tend to view the Crimean Tatars as an “alien” and destabilizing element in their midst. Moreover, the stigma associated with the Tatars wartime “collaboration” continues to linger in the popular consciousness. The Crimean Tatars maintain that they are routinely discriminated against by local authorities, that the peninsula’s “Russian” population is invariably hostile toward them, and that the central authorities in Kyiv are either unwilling or unable to address their concerns. In short, there is a combustible ethnic mix in Crimea.

Two focus groups were conducted in each city, one consisting of a mixed group of ethnic Russians and Ukrainians and the other comprised exclusively of Crimean Tatars. Each group of eight participants was composed of young people aged 15 to 18 evenly divided between males and females; each group also included two participants from rural areas. The average duration of the focus group sessions was two hours. Prior to taking part in the focus groups, the participants listened to 13 episodes of the “Our Street” radio drama on audio cassettes. Each episode was 15 minutes in length, for a total listening time of approximately three hours and 15 minutes. Before listening to the tapes, participants completed a questionnaire designed to gauge attitudes toward various ethnic groups.

In addition to evaluating the effectiveness of the radio drama with respect to UCCG’s primary objective in its work in Crimea, the focus group sessions sought to gauge the participants’ reactions to the content and style of the radio program; to determine the

participants' perceptions of inter-ethnic relations before and after listening to the program; to identify factors that promoted as well as inhibited inter-ethnic understanding and tolerance; to assess the program's impact, both positive and negative, on attitudes; and to identify ways to improve the program and hence its effectiveness.

Unfortunately, I was not able to observe the final focus group in Sevastopol (Crimean Tatar group). Shortly after the moderator began working with the group, a woman—who identified herself as a local schoolteacher, member of a local Crimean Tatar group, and a spokesperson for parents—arrived with two members of the Sevastopol City Council and an officer of the criminal police from the Ministry of Interior. They were subsequently joined by an officer of the financial fraud department of the Ministry of Interior. What ensued was a lengthy and testy discussion about the “legality” of conducting the focus group without the prior approval of the authorities, the “inappropriateness” of such an undertaking, alleged financial “irregularities” in connection with our use of the premises where the focus group was being conducted, and much else, including a check of identity documents by the police. Over and above everything else, our visitors insisted that what we were doing is unnecessary because there never have been and are no nationality problems in Sevastopol. Although the moderator was able to continue working with the group, the video operator stopped taping the session after about ten minutes and whisked away his equipment in anticipation of it being confiscated by the police. After more than two hours of “investigation,” the visitors departed, having successfully disrupted our work.

General Observations

As a whole, the focus group participants may be said to have been fairly positive in their reaction to the “Our Street” drama, although the Russian-Ukrainian group in Sevastopol was decidedly negative about most everything that had to do with the radio serial. This group was also inconsistent and/or contradictory in its judgments. This, as well as other aspects of the discussion in this group, raises questions as to the usefulness of some of the responses they provided. It should also be noted that the Russian-Ukrainian participants were less enthusiastic than the Crimean Tatar group that I observed, which probably was to be expected. Correspondingly, the Crimean Tatar participants were more forthcoming, animated, engaged and articulate in the course of the focus group discussion. It was clear that the Russian-Ukrainian groups tended to perceive the radio serial as raising other issues in addition to those related to inter-ethnic themes—for example, relations with parents. The Russian-Ukrainian group in Sevastopol in particular was adamant in its conviction that problems such as crime, drugs and poverty were far and away more important than any ethnicity-related issues. Conversely, most of the Crimean Tatar participants focused on the ethnic theme, which also was to be expected.

While all three groups were quite similar in their preference for musical and entertainment shows on television and radio, participants in the Crimean Tatar group were more likely to watch or listen to news programs and other more serious broadcasting and to read material dealing with history, politics and culture. One Crimean

Tatar girl said by way of introducing herself that she wanted “every person to know his/her civil rights because this is our problem today in Ukraine.” In contrast, doing the crossword or checking the television programming was often cited by the Russian-Ukrainian participants as reasons for consulting a newspaper. One respondent from the Russian-Ukrainian group in Simferopol said that he often looked at what the magazine kiosks had to offer, but “as a rule there is nothing interesting there.” Television is the preferred medium; some respondents said that they had occasion to listen to the radio only while riding in the *marshrutki* (public transport minivans).

Effectiveness of the Message

The responses of the participants in the three groups that I observed indicated quite clearly that “Our Street” succeeded in delivering the cluster of interrelated messages that it intended to deliver—for example, that ethnicity should serve neither as a basis for conflict nor as a barrier to resolving conflict situations. These were typical responses by participants in both the Russian-Ukrainian and Crimean Tatar groups:

Friendship, irrespective of nationality, is a great, wonderful idea.

People are differentiated not as Russians, Tatars, and Ukrainians, but as good people and bad people.

The most important thing about a person is his soul, not his nationality.

There are no bad nations, there are bad people.

Nonetheless, some caveats are in order. It was my distinct impression that the Russian-Ukrainian participants were inclined to downplay or perhaps even gloss over the ethnic aspects of inter-personal relations and, as a corollary, focus more on what might be termed more “lofty” or universal themes (friendship, love, mutual understanding). Because the respondents were children when the Soviet Union disintegrated, the question here is not one about Soviet propaganda of the “friendship of nations.” However, there may be a residual impact of parents or grandparents. Thus, one respondent in the Russian-Ukrainian group in Sevastopol said: “They [Crimean Tatars] consider Crimea to be their legal land, but that is not the way it is. For me, Russia will always be the entire Russia.” It is not entirely clear what was meant here, but presumably she was equating Russia with the former Soviet Union. Crimea is arguably one of the most “Sovietized” regions of Ukraine.

The Russian-Ukrainian group in Sevastopol was particularly “immune” to ethnic themes. The group participants recognized ethnicity only grudgingly. When one respondent said that mutual understanding was the main idea to emerge from the radio drama and the moderator then probed a bit and asked, “Mutual understanding among nations?”—the respondent answered “No, mutual understanding among people.” But Sevastopol is a special case, as our experience there with the local authorities shows. The majority of the city’s population consists of active or retired personnel from the military and security services; the Russian language is near universal; and the Crimean Tatars are fewer in numbers there than in Simferopol. It is, in some sense, an extraterritorial enclave of

Russia because of the Russian-Ukrainian agreement on the basing rights of the Russian Black Sea Fleet.

Another quite likely explanation is that, like any majority, the Russians and Ukrainians—and in Crimea, Russians and Ukrainians may be viewed largely as a single group—are simply less sensitive or attuned to issues that are important to minorities. Both factors are probably at work here and the effects are discernible. Two respondents from the Russian-Ukrainian group in Simferopol even suggested that the inter-ethnic themes (and the drugs theme) needed to be amplified in the radio drama.

The Crimean Tatar respondents, as already mentioned, were more outgoing and articulate than their Russian and Ukrainian counterparts. There is no question that they were more attuned to inter-ethnic issues. Some watched Crimean Tatar television broadcasts and read Crimean Tatar publications. One respondent spoke specifically about Islam in the context of the impact of 11 September 2001. Some noted that they often personally found themselves in situations where there was a “national problem.” Still, the Crimean Tatar respondents also mentioned things like friendship and love as figuring prominently in the serial.

It seems to me, therefore, that the question for the producers of “Our Street” is not whether the radio program effectively conveys its message: it is effective, as the responses from the focus groups testify. Instead, the key question is how to make the radio drama more effective or perhaps more focused, particularly with a view toward the Russians and Ukrainians. To reiterate, there appears to be a tendency on the part of Russians and Ukrainians to slight ethnicity-related issues or problems, which may be a legacy of the Soviet past. Moreover, themes such as love and friendship are unquestionably quite attractive, all the more so for teens. Finally, problems such as drugs and poverty are, quite objectively, more likely to be “in your face” on a daily basis than inter-ethnic problems and, therefore, are perceived as more important. Against this background, it seems to me that it would be useful to think about ways in which the ethnic content or undercurrent of the program could be accentuated while, at the same time, maintaining it within a broader context of everyday life to which listeners can easily relate.

Content, Format and Style

There was no real consensus on matters of content, format, style, presentation, voices, music and the like. On the contrary, the views were disparate. A case in point is that some respondents liked the music while others did not. Still, one can point to several things that did result in considerable agreement. Several of the respondents said that they were prepared for something quite different, but were pleasantly surprised that their expectations proved to be false—i.e., their response was positive. For example, one respondent said, “I was expecting a lecture.” There was agreement that the middle of the story was somehow less interesting or engaging than the beginning and end. There was near unanimous agreement that the rapist should not have gone unpunished.

One area where there was substantial agreement concerned the use of language, particularly slang. Respondents maintained that the slang used in the radio drama did not correspond to what is heard on the streets. One respondent said “Do you know how many other kinds of curse words there are?” In some instances, this judgment was offered in the broader context of the entire program not reflecting existing realities, being superficial, naive or affected (*naigrano*). These were some of the critical comments offered:

All of this was affected, everything ended as it does in soap operas.

The situation that was shown was rather naive because nowadays everything on the street is different.

There was no improvisation. They simply took it and read it.

There was some sentiment that things are more complicated than the portrayal in “Our Street” and that these kinds of situations do not usually end happily. Still, it is important to emphasize that such criticisms, which could be heard usually at the beginning of the group discussions, were later overshadowed by comments that showed that the respondents were able to “get into” what was happening and that they were able to relate to the issues that were being raised.

Another area of agreement was that programs like “Our Street” are desirable and useful. In some cases, respondents specifically argued that they personally had no need for such a program, but that it would be useful for others. Clearly, this should be taken with a dose of skepticism. Similarly, quite a few of the respondents insisted that their views on ethnicity-related issues did not change after listening to the program and/or that they did not learn anything new. Again, one suspects that these young people were attempting to cast themselves in a positive light—namely, that they were tolerant of other nationalities and not susceptible to ethnicity-based prejudice. One respondent said, “It could be that I simply concretized some details for myself, but nothing more than that.” A few, however, admitted that previously they had not given much thought to the deportations of the Crimean Tatars and other minorities and that the program focused their attention on this issue.

Yes, we learned something new, for example that holiday [May 18 demonstrations].

All of this helped to understand them [Crimean Tatars] more, their traditions and all that stuff.

Others made similar statements. The Crimean Tatar respondents also said that the program did not change their views on nationality issues, but their point of departure is very different from the Russians and Ukrainians; they have had personal experiences on the receiving end.

