Rights vs. reality: minority language broadcasting in South East Europe

JEMIE
Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe

Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe
Vol 12, No 4, 2013, 54-79

Rights vs. Reality: Minority Language Broadcasting in South East Europe

Sally Broughton Micova*
London School of Economics and Political Science

This article examines the challenges to broadcasting in minority languages in South East Europe. It looks closely at the demand for, and supply and use of, minority language media in two of the successor states to the former Yugoslavia and investigates the constraints on achieving institutional completeness in media for national minorities in those two states. The evidence presented indicates that smallness, defined by both population size and economic conditions, is an important limitation, despite state policies designed to ensure the provision of media in the languages of national minorities. The article also shows how definitional issues and particular historical legacies further complicate the provision of media services for existing national minorities. It considers these problems in the context of the changing broadcasting landscape in which multi-channel subscription services on cable, Internet Protocol Television (IPTV) and even digital terrestrial television networks (DTT) facilitate cross-border transmission and consumption. The article argues that in this new environment, cultural preservation and identity-related aims might be served within the region of South East Europe, but that the democratic and public participation of national minorities in their home state is at risk. It also points out the specific problems of the minorities without neighbouring kin-states such as the Roma and Vlach.

Keywords: South East Europe; broadcasting; minority languages; Slovenia; Macedonia

I have heard it said that Balkan history with its oft-changing state borders has been governed by the following logic: 'why should I be a minority in your country, when instead you could be a minority in my country'.[1] The state borders that exist at this time are different from less than a decade ago and radically different from those of over two decades ago. Many individuals who belonged to a majority group in a previous constellation now find themselves part of a minority within newly drawn borders. Populations are so mixed that even with states reduced to very small

* Sally Broughton Micova is the Research Officer for the Media Policy Project at the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) and teaches at LSE and at the School of Journalism and Public Relations in Skopje. Email: s.e.broughton-micova@lse.ac.uk.

territories and populations, each one has a significant number of ethnic and linguistic minorities. This has implications for the media in each of these states but it would be a mistake to attribute this to international standards related to minority language media. Assumptions of state responsibility in this area and acceptance of the rights of national minority groups to media in their own languages are common in the region, not so much because of international standards, but because of the legacy of collective minority language rights in Yugoslavia (Ortakovski, 2000). Nevertheless, as this article will demonstrate, the provision of media in the languages of national minorities is problematic both because of the small size of each of these states and definitional issues that stem precisely from regional historical legacies.

Moring and Godenhjelm (2011) have raised the issue of size in relation to broadcasting for minorities, comparing some smaller Western states with larger ones. They consciously compared countries with high economic standards and a 'relatively privileged group of minorities' (*ibid.*: 181) in order to establish some benchmarks for approaches to minority language media. They found that size did matter among their cases, but that "the will and activity of policy makers" mattered more (*ibid.*: 202). This article builds on the work of Moring and Godenhjelm by examining two states at the other end of the spectrum in South East Europe: Slovenia and Macedonia. The richer of the two, Slovenia, has a gross domestic product (GDP) per capita of less than 50% that of Finland, the poorest small state in Moring and Godenhjelm's sample of seven Western European states with ethno-linguistic minorities. Whereas those authors looked at the conditions for single specific national minorities in each state, such an approach would be misleading for any of the states in South East Europe where anywhere from two to six national minority groups are somehow constitutionally recognized and many more are native to these states. This article uses the demand, supply and use framework of those authors to provide a picture for minority language media in two of Yugoslavia's successor states, the Republic of Macedonia and the Republic of Slovenia.

It is widely acknowledged that there is no accepted definition of a national minority in international law (see McGonagle, 2011; 2012). As Klimkiewicz (2003) pointed out in her study of minority media policy in the Czech Republic, Poland and Slovakia, the way minority groups are defined and distinctions between *ethnic* and *national* minorities have specific consequences in terms of their access to and the provision of media for linguistically and otherwise distinct minority groups.[2] This

article also looks at these definitions and how national minorities are recognized, as well as the implications for minority language media in each case. The evidence from the two cases presented here suggests that in this region historical legacies further complicate the situation for minority language groups and can lead to inequities among them.

The article begins with a short contextual discussion of minority language rights in the media and on "smallness" in terms of media systems, followed by some brief background on the region and the two states covered in the article. The empirical section relies on census data, the financial and annual reports of public service broadcasters (PSBs), as well as other documents of the PSBs or national regulators. It also draws on available secondary data from market research companies and others on the respective media markets and interviews with individuals working in the media sectors in each case. This section uses the data to show the supply, demand and uses of minority language media in Macedonia and Slovenia. The article concludes by arguing on the basis of the evidence presented that the cultural and political needs of the various linguistic populations should be examined at the level of the region of South East Europe, and advocates for a more nuanced approach to the protection of national minority language media.