Main Conclusions

The “Our Street” radio drama drew a generally positive response from the focus group participants. The ratings were predominantly between 7 and 10 on a scale of 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest). The Russian-Ukrainian group in Sevastopol was least impressed. The Crimean Tatar group gave the program high ratings of 9 and 10. The overall sentiment was that such a program is necessary and beneficial.

The radio program achieved its main objective. In spite of the constraints that exist in Crimea (and particularly in Sevastopol), it focused the participants’ attention on inter-ethnic issues and problems. Although the Russian-Ukrainian respondents were predisposed to minimize such issues—particularly in comparison to other social and economic problems—in the final analysis, the focus group discussions showed that the participants were more aware and more concerned about ethnic issues than perhaps they wished to let on.

Nonetheless, more emphasis needs to be placed on specifically ethnic issues in order to shift some of the attention away from more general problems such as drug use and relations between parents and children. One can argue that in some sense the nationality question in Crimea is “competing” with quite serious problems such as crime, drugs, and high unemployment. (Crimea is in worse shape economically than the remainder of the country.) These are everyday concerns that have the effect of “downgrading” inter-ethnic problems.

It would be very difficult to find the winning formula, as it were, with respect to matters relating to style of presentation, language usage and music, which are largely subjective in nature. Still, it seems that the “Our Street” program needs some updating, particularly insofar as the so-called street dynamics and slang are concerned. The overall feeling was that the problems that are portrayed are real enough, but that it is not quite the way “it goes down” on the street.

II. MODERATOR'S MAIN FINDINGS

A. USE OF INFORMATION SOURCES

All of the respondents watch TV; nearly all regularly listen to the radio (except for three participants in Group 1, who said they rarely listened to the radio); and nearly all of the respondents are also regular readers of newspapers and magazines.

Most of the participants watch TV 2-3 hours a day, on average. Both Tatars and Ukrainians/Russians watch music channels on TV (M1, STB, MTV); apart from that, the young Tatars also watch a national channel called "The Crimea."

As radio listeners, most participants listen to musical request programs as well as to music played in other programs. Radio stations that respondents regularly listen to are Russkoye Radio, Hit-FM, Chanson, Megapolis, Radio 107, Europe Plus, Nashe Radio and Trans-M.

The respondents also read all sorts of newspapers and magazines. However, most of them content themselves with the newspapers *Telenedelya* [TV Week] and *Crossvordy* [Crosswords]. Tatars rarely read their national periodicals; many of them do not know their native language.

Reasons for watching TV, listening to the radio and reading periodicals:

- To be well informed of new developments in the country and abroad;
- For entertainment or relaxation;
- To obtain new knowledge, e.g., "to facilitate one's own development...to broaden one's horizons"

B. PERCEPTIONS OF “OUR STREET” AND ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM CONTENT

Most of the teenagers liked the serial “Our Street”; they realized that it was a made-up story attempting to reflect the life of the young generation.

In all focus groups, it was noted that problems addressed by the serial are urgent for young people (the word “problem” was proposed by participants themselves). The young listeners mentioned the following problems that, in their opinion, the drama addressed:

- Ethnic relations
- Relations between parents and children
- Drug addiction

The participants also identified the following messages that they felt the authors of the radio drama were attempting to convey to the listeners:

- Friendship and mutual understanding among peoples
- Mutual understanding between individuals/categories of individuals (relations between parents and children, between young men and young women, “love relationships”)
- Importance of judging people as individuals and recognizing the “good side” of human beings
- The fact that people can succeed in justifying their personal opinions

The focus group participants were asked to evaluate the radio drama using a 10-point scale, with 10 being the highest. Their average scores were as follows:

Group 1	Russians-Ukrainians	Simferopol	8.0
Group 2	Tatars	Simferopol	9.6
Group 3	Russians-Ukrainians	Sevastopol	5.2
Group 4	Tatars	Sevastopol	7.2

As the scores were rather high, the participants’ overall response to the radio drama can be described as favorable.

The young Tatars gave noticeably higher scores to the series than the young Russians did. This is probably due to the Tatars’ tendency to perceive problems addressed by the radio drama in a more emotional way, and also to the fact that, according to the Ukrainian Center for Accord, the Crimean Tatars are a less divided community with greater emphasis on traditional cultural and family values.

The most-liked segments of the radio drama were the following:

- The conversation between mother and Anya about the girl's friendship with Dilyaver, and Anya's successful defense of her viewpoint (Groups 1 and 3);
- The finale of the series—Vlad paid attention to the dishes on the table: *"There are so many dishes here; I wish all of us were so friendly."* (Groups 1 and 2).

The most disliked point was the fact that Alex managed to evade punishment.

The drama had many emotional, touching moments. The following moments were mentioned in each of the focus groups:

- The rape scene
- The motorcycle race
- The reconciliation between Vagan and Nina
- The conversation between Nina and her mother after the rape
- Anya and Dilyaver's first encounter and the evolution of their relationship

In listening to "Our Street," some respondents discovered certain pieces of information or history that were new to them, while others did not find anything new. One segment of the programming that all the participants found interesting was the description of Armenian national traditions and of the holiday Vartavar. In addition, many participants were interested in the specific customs of the Tatar people and the information on the Day of Sorrow. Some respondents were surprised to learn that ethnic groups used to live amicably, and some noted that the program showed devoted friendship, "which one does not encounter frequently." The latter two aspects were of particular interest to Russians/Ukrainians. Apparently, this is a consequence of the so-called divided society.

The best-liked characters in the drama are Vlad, Anya and Saxophone. The respondents described Anya as "sociable and serious" and "striving for education." They considered Saxophone a positive character overall ("a good old man, experienced and wise"), and also noted his helpful role as the program's presenter, acquainting listeners with the facts at the beginning of each episode and summing up the events in the end. One listener commented appreciatively, "Every action by adverse characters gives him a shock; it's like he doesn't know that such things happen in life." Additionally, one participant liked Zombie, as a character who "reformed himself, overcame his weaknesses," and two others liked Kisel, as a person who was trying to help Nina.

On the other hand, participants disliked Marina, Alex and Enver, whom they perceived as the negative characters of the drama. They would like Alex to be punished for his offense; notably, they emphasized that punishment should precede his possible penitence. Respondents also noted that other "negative" characters went unpunished as well. Some even expressed extreme opinions, for instance, "The lot of such people should be death and that's all" (Group 3).

The participants were most concerned about the future of the characters in the drama. They wanted to know if Alex was eventually punished; how Vagan and Nina got along; what became of Ork and his company; whatever happened to the club Black, and whether or not Vlad's new club was successful. The rape of Nina gave rise to the most questions: Did she sue Alex; and if not, why? Furthermore, why did Alex flee, and why did he rape Nina after all? In serials, good usually triumphs over evil; in this drama, however, the triumph of good was not complete, and that was why respondents had so many questions to ask. Apart from questions related to specific characters, quite a few social questions were asked: about drug addiction; about sexually transmitted diseases; about relations within "backstreet" companies; about behavior on the streets; and about relations with one's parents.

As such, one possible recommendation for the authors would be to consider expanding on the above-mentioned points (or similar ones) in future episodes. On the other hand, the fact that the radio drama elicited a response in the teenagers and made them ponder a variety of unanswered questions could be considered a positive feature of the series.

C. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM FORMAT AND PRESENTATION

When listening to the serial, the participants felt the following range of emotions:

- **Interest** (in the course of the whole serial, waiting for the denouement)
- **Disappointment** (when Nina was raped; when the mother was railing at Anya for the girl’s dates with Dilyaver)
- **Relaxation** (when the music was playing; when Saxophone was speaking)
- **Indignation** (when Nina was raped)
- **Confusion** (when Vagan came to the club for a showdown, but five minutes later he was dancing, demonstrating his skill)
- **Joy, delight** (when the key characters reconciled with each other)
- **Pity** (in relation to Nina)
- **Boredom** (during the playback of the music caption)
- “The feeling that this won’t happen to me”

When asked to evaluate the style of presentation (on a scale of 1 to 10), the focus groups gave the following average scores:

Group 1	Russians-Ukrainians	Simferopol	7.0
Group 2	Tatars	Simferopol	8.6
Group 3	Russians-Ukrainians	Sevastopol	7.0
Group 4	Tatars	Sevastopol	6.2

The individual scores for style ranged from as high as 10 to as low as 3, hence the relatively low averages in the groups. Nevertheless, since all group scores are well above 5, we can say that the style of presentation was mostly liked rather than disliked.

Participants who gave low scores for presentation style offered the following reasons for doing so:

- They disliked the actors’ voices;
- They disliked the inflections, or the way the text was delivered, as if being read from a piece of paper; or
- They disliked the use of language, for the inclusion of colloquial words.

Respondents liked the voices of Vagan’s father, Vlad, Dilyaver and Anya: “They talk energetically [and have] pleasant voices” (Group 3). In addition, one member of Group 4 liked the way Ork’s part was played. Apparently, the most-liked voices were those belonging to the “positive” characters. This probably indicates the participants’ emotional response to those characters; by approving of their voices, respondents actually expressed a favorable attitude toward their actions. On the other hand, the teenagers’ reactions to Saxophone’s voice were more mixed—for instance, some found his voice irritating, and some thought it appeared too frequently on the air. Nonetheless, most participants agreed that a character such as Saxophone, who provides the necessary explanations for events

in the serial, is essential to the radio drama. The most disliked voices were those of Alex, Nina's mother and Marina.

Participants found the plot easy to follow as it evolved from episode to episode, and generally agreed that the episodes were not overly drawn out (though several members of Group 1 observed that the beginning of the serial should have been more active). However, many were irritated by the musical interlude that was repeated several times during each episode.

D. THE ROLE OF “OUR STREET” IN ELIMINATING NEGATIVE STEREOTYPES AND TEACHING METHODS FOR RESOLVING CONFLICTS

Focus group participants claimed that “Our Street” did not change their attitudes toward other ethnic groups because their attitudes were already favorable and they were quite loyal to inter-ethnic peace. Nevertheless, they said that the radio drama could prompt people with a more unfavorable attitude toward certain ethnic groups/nationalities to revise their views, and to realize that not all people of a particular ethnic origin are the same, that in every ethnic group there are bad and good people. It was even claimed that, while trying to show the good aspect of other nations, the authors of the serial actually smeared Russians and Ukrainians: “All the Russian and Ukrainian [characters] were very bad [and] have inferior qualities.”

The teenagers found the serial interesting because it showed a variety of ethnic traditions different from their own, gave them some new information (about the Armenian holiday, the Day of Sorrow, and the Tatar musical instrument) and prompted them to ponder issues they had not thought about before.

Some respondents said that the serial gave them new methods and skills for resolving conflicts (although others did not discover any methods in the serial):

In principle, there is just one method here: Treat people well. (Group 1)

One doesn't have to use fists to resolve something; one can do it peacefully. (Group 1)

I would no longer get too excited if something was wrong. I'd stop and think. (Group 1)

One shouldn't give in to emotions—this won't lead to anything good; this leads to aggression. (Group 1)

When someone starts insulting you, be silent and count to 10. (Group 2)

Problems shouldn't be resolved by way of determining who is the better drinker or the faster racer. (Group 3)

According to participants, the serial can also be instrumental in improving the pattern of relations between parents and children.

E. PROSPECTS FOR BROADCASTING THE SERIAL ON THE RADIO

Most of the participants responded favorably to the possibility of broadcasting the serial on the radio; however, some expressed doubt as to whether it was actually expedient to do so.

In the view of the respondents, the serial's target audience consists of teenagers belonging to different ethnic groups, living in the Crimea, aged between 12 and 16. (One group believed that the age range started at 10 years, and another thought it ended at age 20, but the other groups did not support these views).

Participants identified the following radio stations as most appropriate for the serial:

- Hit-FM (five members of Group 3; one member of Group 2; two members of Group 4)
- Russkoye Radio (four members of Group 2; two members of Group 4)
- Chanson
- UT-1
- Europe Plus

There was disagreement as to the best time for broadcasting. Some respondents thought the morning (between 7:00 and 8:30) would be most convenient; others suggested early afternoon (between 14:00 and 16:00), "when people come home for lunch"; and still others favored the evening hours (between 18:00 and 21:00).

In all four groups, participants spontaneously mentioned drug addiction, ethnic relations and poverty as problems characteristic of the Crimea. The Simferopol groups identified injustice as one of the major problems of the Crimea, while the Sevastopol groups singled out poverty as the greatest problem. Thus, it seems that the issue of ethnic relations does rank among the urgent problems, although some participants denied that.

F. ETHNIC RELATIONS ASSESSMENT USING THE BOGARDUS SCALE¹

The results of the Bogardus Scale test clearly indicate that the respondents maintain the closest distances with members of their own nationality, although they were more likely to have a better attitude toward other nationalities after listening to “Our Street.” However, as the data received from focus groups are not representative of the population at large, we can speak only about the tendency.

Although many respondents used stereotypes in their descriptions of certain nationalities, most of them emphasized that all nationalities are equal, that each nationality has both good and bad people and that it is impossible to judge a nation by its individual members. One possible explanation for this apparent contradiction is that the formation of stereotypes is a natural process of socialization and that young people are still unable to distinguish stereotypes sufficiently, though their understanding of the fact that stereotypes are bad is already an important step in overcoming them.

¹ For more detailed descriptions of the participants’ attitudes toward various nationalities, see Appendix C.

G. CONCLUSION

Overall, the Crimean teenagers were well disposed toward “Our Street.” The radio drama made them think about ethnic relations as well as mutual relations among individuals, and they generally agreed that the serial reflects problems existing in the local milieu. Additionally, the participants responded favorably to the possibility of broadcasting “Our Street” on the radio.

The radio drama can facilitate the achievement of the major goals of the project (cultivation of inter-ethnic understanding among young residents of the Crimea, prevention of conflicts in the local multicultural environment and instruction in conflict resolution skills). Under the influence of the programs, the focus group participants took an interest in ethnic groups other than their own and expressed a desire to understand them better. Furthermore, the serial enhances the attractiveness of positive human values such as love, friendship and good. The series also provides insight into the role of emotions in a conflict. For instance, listeners recognized the importance of comprehending a situation before responding to it and of trying to resolve a conflict peacefully rather than attempting to overcome the opponent.

The teenagers acknowledged the existence of stereotypes toward a variety of ethnic groups, such as the alleged jealousy of the Armenians and the Tatars’ supposedly bad attitude toward women. Moreover, they realized that such stereotypes often underlie people’s attitudes toward the entire ethnic group, thus provoking conflicts (not only inter-ethnic but interpersonal as well). They were aware that the existence of stereotypes does not yield favorable consequences. Indeed, they observed that one must not judge entire nations by their individual representatives and that one’s opinion about an individual must be formed solely on the basis of his/her personal experience of communicating/dealing with that person. Thus, we conclude that the radio drama prompts teenagers to get rid of stereotypes and to start perceiving other people comprehensively, as personalities, with all of their merits and faults.

In summary, “Our Street” succeeded in achieving most of its goals.

In order to enhance the effectiveness of the serial, we recommend the following:

- Recruit young people who will talk about their own experiences, about real situations they have faced in their lives;
- Modify somewhat the language used in the programs, as the slang used by the characters does not seem natural enough for a “teenaged grouping”;
- Bring the situation involving Alex and Nina to a logical conclusion, as many participants perceived it as “unfinished gestalt”; and
- Place greater emphasis on the ability to resolve conflicts and familiarize listeners with the possible lines of constructive behavior (listening to the other side, showing respect to it, asking relevant questions and declaring personal interests). It should be noted that, while the listeners appreciated the importance of

vindicating one's personal opinion (as exemplified by Anya's conversation with her mother about Dilyaver), they did not see what is the right way to do it.

III. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH RESULTS

A. USE OF MASS MEDIA

All of the respondents watch TV; nearly all regularly listen to the radio (except for three members of Group 1, who said they rarely listened to the radio); and nearly all of the respondents are also regular readers of newspapers and magazines.

Most participants watch TV for an average of 2-3 hours daily. Both Tatars and Ukrainians/Russians watch music channels on TV (M1, STB, MTV); apart from that, the young Tatars also watch a national channel called The Crimea.

TV Programs (Program Categories) Regularly Watched by Respondents²:

<i>Russians/Ukrainians</i>	<i>Tatars</i>
<i>Brain Ring</i> (1) <i>What, Where, When</i> (1) Melodrama (1) Films (3) News bulletins (1) Cartoons (1) <i>The Big Kush</i> (1)	<i>The Big Kush</i> (1) KVN (2) <i>The Big Washing</i> (1) The Serial <i>Drongo</i> (1)

Radio Stations Regularly Listened to by Respondents:

<i>Russians/Ukrainians</i>	<i>Tatars</i>
Hit FM (4+11) Russkoye Radio (6+7) Chanson (1+1)	
Megapolis (2) 107 (8)	Europe Plus (3) Nashe Radio (1+1) Trans M (2)

As radio listeners, most of the focus group members listen to musical request programs as well as to music played in other programs.

² Figures in parentheses indicate the number of participants mentioning the respective option

Newspapers and Magazines Regularly Read by Respondents:

<i>Russians/Ukrainians</i>	<i>Tatars</i>
<div style="border: 1px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 10px; background-color: #e0ffff; display: inline-block;"> <i>Telenedelya</i> [“TV Week”] (2+4) <i>Crossvordy</i> [“Crosswords”] (2+1) </div>	
<i>Sem</i> [“Seven”] (1) <i>Komanda</i> [“The Team”] (1) <i>Komsomolskaya Pravda</i> (1) <i>The Crimea</i> (1) <i>Zeitung</i> (1) <i>Vokrug Sveta</i> [“Around the World”] (1) <i>Fitness</i> (1) <i>Nauka i Zhyzn</i> [“Science and Life”] (1) <i>Teleprogramma</i> [“TV program”] (1) <i>Oops</i> (1)	<i>Natalie</i> (1) <i>Art Mozaika</i> [“Art Mosaic”] (3) <i>Burda</i> (1) <i>Chic</i> (1) <i>Cool Girl</i> (1) <i>Lisa</i> (1) <i>Otdokhni</i> [“Relax”] (1) <i>Signal</i> (1) <i>The Crimea</i> (3)

Apart from *The Crimea*, the interviewed Tatars hardly ever read any other Tatar-language periodical.

Participants observed that they sometimes read other magazines or newspapers as well, most often if they take interest in a particular item included in the periodical: “I often look at what our kiosks sell...at times I come across something interesting” (№6, Group 1).

Attention-Attracting Information in Newspapers and Magazines*:

<i>Russians/Ukrainians</i>	<i>Tatars</i>
Sports (1) Cultural news, “what new films or stage productions have been released” (1) Historical articles (1) Humor (1) Polls (1) Crosswords (1) Music news (1) Information on other countries (1) Women’s issues (1) New technologies in science (1) Cars (1) Fashion (1)	Music news (1) Horoscope (1) Political history (1) Life stories (1) Historical articles (1) Political articles (1) Criminal news (1) News bulletins (1)

*Figures in parentheses indicate the number of respondents mentioning the respective item.

Reasons for watching TV, listening to the radio and reading periodicals:

- To be well informed on new developments in the country and abroad
- For entertainment or relaxation
- To obtain new knowledge, e.g., “to facilitate one’s own development...to broaden one’s horizons.”

B. PERCEPTIONS OF “OUR STREET”

The section presents the focus group participants’ spontaneous responses to the radio drama “Our Street.”

Most of the teenagers liked the serial; they realized that it was a made-up story attempting to reflect the life of the young generation:

There were some points that resembled our life; the serial is just for us. (№2, Group 2)

One indication that the serial was interesting was that I skipped my favorite TV series [in order to listen to it]. (№3, Group 2)

In principle, I liked the idea. It’s a good, pure idea: friendship in general, regardless of one’s ethnic origin, regardless of anything. (№6, Group 1)

I liked it in general; the whole serial was very close to life, because such cases are very natural and frequent in life. (№1, Group 4)

It’s a necessary thing. (№2, Group 3)

The disliked points of the serial (in response to the moderator’s request that participants “describe their impressions of the radio drama”) were as follows:

- Naiveté

Nowadays, things are totally different in the streets; nowadays, there are many bad things and it is easy to lure a clever, decent person into anything at all.

Things are sometimes a little naïve there.

The characters are too idealized: these are good and those are bad; it’s not like that in life.

- The language used by the characters. According to participants, not all young people, and not in all situations, talk like the characters do. In addition, the current slang used in nightclubs is somewhat different than that used in the programs.

There is too much talking of that sort there; the impression is that just a set of words was picked up and thrust in.

The [slang] they use [in the nightclubs] is sort of obsolete.

- Affectedness

The dialogues obviously have been written by adults who do not live here.

They talked in an unnatural, sort of affected way.

- The musical theme. It was repeated several times in the course of each episode and irritated the listeners. That irritation may have resulted from the fact that the

participants had to listen to many episodes in a row; probably there would have been no irritation if they had been listening to one or two episodes a day.