1. Justifications for national minority rights in the media

During the twentieth century, Western democracies moved from the pure nation-state idea of a single nation and language to the recognition that their states were sometimes made up of several peoples or "nations" and languages, which then led to a range of minority rights protections (Kymlicka, 2002, 2010). Various international instruments deal with such rights under the auspices of the United Nations (UN), the Council of Europe and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). It is outside the scope of this article to discuss at length these various rights and instruments, as what is of interest here are the rights related to media based on the fundamental right to freedom of expression. McGonagle (2011) provides an overview of these instruments and their connection to minority language media. He outlines the four key elements of the rationale behind protecting expressive rights for minorities: encouraging democratic participation; creating alternative discursive spaces; creating and sustaining (cultural) identities; preserving linguistic identity (McGonagle, 2011: 120-126).

Therefore, state intervention to preserve expressive rights for minority language speaking groups are simultaneously aimed at protecting the unique cultural and linguistic identity of the minority group and encouraging the participation of those within the group in democratic processes and public discourse. To help achieve this, in the Guidelines on the Use of Minority Languages in the Broadcast Media, the OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities (HCNM) recommends *inter alia* direct state support for minority language broadcasters including aimed at encouraging private minority language media and allocated programming on public broadcasters (OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, 2003). These guidelines refer only to broadcasting, but scholars have made convincing cases for the desirability of giving minorities access to media in their language in each type of media, referring to such an offer as "institutionally complete" (See Kymlicka, 1995; Moring, 2007). It has also been argued that on these different platforms there is a need for pluralism of ownership or media sources and of types of content (McGonagle, 2011: 475; Moring, 2007; Moring & Dunbar, 2008). Based on these recommendations, one can assume that the ideal situation for minority language groups would be in a state in which minority language media are available in print, broadcast and online forms and that there are multiple owners or sources of media on each platform. This article deals with broadcast media in particular because of its continued dominance as a source of information and entertainment in the region and because of the radical changes in the broadcasting landscape brought about by digitalization and the spread of new transmission platforms. In broadcasting, "completeness" refers to having a broad range of genres, diversity of viewpoints and pluralism of ownership.

The nature of existing state intervention to address the issue of national minority media varies considerably. Only a few examples of institutionally complete offerings in minority languages can be found in Europe, such as Catalan in Spain, Welsh in the United Kingdom, German in Italy and Swedish in Finland (Kymlicka, 2002; Moring, 2007: 19). Drawing on early work by Stephen Riggins, Beata Klimkiewicz (2003) describes four different models for state approaches to minority languages in the media. The first is the *autonomous model* in which minority groups are encouraged to set up their own media relying partially on advertising and partially on local government or regional public funds. The second and third models both

entail significant state support for media in minority languages; but as opposed to the *minority protection model* that includes only measures aimed at media in minority languages, the *anti-discrimination/diversity model* also includes participation of minorities in the mainstream media. The fourth model is that of *assimilation* in which there is no minority language media. The choice of models would seem to have implications for the extent of institutional completeness in minority language media. However, as Klimkiewicz explains, the population size of the minority group in question, and the capacity or willingness of the state to provide support, are important factors in determining the model implemented. In the Central European cases she studied, she also finds that that there can be a mismatch between how these approaches are reflected in law and how they operate in practice. This suggests that the size and resources of the state can shape the protection of minority language rights in the media.

2. Small states media systems

All of the successor states of the former Yugoslavia can be considered small states according to commonly used definitions. Though a few different figures have been used as the cut-off between large and small states, population size is one of the key factors. The size of the domestic economy, level of influence in international relations and other factors are also sometimes considered, but smallness is always relative.[3] Canada, for example is sometimes considered a small state in media research because of its larger neighbour with which it shares a common language (see Siegert, 2006). The characteristics of small state media systems were identified in the early 1990s by Trappel (1991), Meier (Meier & Trappel, 1991), and Burgelman and Pauwels (1992). These studies focused on Europe, but did not specify exactly which states should be considered small. Switzerland and Austria were small in comparison to Germany (Trappel, 1991); and Belgium in relation to France and the Netherlands (Burgelman & Pauwels, 1992). These authors described the limitations of small advertising markets and low production capacity, highlighting the importance of state intervention, particularly public service broadcasting to counter the influence of media coming from outside, primarily from neighbours with the same language.