C. ASSESSMENT OF THE CONTENT OF THE SERIAL

In all the focus groups, respondents noted that the problems addressed by the serial are urgent for young people (the word “problem” was proposed by participants themselves). The young listeners mentioned the following problems that, in their opinion, the drama addressed:

- Ethnic relations
- Relations between parents and children
- Drug addiction

Ethnic relations. According to the respondents, young people face this problem, since there are many ethnic groups in the Crimea and prejudices and stereotypes about each of them run rampant. (For example, one member of Group 2 said that his classmates had been mocking an Armenian pupil; furthermore, Tatars encounter a variety of unpleasant situations). One aspect of the serial that respondents liked was that “different ethnic groups communed together and supported each other in their hour of need.” The problem of ethnic relations was observed in the communications between Nina and Vagan; Nina’s mother and Dilyaver; Anya and Dilyaver at the rally; and Enver and Dilyaver. Respondents were particularly impressed by the relationships between Nina’s mother and Dilyaver, on the one hand, and between Anya and Dilyaver, on the other:

Mother began telling Anya that she shouldn’t go out with a Tatar...although she wasn’t even personally acquainted with that Tatar... Mother was driving home her personal convictions, while she didn’t have any facts. (№6, Group 2)

A separate issue was the deportation of the Tatars. Some respondents did not like that when deportation was mentioned, the emphasis was placed solely on Tatars; in their view, the problem was overemphasized:

When the day of deportation comes, all channels start emphasizing the Crimean problem and the deportation.... However, all ethnic [minority] groups were deported, not only the Tatars. (№3, group1)

The problem of parents and children is also urgent for teenagers regardless of their ethnicity, as they still live with their parents. Participants acknowledged that occasionally they have conflicts with their parents, for a variety of reasons. However, they denounced Nina for “extracting” money from her mother and disapproved of the girl’s “high-pitched” conversations with her. Respondents mentioned that the episode provided a useful method for avoiding conflicts: count to 10 before responding in a situation of disagreement. Some participants said they would try to put this method in practice.

The problem of drug addiction was not discussed in detail in the focus groups, yet it was raised time and again during each of the discussions. According to the participants, young people in the Crimea often face the problem of drugs; some of them are on friendly terms with youngsters addicted to drugs.

We know it; drugs are also widespread in our circle, and once someone gets involved in such a situation...it is usually rather hard to get out of it. (№5, Group 3)

Nowadays, friends are more likely to entangle you with drugs than to disentangle you from them. (№7, Group 1)

Messages that the authors of the radio drama tried to convey to the listeners:

- Friendship and mutual understanding among peoples

Ethnic origin does not matter; the most important thing is friendship. (№8, Group 3)

People can socialize with each other regardless of their ethnic affiliations; there were Russians and Tatars there, and everything was all right—they understood each other and socialized together. (№3, Group 1)

There are no bad nationalities; there are bad people. (№7, Group 2)

People are not divided into Russians, Tatars and Ukrainians; they are divided into bad people and good people. (№4, Group 1)

One mustn't judge a people, saying, "I like them" or "I dislike them," without knowing [the people's] traditions and culture; and of course, one mustn't judge a whole people by a single person only (№1, Group 2)

- Mutual understanding between individuals/categories of individuals (relations between parents and children, between young men and young women, "love relationships")

The possibility of mutual understanding helps the individual to survive in difficult situations. (№4, Group 1)

- Importance of judging people as individuals and recognizing the "good side" of human beings

Characters such as Zombie and Kisel have a good basis; so if one addresses that good basis, he will respond to that. (№6, Group 1)

- The fact that people can succeed in justifying their personal opinions

The individual should have a personal opinion; the opinions of others should not affect one's self-esteem and one's opinion about other people. (№6, Group 2)

- Some respondents actually wrote down a few program maxims that they liked:

Friendship can work true wonders.

The main thing that one has is the soul, not the nationality.

The main messages of the radio drama:

Friendship and love are the quintessence of relations among people. (№4, Group 1)

Not all people are either good or bad. It is necessary to make a realistic assessment of the situation and not to be naïve. (№2, Group 2)

One mustn't judge someone by ethnic origin. (№6, Group 2)

It is necessary to treat people the way they deserve [to be treated]. (№7, Group 2)

It is necessary to love each person, to be patient. (№4, Group 2)

There has to be mutual understanding between people. (№2, Group 3)

Thus, the focus group participants interpreted two main messages of the serial: be kind-hearted toward others; and do not allow your interpersonal relationships to be influenced by stereotypes.

Evaluation of the radio drama using a 10-point scale (average scores)

- **Group 1:** 8.0
- **Group 2:** 9.6
- **Group 3:** 5.2
- **Group 4:** 7.2

As the average scores were rather high, the participants' overall response to the radio drama can be described as favorable. Individual respondents' scores ranged from 4 to 10.

The young Tatars (Groups 2 and 4) gave noticeably higher scores to the series than the young Russians/Ukrainians (Groups 1 and 3) did. This is probably because the Tatars tend to perceive problems addressed by the radio drama in a more emotional way, and also to the fact that, according to the Ukrainian Center for Accord, the Crimean Tatars are a less divided community with greater emphasis on traditional cultural and family values.

Participants who gave lower scores offered the following reasons for doing so:

- “Unnatural” manner of text reading;
- Frequent repetition of the musical theme;
- The unrealistic, naïve nature of the serial: “Once you find yourself in such a situation, you won't get out of it so easily.” (№5, Group 3)

- The superficial interpretation of the topics: “There are many [topics], but all are mentioned parenthetically” (№1, Group 1). (However, most participants felt that the subject of love was treated with sufficient depth.)
- Use of language: “Many words are unsuitable—so slangy.” (№7, Group 2)
- Banality: “a usual serial, nothing new about it” (№3, Group 3).
- “No one would let them own a bar on Pushkin Street” (№7, Group 2). Perhaps no particular street should have been indicated; the members of the Simferopol groups saw Pushkin Street in their mind’s eye as soon as it was mentioned, but to potential listeners in other Crimean localities, that name may mean nothing.

In general, those participants who gave high scores explained that they “simply liked the programs” and that the programs reflected the realities of life:

They showed a life just like ours, because there really are many drug barons, there are many people selling drugs. (№6, Group 2)

It is good as a serial: there are good and bad things, happiness as well as grief, and friendship. (№7, Group 2)

Points/Situations/Dialogues That Respondents Liked:

<i>Group 1</i>	<i>Group 2</i>	<i>Group 3</i>	<i>Group 4</i>
<p><i>The conversation between mother and Anya about the girl’s friendship with Dilyaver; Anya’s successful defense of her viewpoint (Groups 1 and 3) The finale of the serial—Vlad paid attention to the dishes on the table: “There are so many dishes here; I wish all of us were so friendly.” (Groups 1 and 2) Dilyaver’s refusal to become a drug dealer (Groups 3 and 4)</i></p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When Vagan’s father persuades him to pursue the family business, “about the person and his roots” (№1) • Nina’s friends attitude toward her and support for her (№5) • The way Anya reconciled Nina with her mother (№2) • The description of Vartavar (№8) • Zombie, who managed to overcome his weaknesses (№6) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nina “did not sell herself” to Alex for the ring (№6) • When Nina and Anya began to scuffle with each other in jest (№2) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scene when Alex was dragging Nina down to the basement and his friends came to her defense, although at first they seemed to be bad guys (№3) • When Alex phoned Nina after the rape and she said she was not afraid of him (№1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conversation between Anya and Dilyaver on the Day of Sorrow (№2) • The episode in which Vlad told the story of his drug-addicted friend (№1) • The fact that in the serial, people belonging to a variety of ethnic groups talk about different people’s traditions (№7)

These situations—which respondents found most appealing—indicate that Crimean teenagers lean toward positive human values, such as friendship, love, honesty, and the ability to preserve one’s true nature, dignity and self-respect regardless of the circumstances. Also, the above situations are suggestive of the participants’ interest in ethnic groups other than their own.

Points/Situations/Dialogues That Respondents Disliked:

<i>Group 1</i>	<i>Group 2</i>	<i>Group 3</i>	<i>Group 4</i>
<i>The fact that Alex managed to evade punishment (Groups 1, 3, 4)</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The quarrel between Anya and Dilyaver (№6) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The way Alex talked to Nina (the use of words like “mademoiselle”) (№7) ✓ The rape of Nina (№6) ✓ The way Marina scoffed at Nina while pretending to be her friend (№3) ✓ The excessive number of quarrels between the characters (№2) ✓ The fact that mother began to shout at Nina when she learned that the girl had been raped (№5) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The way Nina talked to her mother: “You gave birth to a bunch of children and so you must provide for them.”(№6) ✓ The excessive use of the Russian slang word “blin” and obscene language (№3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The serial fails to indicate the Anya’s mother’s response to Dilyaver’s proposal to Anya (№5)

One member of Group 3 said that “the entire serial was at the same level; there were neither positive nor negative points.” On the whole, respondents disliked the absence of information on certain points and the unconstructive behavior of some of the characters.

The best-liked characters in the drama are Vlad, Anya and Saxophone. The respondents described Anya as “sociable and serious” and “striving for education.” They considered Saxophone a positive character overall (“a good old man, experienced and wise”), and also noted his helpful role as the program’s presenter, acquainting listeners with the facts at the beginning of each episode and summing up the events in the end. One listener commented appreciatively, “Every action by adverse characters gives him a shock; it’s like he doesn’t know that such things happen in life.” (However, nearly all members of Group 3 disliked Saxophone.) Additionally, one participant liked Zombie, as a character who “reformed himself, overcame his weaknesses,” and two others liked Kisel, as a person who was trying to help Nina.

On the other hand, participants disliked Marina, Alex and Enver, whom they perceived as the negative characters of the drama. They would like Alex to be punished for his offense; notably, they emphasized that punishment should precede his possible penitence.

Respondents also noted that other “negative” characters went unpunished as well. Some even expressed extreme opinions, for instance, “The lot of such people should be death and that’s all” (Group 3).