Revisiting the category nearly a decade later, Puppis (2009) argued that small states are less able to intervene in the public interest than larger ones. This is at least partly because they have fewer resources, such as a base for licence fee collection, to

draw on for funding public service media or other interventions (see also Picard, 2011). Puppis also pointed out that states with large neighbours with the same language may have different interests than small states with unique languages. He offered a population size cut-off figure of 18 million. Population size may be a more important factor in defining smallness when discussing media systems than in international relations in general because of its relationship to potential audience size. Media, particularly advertising-funded broadcast media, rely on selling their audience to advertisers. Others rely on income from subscriptions, the potential for which can also be constrained by population size. As Picard (2011), who used a cut-off figure of 20 million[4], showed, smallness in media markets is not just a matter of population size. He demonstrated that overall economic conditions, which he measured by using GDP rates, are also strongly related to the amount that is spent on advertising as a whole and on the funds that can be raised through licence fees (*ibid.*: 52). The conclusions here may seem simple: states with small populations and low GDP have less advertising and public revenue to sustain the media. However, looking at data from 31 European countries Picard also found that small states defined by both those factors invested more in domestic production than wealthier states with small populations.

There has been little research into the implications of these size-related constraints for minority language media. The work mentioned above by Moring and Godenhjelm (2011) looked only at countries that were small by population size, but that fell into the higher brackets of GDP levels. Comparing them to big countries in the same wealth bracket they found the size of the states studied to be less important than the willingness of policy makers to provide support for minority language media. This article looks at two countries that are small both in terms of population size *and* in terms of GDP.

3. The Yugoslav successor states

Before it began to disintegrate in 1991, Yugoslavia was comfortably above the aforementioned thresholds for small states. With a population of just under 25 million in 1990, it surpassed both Picard's (see also Lowe, Berg, & Nissen, 2011) and Puppis' cut-off marks. This was a state with a highly diverse population and a complex system for affording collective rights to the various groups within it. There was a distinction between those who were considered "nations" (*narod*) and those who were

"nationalities" or national minorities. In 1946, the nations – Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Montenegrins, and Macedonians – were all granted federal units, or republics, while Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) was considered to be mixed with a large percentage of Slavic Muslims who were classified as a religious group rather than a nation (Ortakovski, 2000: 230). National minorities – Albanians in Kosovo and Hungarians in Vojvodina – were given autonomous provinces. The 1974 Constitution established that nations and nationalities had equal rights, which had consequences for the use of languages by public institutions, the education system, and for the media (*ibid.*: 231-232). Radio Television Prishtina (RTP) and Radio Television Vojvodina (RTV) were established shortly afterwards[5] and there followed a period of heavy investment in radio and television programming in Hungarian, Italian and other languages in the republics. National minorities that were neither large nor concentrated enough to be in autonomous provinces still had language rights. During Yugoslav times in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia, for example, there were state-run daily newspapers in Albanian and Turkish that had been published since before 1950, as well as daily radio and television programming on the republic-level broadcaster RTV Skopje (Saracini *et al*., 2012). Moreover, Radio Koper in the Socialist Republic of Slovenia in Yugoslavia had been broadcasting in Italian since 1949, and was upgraded to a television station in 1971 (RTV Slovenia, 2011). From this history, one can see that in Yugoslavia there was a high level of institutional completeness, certainly by the mid-1970s, for most national minorities and all the "nations", with the qualification that none of the media were in private hands. There was a tradition and an expectation of collective rights to, and state support for, media in the languages of national minorities.

Beginning with the withdrawal of the Republic of Slovenia in 1991, Yugoslavia broke into ever smaller pieces, with much blood shed along the way. Currently there are seven successor states to the former Yugoslavia including the Republic of Kosovo.[6] This process created new minorities as those who had been in the majority or had the status of "nation" in Yugoslavia became minorities in the new states. The new states all fall firmly within the category of small states both in terms of population size and in terms of GDP in the context of Europe. Each state has developed a media sector that includes a mix of publicly-funded broadcasters and private media across all platforms. Among these, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the Republic of Kosovo can be considered different from the rest for a variety of reasons,

not least the heavy involvement of international actors such as the UN and the OSCE in the establishment of their institutions.[7] It would be beyond the limits of a single article to do look closely at the supply, demand and use of minority language media in all five remaining successor states. This article therefore focuses on Macedonia and Slovenia as they are approximately the same size in terms of territory and population, have both been independent states since 1991, and were least involved in the violent conflicts of the early 1990s.