Points That Respondents Found New and Interesting:

<i>Group 1</i>	<i>Group 2</i>	<i>Group 3</i>	<i>Group 4</i>
<i>Vartavar holiday</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ “I wasn’t aware of how girls get involved in prostitution.” ✓ Issues about young people’s intimate lives ✓ Mutual understanding between friends, and readiness to help each other ✓ The information about the Tatar musical instrument ✓ “In my life, I have never encountered people as mean as Alex.” ✓ The communication between Nina’s friends and the people at the club 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The slang; one does not often hear such words even in gangster films ✓ The fact that drug are sold inside bars ✓ What Vagan did when Alex took Nina away on a motorcycle ✓ Nina’s mother first rejected Dilyaver, but then she liked him ✓ When Alex’s former friends left him to side with Vlad and began to address each other by their real names 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Friendship can be so strong that everything else is relegated to the background ✓ Issues related to sex and rape are often encountered in routine life ✓ The fact that all ethnic groups used to live amicably ✓ The mean way in which Marina intimidated Nina ✓ The emphasis on drugs and music is untypical ✓ The boys from the club turned out not to be so bad after all 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Nina is interesting as a person ✓ When Dilyaver was telling Anya about Tatars’ customs

In listening to “Our Street,” some respondents discovered certain pieces of information or history that were new to them, while others did not find anything new. One segment of the programming that all the participants found interesting was the description of Armenian national traditions and of the holiday Vartavar. In addition, many participants were interested in the specific customs of the Tatar people and the information on the Day of Sorrow. Some respondents were surprised to learn that ethnic groups used to live amicably, and some noted that the program showed devoted friendship, “which one does not encounter frequently”; in other words, friendship is an attractive value but there are

doubts as to its feasibility. The latter two aspects were of particular interest to Russians/Ukrainians. Apparently, this is a consequence of the so-called divided society.

Moments That Respondents Found Touching:

<i>Group 1</i>	<i>Group 2</i>	<i>Group 3</i>	<i>Group 4</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The rape scene</i> ▪ <i>The motorcycle race</i> ▪ <i>The reconciliation between Vagan and Nina</i> ▪ <i>The conversation between Nina and her mother after the rape</i> ▪ <i>Anya and Dilyaver's first encounter and the evolution of their relationship</i> ▪ <i>The relationship between Vagan and Alex (Groups 1 and 4)</i> 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Vagan's quarrel with Nina ✓ When Vagan was provoked by Alex to smoke marijuana ✓ The conversation between Ork and Vagan ✓ The story of the Day of Deportation ✓ Nina's quarrel with her mother 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The standoff between the groups ✓ The conversation between Alex and Vagan before the races ✓ Nina's incorruptibility, displayed when Alex offered her a ring ✓ When Vagan's father came to see his son dance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ When mother was drinking the valerian, feeling anxiety for her daughter ✓ All ethnic groups are ready to help each other ✓ Nina's quarrel with her mother ✓ When Vagan pushed Nina aside (during the race) ✓ Dilyaver's proposal to Anya ✓ Friendship among people of different nationalities ✓ Vlad's story of his friend's death because of drugs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ When Marina began giving Nina money for clothes and cosmetics ✓ The Day of Sorrow ✓ Vagan's hot temper ✓ Dilyaver's refusal to work for Enver, i.e., to sell drugs

Points That Respondents Found Contradictory:

<i>Group 1</i>	<i>Group 2</i>	<i>Group 3</i>	<i>Group 4</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The young people's quarrels with their parents ✓ Vagan said he had an aversion to drugs, and yet he smoked grass before the race ✓ The Pushkin Street in the serial does not resemble the real one ✓ How quickly Vlad found a place and money for his club ✓ The behavior of Alex's friends ("ready to please both sides") ✓ Anya's mother's attitude toward Dilyaver ✓ The way Marina framed Nina 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ All people fled from Black to a different club and Enver did not do anything about it ✓ Dilyaver's refusal of Enver's offer; not all people would do that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Alex's fear of punishment for the rape, while that fact is impossible to prove ✓ Nina should not have gone to Alex, abandoning Vagan ✓ When Del found himself in the bar; in real life, questions are not resolved so easily ✓ Vagan did not cancel the performance and asked Nina to come to the club ✓ Nina paid no attention to Vagan and dated Alex instead ✓ Vagan wanted Nina back, and yet he always found excuses ✓ The fact that Alex went unpunished ✓ The fact that Nina was only in the 9th grade 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Alex was wrong when he said that Nina was his girl and so only he had the right to touch her and dance with her ✓ The emphasis on drugs ✓ The somewhat outdated slang that does not correspond to present-day reality ✓ Enver would not have hired someone like Alex to sell drugs ✓ Ork and Kisel are too colloquial

Not all of the respondents understood what the term "contradictory points" means; therefore, there were a few "to-the-letter" answers such as "the contradictory points were the quarrels" or "it was the problem of parents and children." Nevertheless, the teenagers did find many points in the series that they considered contradictory or ambiguous.

Participants Would Like to Find Answers to the Following Questions:

<i>Group 1</i>	<i>Group 2</i>	<i>Group 3</i>	<i>Group 4</i>
<i>Was Alex punished, and what was his future like? The fate of Nina and Vagan (Groups 1 and 2)</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Why is there division into different ethnic groups/nationalities? ✓ Why did Alex rape Nina? ✓ The issue of young people's degradation ✓ The life of young people not only from the central streets but also of those representing "backstreet groupings" ✓ What to do if someone has been lured into the company of drug addicts? ✓ Deeper insight into inter-ethnic conflict ✓ Deeper insight into drug abuse ✓ How street gangs really live, and how to build relations with those around you, so as to have as few conflicts as possible? ✓ Do the characters represent real people? ✓ Who created this project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Why didn't Nina guess that Marina would blackmail her because of the money? ✓ Why did Alex flee abroad? ✓ Why did Nina's mother choose friends for her daughters on the basis of ethnicity? ✓ Whatever happened to the club Black? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ How can one establish good relations with one's parents if they don't understand their child? ✓ Problems related to sexually transmitted diseases ✓ Extreme sports, tourism ✓ Did Vlad's club develop afterwards? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Why didn't Nina sue Alex? ✓ What did Anya's mother say in response to Dilyaver's proposal? ✓ Can teenagers belonging to different ethnic groups get along with one another in the same street? ✓ Whatever happened to Ork and his company?

The participants were most interested in finding about the future of the characters in the drama. They wanted to know if Alex was eventually punished; how Vagan and Nina got along; what became of Ork and his company; whatever happened to the club Black, and whether or not Vlad's new club was successful. The rape of Nina gave rise to the most questions: Did she sue Alex; and if not, why? Furthermore, why did Alex flee, and why did he rape Nina after all? In serials, good usually triumphs over evil; in this drama, however, the triumph of good was not complete, and that was why respondents had so many questions to ask. Apart from questions related to specific characters, quite a few social questions were asked: about drug addiction; about sexually transmitted diseases; about relations within "backstreet" companies; about behavior on the streets; and about relations with one's parents.

As such, one possible recommendation for the authors would be to consider expanding on the above-mentioned points (or similar ones) in future episodes. On the other hand, the fact that the radio drama elicited a response in the teenagers and made them ponder a variety of unanswered questions could be considered a positive feature of the series.

Respondents offered the following suggestions for making the serial even more interesting and attractive:

- Punish Alex (this idea was mentioned in all groups);
- Address some topics beyond the life of the "group";
- Recruit young people to work on the serial:

It was obvious that this was done by someone who saw the group from the outside only, and so he could only make assumptions as to what was happening inside. Young people could give some ideas and express their opinions.

It would really be better to invite someone, so as to learn how young people live. They won't probably say everything, but they can provide help in some aspects.

It would be better to have representatives of different groups.

D. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM FORMAT AND PRESENTATION

The objective of this section was to assess the presentation style of the serial, as well as a variety of presentation aspects (voice, pace of storytelling, unfolding of the plot, etc.)

When listening to the serial, the participants felt the following range of emotions:

- **Interest** (in the course of the whole serial, waiting for the denouement)
- **Disappointment** (when Nina was raped; when the mother was railing at Anya for the girl's dates with Dilyaver)
- **Relaxation** (when the music was playing; when Saxophone was speaking)
- **Indignation** (when Nina was raped)
- **Confusion** (when Vagan came to the club for a showdown, but five minutes later he was dancing, demonstrating his skill)
- **Joy, delight** (when the key characters reconciled with each other)
- **Pity** (in relation to Nina)
- **Boredom** (during the playback of the musical theme)
- "The feeling that this won't happen to me"

When asked to evaluate the style of presentation (on a scale of 1 to 10), the focus groups gave the following average scores:

- **Group 1:** 7.0
- **Group 2:** 8.6
- **Group 3:** 7.0
- **Group 4:** 6.2

The individual scores for presentation style ranged from as high as 10 to as low as 3, hence the relatively low averages in the groups. Nevertheless, since all group scores are well above 5, we can say that the style was mostly liked rather than disliked.

Participants who gave low scores offered the following reasons for doing so:

- **They disliked the actors' voices.**
I did not like Nina's voice. Other voices are not particularly likeable either. (№5, Group 1)
From the very beginning, the voices made me laugh. (№8, Group 1)
- **They disliked the inflections, the way the text was delivered; or they found the acting too affected.**
They were simply reading; they didn't learn the text by heart. (№8, Group 2)
It seemed affected to me when Nina and Vagan were conversing after the rape—she sounded rather cheerful, she wasn't crying. (№5, Group 1)

Sometimes they gave answers without thinking; there was no improvisation.

- **They disliked the use of language, especially the colloquial speech.**

I did not like the language; it is a mixture of the language that should be used and the one that people actually use to communicate. (№4, Group 1)

I am irritated by the slangy words. (№7, Group 2)

That slang, those colloquial words—they are sort of obsolete; it would be good to make a more serious serial, without colloquial speech. (№4, Group 4)

Respondents liked the voices of Vagan’s father, Vlad, Dilyaver and Anya: “They talk energetically [and have] pleasant voices” (Group 3). In addition, one member of Group 4 liked the way Ork’s part was played. Apparently, the most-liked voices were those belonging to the “positive” characters. This probably indicates the participants’ emotional response to those characters; by approving of their voices, respondents actually expressed a favorable attitude toward their actions. On the other hand, the teenagers’ reactions to Saxophone’s voice were more mixed—for instance, some found his voice irritating, and some thought it appeared too frequently on the air. Nonetheless, most participants agreed that a character such as Saxophone, who provides the necessary explanations for events in the serial, is essential to the radio drama. The most disliked voices were those of Alex, Nina’s mother and Marina.

Participants found the plot easy to follow as it evolved from episode to episode, and generally agreed that the episodes were not overly drawn out (though several members of Group 1 observed that the beginning of the serial should have been more active). However, many were irritated by the musical interlude that was repeated several times during each episode.

Some participants indicated that improving the following aspects would make the presentation style more interesting:

- The actors’ manner of speaking: “The characters [should] talk normally, without affectation.”
- Quality of music: “It is clear that they are not professional musicians; they don’t play the guitar particularly well” (№6, Group 1). Members of the other groups, however, liked the music, saying they wished there would be more of it.

Relevance

Overall, respondents felt that “Our Street” only partially reflected the life of young people in the Crimea (with the exception of Group 2, in which all members believed that the serial fully reflected their lives):

There is a little bit of naiveté in everything; it's a little fairy tale. It's all right for a serial; in life, however, everything is different. (№6, Group 4)

Too naïve—for example, Enver could not let them all go just like that. (№8, Group 3)

It's unnatural for friendship to be as strong as it was shown to be. (№7, Group 1)

TV shows many things that are more serious than [the topics addressed] in this serial—anarchy in the streets, drug dealing, crime. (№5, Group 3)

E. THE ROLE OF “OUR STREET” IN ELIMINATING NEGATIVE STEREOTYPES AND TEACHING METHODS FOR RESOLVING CONFLICTS

The objective of this section was to provide young people with constructive methods for resolving conflicts and to promote the human values of kindness, love and friendship among them.

Focus group participants claimed that “Our Street” did not change their attitudes toward other ethnic groups because their attitudes were already favorable and they were quite loyal to inter-ethnic peace. Nevertheless, they said that the radio drama could prompt people with a more unfavorable attitude toward certain ethnic groups/nationalities to revise their views, and to realize that not all people of a particular ethnic origin are the same, that in every ethnic group there are bad and good people. It was even claimed that, while trying to show the good aspect of other nations, the authors of the serial actually smeared Russians and Ukrainians: “All the Russian and Ukrainian [characters] were very bad [and] have inferior qualities.”

The teenagers found the serial interesting because it showed a variety of ethnic traditions different from their own, gave them some new information (about the Armenian holiday, the Day of Sorrow, and the Tatar musical instrument) and prompted them to ponder issues they had not thought about before:

For example, I have never even thought about the Tatars having been deported...now I felt the situation from their side—how painful and hurtful it is. Now I understand them better. (№6, Group 1)

The participants’ responses suggest that the serial can also be instrumental in improving the pattern of relations between parents and children.

Many respondents said that the serial gave them new methods and skills for resolving conflicts (although others did not discover any methods in the programs):

- “In principle, there is just one method here: Treat people well.” (№6, Group 1)
- “One doesn’t have to use fists to resolve something; one can do it peacefully.” (№1, Group 1)
- “I would no longer get too excited if something was wrong. I’d stop and think.” (№5, Group 1)
- “One shouldn’t give way to emotions—this won’t lead to anything good; this leads to aggression.” (№7, Group 1)
- “When someone starts insulting you, be silent and count to 10.” (№5, Group 2)
- “Problems shouldn’t be resolved by determining who is the better drinker or the faster racer.” (№2, Group 3)

Some participants would recommend that their friends listen to the serial. However, they also noted that not all of those friends would actually listen to such a serial, as they no

longer belong to the target age group (despite the fact that the respondents themselves found it interesting!), or that many would not listen to the programs because of their personalities. Perhaps some of the respondents simply lack the determination to suggest that their friends listen to the programs.

The participants clearly understood the necessity of thinking carefully about a conflict situation if one arises, instead of immediately responding to the opponent's words or actions. Furthermore, they said that it is essential to get in the mood for a "calm, good" resolution of controversial questions.

F. PROSPECTS FOR BROADCASTING “OUR STREET” ON THE RADIO

Most of the participants responded favorably to the possibility of broadcasting the serial on the radio:

If there were one episode each day, it would be interesting, and people would wait impatiently for the next episode. (№5, Group 3)

Overall, I think [the serial] is good; it could be distributed via mass media. (№1, Group 1)

However, some expressed doubt as to whether it was actually expedient to do so:

If you miss just a single episode, it's possible that you won't be able to understand the rest. (Groups 2 and 4)

In the view of the respondents, the serial's target audience consists of teenagers belonging to different ethnic groups, living in the Crimea, aged between 12 and 16. (One group believed that the age range started at 10 years, and another thought it ended at age 20, but the other groups did not support these views).

Participants identified the following radio stations as most appropriate for the serial:

- Hit-FM (five members of Group 3; one member of Group 2; two members of Group 4);
- Russkoye Radio (four members of Group 2; two members of Group 4);
- Chanson;
- UT-1;
- Europe Plus.

There was disagreement as to the best time for broadcasting. Some respondents thought the morning (between 7:00 and 8:30) would be most convenient; others suggested early afternoon (between 14:00 and 16:00), “when people come home for lunch”; and still others favored the evening hours (between 18:00 and 21:00).

G. ISSUES/PROBLEMS URGENT FOR THE CRIMEAN POPULATION

The objective of this section is to compare the issue of ethnic relations with other issues that are urgent for the population of the Crimea.

Problems Considered Urgent for the Crimean Population:

<i>Group 1</i>	<i>Group 2</i>	<i>Group 3</i>	<i>Group 4</i>
<i>Drug addiction</i> <i>Ethnic relations</i> <i>Poverty</i> <i>“The language problem” (Groups 2 and 3)</i>			
✓ Rape (№2) ✓ Lack of freedom of speech (№8)	✓ Lack of social protection (№7) ✓ Injustice (№6)	✓ Water supply (№2) ✓ Heat supply (№2) ✓ Garbage removal (№2) ✓ Universal indifference (№6)	✓ The environment (№7) ✓ Crime (№4) ✓ Corruption (№1)

In all four groups, participants spontaneously mentioned drug addiction, ethnic relations and poverty as problems characteristic of the Crimea. The Simferopol groups identified injustice as one of the major problems of the Crimea, while the Sevastopol groups singled out poverty as the greatest problem. Thus, it seems that the issue of ethnic relations does rank among the urgent problems, although some participants denied that.

H. ETHNIC RELATIONS ASSESSMENT USING THE BOGARDUS SCALE

The role of culture in the formation of prejudices and the population’s mindsets regarding race and ethnicity can be measured by determining the extent of similarity of answers to questions pertaining to individuals’ attitudes toward a variety of ethnic and racial groups. If members of the same society (nationality, ethnicity) rank the different groups similarly, one can conclude that this results from the impact of behavioral norms. This technique, developed by Emory S. Bogardus, is designed to determine the social distance in the minds of the representatives of a particular group between themselves and a different group and its members. Bogardus formulated a number of judgments representing different degrees of social closeness and remoteness. He asked his respondents to indicate the distance at which they would readily allow the members of the other group to stay. The scale included the following judgments:

- Close kinship by way of marriage (1 point)
- Friendly communication (2 points)

- Companion-like, neighborly communication (3 points)
- Belonging to the same professional group (4 points)
- Living in the same neighborhood (5 points)
- Living in the same city/region (6 points)

The specificity of this scale is designed so that each statement (opinion, position) automatically includes all the subsequent ones and excludes all the preceding ones.

It is assumed that, if a respondent is ready to consider a given person as, for example, his/her friend, then that respondent would not object to having that person as a neighbor, co-worker, business partner or tourist. Based on that assumption, researchers determine how far a particular individual distances himself/herself from the representatives of a given race, ethnic group or nationality.

Prior to the focus group discussions, and prior to the start of the cassette listening session, the respondents were asked to complete questionnaires designed to reveal their attitudes toward a number of ethnic groups (in particular, using the Bogardus scale). After the discussions, the respondents were asked to complete almost identical (somewhat shorter) questionnaires, with the purpose of assessing the impact of the radio drama “Our Street” on their ethnic stereotypes. The results of the Bogardus scale test are listed in Appendix B, and the descriptions of the participants’ attitudes toward various nationalities are included in Appendix C.

The results clearly indicate that the respondents maintain the closest distances with members of their own nationality, although they tended to have a better attitude toward other nationalities after listening to “Our Street.” However, as the data received from the focus group study are not representative, we can speak only about the tendency.

Not surprisingly, the predominant attitude toward Ukrainians and Russians in the Ukrainian-Russian groups was rather positive:

Kindness, respect (№1, Group 1) - about Ukrainians

People with open soul, kind, honest (№4, Group 3) - about Russians

In the Tatar groups, as a whole, the attitude toward Ukrainians and Russians was also positive, but there were more negative statements:

Ukrainians are the ethnic group that feels that they are at home and make good use [of that feeling]. (№6, Group 2)

I do not have any special feelings toward Ukrainians. (№5, Group 4)

(Russians) offend other groups because they respect only their own culture and language. (№2, Group 2)

Straightforward and a little egoistic. They look haughtily at members of other ethnic groups. (№7, Group 4)

Nevertheless, the Tatar participants tended to improve their attitude toward the given nationalities after listening to the radio drama.

The attitude of Russians/Ukrainians toward Tatars was rather neutral—when describing their attitude, they often used the word “normal,” which does not carry any bright emotional coloring. The Tatar participants, on the other hand, described their attitude toward their own nationality brightly, emotionally:

Tatars have deserved their right to become the full inhabitants of the Crimea and Ukraine with their blood and sweat and because Crimea is their home and their entire background is Crimean. (№6, Group 2)

Hospitable—they respect elders and maintain their people’s traditions. (№2, Group 4)

The Tatars’ perception of their own people demonstrates unity, significant emotional experiences and possibly illustrates a traditional society.

The respondents’ attitudes toward the Armenians varied widely—ranging from indifference to a friendly attitude—but in all groups, emotionality was mentioned as characteristic of the Armenian people (which probably already has become a stereotype).

Many participants said that they have not communicated with Greeks, but nonetheless their overall attitude toward this group was rather positive:

Interesting people with a rich history and culture. It would be nice to communicate with them. (№5, group1)

Never communicated with the Greeks, but I think that each nation has the right to prosperity. So my attitude toward them is positive. (№8, Group 4)

The predominant attitude toward Americans was rather positive as well.

Although many respondents used stereotypes in their descriptions of certain nationalities, most of them emphasized that all nationalities are equal, that each nationality has both good and bad people and that it is impossible to judge a nation by its individual members. One possible explanation for this apparent contradiction is that the formation of stereotypes is a natural process of socialization and that young people are still unable to distinguish stereotypes sufficiently, though their understanding of the fact that stereotypes are bad is already an important step in overcoming them.

IV. APPENDIX

A. RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

<i>No.</i>	<i>Grp No.</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Age</i>	<i>Ethnicity/sex</i>	<i>Location (city/village)</i>	<i>Occupation</i>
1	1	Anastasiya	15	Russian, female	Konstantinovka, v.	College student
2	1	Aleksei	15	Russian, male	Simferopol, c.	10 th form pupil
3	1	Denis	16	Ukrainian, male	Konstantinovka, v.	11 th form pupil
4	1	Mariya	15	Russian, female	Simferopol, c.	10 th form pupil
5	1	Olga	16	Russian, female	Simferopol, c.	11 th form pupil
6	1	Yevgeniya	18	Ukrainian, female	Simferopol, c.	Sevastopol National Technical University student
7	1	Roman	17	Russian, male	Simferopol, c.	Artistic college student
8	1	Nikolai	17	Ukrainian, male	Simferopol, c.	3 rd year student
9	2	Enver	16	Tatar, male	Simferopol, c.	10 th form pupil
10	2	Lutfiye	17	Tatar, female	Simferopol, c.	Crimean State Industrial Pedagogical Institute student
11	2	Zarema	18	Tatar, female	Simferopol, c.	Dressmaker
12	2	Siran	17	Tatar, male	Konstantinovka, v.	National Legal Academy student, worker
13	2	Leviye	16	Tatar, female	Konstantinovka, v.	11 th form pupil
14	2	Timur	18	Tatar, male	Simferopol, c.	Crimean State Industrial Pedagogical Institute student
15	2	Niyara	18	Tatar, female	Simferopol, c.	Odessa Legal Academy student
16	2	Ernes	16	Tatar, male	Simferopol, c.	11 th form pupil
17	3	Sergei	17	Ukrainian, male	c. Orlinoe, v.	11 th form pupil
18	3	Yevgeny	15	Russian, male	Sevastopol, c.	10 th form pupil
19	3	Suzanna	15	Ukrainian, female	Sevastopol, c.	Pupil of the Center for Technical Design
20	3	Yelena	16	Russian, female	Sevastopol, c.	11 th form pupil
21	3	Viktoria	16	Russian, female	Sevastopol, c.	11 th form pupil
22	3	Svetlana	17	Russian, female	Sevastopol, c.	11 th form pupil
23	3	Sergei	18	Russian, male	Sevastopol, c.	Sevastopol National Technical University student
24	3	Marina	18	Russian, female	Verkhnyesadovoye, v.	Student
25	4	Selime	18	Tatar, female	Sevastopol, c.	Sevastopol National Technical University student
26	4	Susanna	17	Tatar, female	Verkhnyesadovoye, v.	Hairdresser
27	4	Safiye	15	Tatar, female	Sevastopol, c.	10 th form pupil
28	4	Shevkhiiye	15	Tatar, female	c. Orlinoe, v.	10 th form pupil
29	4	Resul	16	Tatar, male	Sevastopol, c.	2 nd year technical student
30	4	Arsen	17	Tatar, male	Sevastopol, c.	1 st year university student
31	4	Ismet	18	Tatar, male	Sevastopol, c.	Student
32	4	Eldar	16	Tatar, male	Sevastopol, c.	11 th form pupil

B. BOGARDUS SCALE DATA

The tables below present results of attitudes toward other ethnic groups where 1 represents the closest possible relationship —kinship by way of marriage— and 6 represents the most distant relationship —living in the same city or region.

Group 1

	№1 Russian		№2 Russian		№3 Ukrainian		№4 Russian		№5 Russian		№6 Ukrainian		№7 Russian		№8 Russian		Mean point		
	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	
Ukrainians	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1.1	1
Russians	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Tatars	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	3	1	1	2	2	2	1.8	
Armenians	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	3	2	1	1	2	3	2.1	1.9	
Greeks	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1.5	1.3	
Americans	1	1	1	1	1	2	4	3	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	5	1.8	2	

Group 2

	№1 Tatar		№2 Tatar		№3 Tatar		№4 Tatar		№5 Tatar		№6 Tatar		№7 Tatar		№8 Tatar		Mean point	
	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after
Ukrainians	4	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	6	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2.9	1.9
Russians	4	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	4	2	2	2	4	2	3	2	2.8	1.9
Tatars	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Armenians	6	2	4	2	1	2	2	2		2	6	2	2	3	4	2	3.6	2.3
Greeks	3	1	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	2	2	3	2	2.8	1.9
Americans	2	2	2	2	3	4	2	2	3	2		2	2	2	2	2	2.3	2.3

Group 3

	№1 Russian		№2 Ukrainian		№3 Ukrainian		№4 Russian		№5 Russian		№6 Russian		№7 Russian		№8 Russian		Mean point	
	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after
Ukrainians			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	4	1	1		4	1.3	2.3
Russians	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1.6	1
Tatars			1	1	1	1	4	1	4	1		3	4	3	4	3	2.8	2
Armenians			1	1		1	3	1	3	1		3		5		4	2	2.5
Greeks		2	2	2		6	6	1	6	1	3			6	3	1	2.8	3
Americans	1	1	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	1	1		2	2	2	1	1.9	1.7

Group 4

	№1 Tatar		№2 Tatar		№3 Tatar		№4 Tatar		№5 Tatar		№6 Tatar		№7 Tatar		№8 Tatar		Mean point	
	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after	before	after
Ukrainians	2	1	1	1	2	2	5	2		1	2	2	2	1	3	2	2.4	1.5
Russians	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1.9	1.6
Tatars	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Armenians	2	2	1	1	2	2	6	4		1	2	2	2	1		1	2.5	1.8
Greeks	2	2	1	1	2	2		2		1	2	2	2	1		1	1.8	1.5
Americans	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	2	1	1	2	1	5	1	2.4	1.5

C. ATTITUDES TOWARD DIFFERENT ETHNIC GROUPS

The tables below summarize the attitudes of the groups toward other ethnic groups using key words or phrases as written in the pre-groups questionnaires.

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
Ukrainians	<p>№1. Kindness, respect.</p> <p>№2. Ukrainians are wise people who live by their customs. I respect their language and sometimes I communicate with my friends using Ukrainian language.</p> <p>№3. Love, respect, admiration.</p> <p>№4. Friendly attitude.</p> <p>№5. My attitude to Ukrainians is very good; there are a lot of people of this nationality among my friends and acquaintances.</p> <p>№6. Positive emotions.</p> <p>№7. Nationality doesn't matter. My attitude is good.</p> <p>№8. My attitude in normal. I don't see large differences between the Russians and Ukrainians.</p>	<p>№1. Positively.</p> <p>№2. Trust and respect, and especially to western Ukrainians.</p> <p>№3. They are very nice to communicate with but it is very difficult to communicate with ardent nationalists, that is why I try to choose safe themes for conversations with them.</p> <p>№4. Hardworking people.</p> <p>№5. People are very friendly, hospitable, hard workers.</p> <p>№6. Ukrainians is that ethnic group, which feels itself at home and uses it.</p> <p>№7. Respectable, polite.</p> <p>№8. Each nation has good people, who are nice to talk to. I can not tell that one nation is better and another one is worse. Because we all are people and each nation is good in their way.</p>	<p>№1. My opinion is that it is not important what nationality a person is, what his sole is like is important.</p> <p>№2. All peoples are good and deserve respect. Each nation has good and bad people. Normal people.</p> <p>№3. Good people.</p> <p>№4. Greedy, egoists.</p> <p>№5. I am indifferent to them.</p> <p>№6. Good.</p> <p>№7. Good people.</p> <p>№8. A normal ethnic group. Kind, responsive people. Everything suits me about this nation.</p>	<p>№1. This group is normal. I can't say anything bad.</p> <p>№2. Hospitable people, they cook well.</p> <p>№3. Normal. For me there are no clear divisions into ethnic groups, since I think that it is impossible to give privileges only to nation, because all nations are equal. It is not good to judge the whole nation by one person. When meeting people it is not important to me what nation they are, the person himself is important. That is why it is very difficult for me to express my feelings, my attitude to different nations.</p> <p>№4. I think that nation doesn't matter; the main thing is that the person is good, kind and responsive. And I have a good attitude to all nations.</p> <p>№5. I have a few acquaintances who are Ukrainians; I went to school with them. I don't have any special feeling for them. The only thing I don't like is their national songs.</p> <p>№6. Many friends who are</p>

				<p>Ukrainians. My attitude is normal.</p> <p>№7. Nice and hospitable people who are nice to socialize with.</p> <p>№8. We live in the same country with them and personally I do not have any reasons to treat them badly.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Russians</p>	<p>№1. Hospitable, open people.</p> <p>№2. Russian is closer to me since I am a Russian myself and my language is Russian, though I study English, professional American and German.</p> <p>№3. Close, open feelings.</p> <p>№4. Blood relationship.</p> <p>№5. I am a Russian myself, that is why, naturally, I like these people most of all.</p> <p>№6. Good attitude, we are neighbours, all in all.</p> <p>№7. Nationality doesn't matter. Good attitude.</p> <p>№8. Normal attitude.</p>	<p>№1. Positively.</p> <p>№2. Insult, these are people who respect only their own culture, language.</p> <p>№3. I like communicating with them, and the illustration of this is the fact that most of my friends are Russians</p> <p>№4. Cheerful people.</p> <p>№5. Friendly people, very beautiful, smart, hard workers.</p> <p>№6. Russians consider themselves natives. Their attitude to forcibly displaced people in negative.</p> <p>№7. Peaceful, international.</p> <p>№8. Each nation has good people who are nice to talk to. I can not say that one nation is better and another one is worse. Because we all are people and each nation is good in its own way.</p>	<p>№1. My opinion is that it is not important what nationality the person is, what his soul is like is important.</p> <p>№2. All nations are good and deserve respect. All nations have good and bad people. Very smart people. Deeply appreciate and respect them, because these are my people.</p> <p>№3. Good people.</p> <p>№4. People with open souls, kind, fair.</p> <p>№5. Beautiful people.</p> <p>№6. Good.</p> <p>№7. I love my nation.</p> <p>№8. A good nation also, but they talk much and do little.</p>	<p>№1. I treat Russians absolutely normal and easy, since I communicate and live among them.</p> <p>№2. They keep to their families and always try to find an occasion for a holiday.</p> <p>№3. Normal. For me there are no clear divisions into ethnic groups, since I think that it is impossible to give privileges only to nation, because all nations are equal. It is not good to judge the whole nation by one person. When meeting people it is not important to me what nation they are, the person himself is important. That is why it is very difficult for me to express my feelings, my attitude to different nations.</p> <p>№4. I think that nation doesn't matter; the main thing is that the person is kind and responsive. And I have a good attitude to all nations</p> <p>№5. Most of my acquaintances and friends are Russians. I have a good opinion about them, since my best friends are Russians.</p> <p>№6. A lot of friends. I treat them well as well.</p> <p>№7. Straightforward and a little egoistic. Look haughtily at the representatives of other ethnic groups.</p>
-----------------	--	--	---	--

				<p>№8. Sevastopol is a Russian city and I always communicate with them. I understand that there are some not the best representatives of this nation (as in all nations). But it is not good to judge a nation by the worse representatives. My attitude is positive.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p>Tatars</p>	<p>№1. Hospitable, hard workers.</p> <p>№2. Good people and the main thing is that they are hard workers. I had to communicate with them many times. I have a lot of Tatar friends in my class.</p> <p>№3. Rather indifference.</p> <p>№4. Friendly attitude.</p> <p>№5. The same people as others. I have acquaintances who are Tatars. They are smart and pleasant in communication.</p> <p>№6. Distrust, hostility.</p> <p>№7. Nationality doesn't make a difference. I know a lot of good people of this nationality.</p> <p>№8. Treat them well, but basically my contemporaries.</p>	<p>№1. Very good.</p> <p>№2. These are my people, I love and respect them and take closely all their difficulties.</p> <p>№3. I have different attitudes to them. On one hand they are sociable, hard workers and other, but on the other hand they are too cocky and troublesome.</p> <p>№4. Hospitable people.</p> <p>№5. Hard workers, generous and hospitable people.</p> <p>№6. Tatars have deserved their right to become the full inhabitants of Crimea and Ukraine with their blood and sweat and because Crimea is their home and all their background is Crimean.</p> <p>№7. Hard workers, patient.</p> <p>№8. Each nation has good people who are nice to talk to. I can not say that one nation is better and another one is worse. Because we all are people and each nation is good in its own way.</p>	<p>№1. My opinion is that it is not important what nationality the person is, what his soul is like is important.</p> <p>№2. All nations are good and deserve respect. All nations have good and bad people. Normal people.</p> <p>№3. Good people.</p> <p>№4. Depends on which ones.</p> <p>№5. It seems to me they are open people.</p> <p>№6. Badly.</p> <p>№7. Normally.</p> <p>№8. There are some people who you can trust and communicate with them, but there are people who are a complete contrast to them.</p>	<p>№1. Since I am a Tatar myself, I love and respect this nation.</p> <p>№2. Hospitable, respect the grown-ups and save traditions of the people.</p> <p>№3. Normal. For me there are no clear divisions into ethnic groups, since I think that it is impossible to give privileges only to nation, because all nations are equal. It is not good to judge the whole nation by one person. When meeting people it is not important to me what nation they are, the person himself is important. That is why it is very difficult for me to express my feelings, my attitude to different nations.</p> <p>№4. I think that nation doesn't matter; the main thing is that the person is kind and responsive. And I have a good attitude to all nations.</p> <p>№5. I have a lot of male and female friends who are Tatars. They are very hard working people.</p> <p>№7. Open and good-natured. Great respect to grown-ups. They to come to the rescue of each other in a difficult moment.</p> <p>№8. I am a Tatar myself and I treat my countrymen well.</p>
---------------	--	---	--	--

<p>Armenians</p>	<p>№1. Didn't communicate.</p> <p>№2. I didn't contact with Armenians much and that is why I can't tell anything specific. But I know that they are fair and obliging people.</p> <p>№3. Indifference.</p> <p>№4. Friendly attitude.</p> <p>№5. Attract me even more than Tatars, because they confess Christianity.</p> <p>№6. Indifferent attitude.</p> <p>№7. Nationality doesn't matter. Mostly very merry people.</p> <p>№8. I do not have anything against them, but I do not have a particular wish to communicate with them.</p>	<p>№7. Sly, jealous.</p> <p>№6. Armenians are nationality with rich past. Armenians are very friendly people.</p> <p>№4. Didn't communicate.</p> <p>№8. Each nation has good people who are nice to talk to. I can not say that one nation is better and another one is worse. Because we all are people and each nation is good in its own way.</p> <p>№1. Positively, but with a shade of distrust.</p> <p>№5. Didn't communicate.</p> <p>№3. It is difficult to say anything, I almost didn't communicate with them, but if to judge by those people whom I communicated with, they made a good impression.</p> <p>№2. I am not familiar with this nation, but I would like to familiarize with its culture, traditions.</p>	<p>№1. My opinion is that it is not important what nationality the person is, what his soul is like is important. Armenians are emotional and this is their "plus" and their "minus".</p> <p>№2. All nations are good and deserve respect. All nations have good and bad people. Normal people.</p> <p>№3. Good people.</p> <p>№4. Didn't communicate closely.</p> <p>№5. Good people.</p> <p>№6. Bad.</p> <p>№7. Didn't communicate.</p> <p>№8. Didn't communicate, can't judge.</p>	<p>№1. I respect Armenians. I have Armenian friends with whom I communicate very well.</p> <p>№2. Merry people.</p> <p>№3. Normal. For me there are no clear divisions into ethnic groups, since I think that it is impossible to give privileges only to nation, because all nations are equal. It is not good to judge the whole nation by one person. When meeting people it is not important to me what nation they are, the person himself is important. That is why it is very difficult for me to express my feelings, my attitude to different nations.</p> <p>№4. I think that nation doesn't matter; the main thing is that the person is kind and responsive. And I have a good attitude to all nations.</p> <p>№5. I am almost not familiar with this ethnic group. I can not tell anything good as well as anything bad about them. I only see them in the market where they sell things.</p> <p>№6. Indifferently.</p> <p>№7. Polite people. Treat their interlocutors with respect.</p> <p>№8. Too emotional, but this doesn't prevent them from being nice people.</p>
------------------	--	---	---	--

<p>Greeks</p>	<p>№1. Didn't communicate.</p> <p>№2. Communicated with Greeks a lot of times. They are very modest and interesting people. I like their traditions very much, especially their skills to dance their national dance.</p> <p>№3. Indifference.</p> <p>№4. Friendly attitude.</p> <p>№5. Interesting people with rich history and culture. I would like to communicate with them.</p> <p>№6. Didn't face them in life.</p> <p>№7. Nationality doesn't matter. Never met aggression from their side.</p> <p>№8. Treated them well and treat them well, but I simply didn't communicate much with them.</p>	<p>№1. Normally, but I didn't communicate with them.</p> <p>№2. I know Greeks from myths, history, legends. They are people with an ancient culture. I have respect for them.</p> <p>№3. A good nation, they have a lot of good qualities, I sympathize them a lot.</p> <p>№4. Didn't communicate.</p> <p>№5. Didn't communicate.</p> <p>№7. Friendly, merry.</p> <p>№6. I am not very familiar with the Greeks and their problems, but I know that Greeks are the oldest nation.</p> <p>№8. Each nation has good people who are nice to talk to. I can not say that one nation is better and another one is worse. Because we all are people and each nation is good in its own way.</p>	<p>№1. My opinion is that it is not important what nationality the person is, what his soul is like is important.</p> <p>№2. All nations are good and deserve respect. All nations have good and bad people. Normal people.</p> <p>№3. Good people.</p> <p>№4. Good people.</p> <p>№5. Good people.</p> <p>№6. Normally.</p> <p>№7. Didn't communicate.</p> <p>№8. The same as with Armenians.</p>	<p>№1. Good people. I don't have anything against them.</p> <p>№2. I didn't communicate with them.</p> <p>№3. Normal. For me there are no clear divisions into ethnic groups, since I think that it is impossible to give privileges only to nation, because all nations are equal. It is not good to judge the whole nation by one person. When meeting people it is not important to me what nation they are, the person himself is important. That is why it is very difficult for me to express my feelings, my attitude to different nations.</p> <p>№4. I think that nation doesn't matter; the main thing is that the person is kind and responsive. And I have a good attitude to all nations.</p> <p>№5. I am not familiar with Greeks all the more. I know them a little from history.</p> <p>№6. Indifferent.</p> <p>№7. I can't tell, since I almost didn't communicate with Greeks.</p> <p>№8. Never communicated with the Greeks, but I think that each nation has the right to prosperity. So my attitude to them is positive.</p>
---------------	--	---	--	---

<p>Americans</p>	<p>№1. Didn't communicate.</p> <p>№2. I communicate with Americans every week. Native Canadians teach professional English language at our school. I have learned a lot about their country, holidays, and traditions over the years of studying with them. I correspond with a friend in America for eight years also.</p> <p>№3. Indifference.</p> <p>№4. Tolerant attitude.</p> <p>№5. For some reason I have such an opinion about them that Americans are business-like people, practical and smiling. Actually, I don't have anything against them.</p> <p>№6. I get pleasure from communicating with them. Pleasant, easy people.</p> <p>№7. Nationality doesn't matter. Do not trust, but without prejudice.</p> <p>№8. My attitude is normal, but I don't have a specific trust.</p>	<p>№1. Communicated, good attitude.</p> <p>№2. Respect—they are people who respect and love their native country very much.</p> <p>№3. Female Americans do not impress me much, they behave too manly, and guys are very diligent, communicative, think about their families, know how to earn money and that is why I like them a lot.</p> <p>№4. Didn't communicate.</p> <p>№5. Have trouble answering.</p> <p>№6. Very progressive people with great past. This people do charity work. And in general, they are very well-to-do people and a rich nation.</p> <p>№7. Business people, unusual.</p> <p>№8. Each nation has good people who are nice to talk to. I can not say that one nation is better and another one is worse. Because we all are people and each nation is good in its own way.</p>	<p>№1. My opinion is that it is not important what nationality the person is, what his soul is like is important. Americans are somewhat self-confident, sometimes when this self-confidence is not confirmed with anything.</p> <p>№2. All nations are good and deserve respect. All nations have good and bad people. Normal people.</p> <p>№3. Good people.</p> <p>№4. Hard workers, rich.</p> <p>№5. People who want to work that is why they are advantaged. Pleasant in communication.</p> <p>№6. Good.</p> <p>№7. Positively.</p> <p>№8. Generally all normal people, but they live too easily.</p>	<p>№1. Never communicated with Americans, that is why I can't say anything.</p> <p>№2. Didn't communicate.</p> <p>№3. Normal. For me there are no clear divisions into ethnic groups, since I think that it is impossible to give privileges only to nation, because all nations are equal. It is not good to judge the whole nation by one person. When meeting people it is not important to me what nation they are, the person himself is important. That is why it is very difficult for me to express my feelings, my attitude to different nations.</p> <p>№4. I think that nation doesn't matter; the main thing is that the person is kind and responsive. And I have a good attitude to all nations.</p> <p>№5. I hardly ever come across Americans, but I know them well from the movies. They are rich, they have everything, but they treat people like things.</p> <p>№7. I have communicated with only one American. He is a good person, but this is not enough to judge about the whole nation.</p> <p>№8. I don't have anything against any nation. And I have a good attitude to them.</p>
------------------	---	--	--	---