4. The demand, supply and use of minority language media

The examination of supply, demand and use of minority language media by Moring and Godenhjelm (2011) stems from the concept of institutional completeness and Moring's (2007) development of the concept of functional completeness in the media. As mentioned above, institutional completeness refers to the offering or availability of minority language media across platforms. In commercial markets, the offering or supply of a commodity or service is determined by demand. Media markets are special in a variety of ways (see Albarran, 2002; Doyle, 2002). One of the key characteristics is that many media companies "sell" both to audiences and to advertisers, and the demand from audiences is closely related to the demand from advertisers (Picard, 2002) – the bigger the audience reached, the higher the demand from advertisers. Another characteristic of media markets in Europe in particular is that there are high levels of state intervention. This is mainly in the form of PSB, but is also often done through subsidies or tax incentives for newspapers and other media. Demand for media content and services by audiences is complex and one can take into account tastes, habits and many other factors. However, in considering demand for minority language media Moring and Godenhjelm began with the premise that 'a language would always require the support of full and comprehensive media services on all platforms and genres' (2011: 186). Therefore, if there is a minority language group, one must assume that it demands the full spectrum of media – or, an institutionally complete offer – just as the majority population would demand.

Moring and Godenhjelm did not consider demand on the advertising side of the media markets, yet this is an important factor in determining media supply where advertising funds content and service provision. Macedonia and Slovenia have public and commercially-funded media and their PSBs are partly funded by advertising, making advertising demand an important part of the picture and determinant of

supply. I therefore first discuss the demand for, and then the supply of, minority language media in these cases. The evidence I present is from secondary data from censuses and market research, reports from national regulators and civil society group data as well as interviews with individuals working in both public and commercial broadcasters. These will provide a picture of the institutional completeness of minority language media.

Moring's idea of "functional completeness" is about how minority language populations *use* the media that is offered. It can be considered the flip side of the concept of institutional completeness. This depends to some extent on the offering, as minorities that have access to little media in their own language are likely to use that which is available as complementary to media in the majority language (Moring, 2007). According to Moring, the level of bilingualism and size or concentration of the minority language population can also play a role. In this section I rely on available figures from audience measurement and other secondary data as evidence of the use of minority language media in both Slovenia and Macedonia and examine this in terms of demand, supply and use.

4.1. *Demand*

Operating on the assumption that if there is a minority language group in a state, it will demand an institutionally complete offering of media, the first thing to look at is the breakdown of the respective populations by nationality. The table below shows the most recent available census data from each state according to nationality. In each case the category is referred to as "nationality", or in literal translation "national belonging", and the labels are self-declared. [8] Because the classifications are determined by how individual respondents chose to define themselves they do not necessarily coincide with normally accepted national minority groups. However, except for those in Slovenia who declared themselves to be "Muslims", and of course the "others" in both countries, each label can also be linked to a distinct language.

Table 1. Breakdown of populations by self-declared nationality or "national belonging"

Slovenia		**Macedonia**	
Nationality	**2002**	***Nationality***	**2002**
Slovenes	1,631,363	Macedonians	1,297,981
Serbs	38,964	Albanians	509,083
Croats	35,642	Turks	77,959
Bosniaks	21,542	Roma	53,879
Muslims	10467	Serbs	35,939
Hungarians	6,243	Bosniaks	17,018
Albanians	6,186	Vlach	9,695
Macedonians	3,972	Others	20,993
Roma	3,246	**Total**	**2,022,547**
Montenegrins	2,667		
Italians	2,258		
Others	4,432		
Don't know	126,325		
Refused	48,588		
Undetermined	22,141		
Total	**1,964,036**		

The first thing one notices is the number of different nationalities represented, considering how little in-migration there is in the region. Some of these figures represent migration from other parts of the former Yugoslavia during the war in Bosnia (1992-1995), however this is still minimal. The State Statistical Office of Slovenia reported that the increase in the population by just over 50,000 between 1991 and 2002 was only partly accounted for by immigration (28,000), while the rest was due to the legalization of the status of long-time residents with Yugoslav citizenship.[9] In the 2002 Census in Macedonia only 5,358 individuals were foreigners with residency of over a year and 3,306 were refugees.[10] Therefore the national minority populations represented in the table above are mainly not immigrants, but are native to each of these countries or at least present since before their independence.

Also noteworthy is that not all of these self-declared national affiliations represent separate linguistic groups and there are many of undefined or undeclared nationality. Those declaring themselves as simply "Muslims" likely speak the language of the majority where they live as a mother tongue or perhaps Bosnian.[11] In the Slovenian case the "other" category includes several smaller minorities, which

number fewer than 2,000 people. These were disaggregated in the published census data, but condensed here for the sake of space. The "other" category in the Macedonian case appears as such in the published data. It is much larger as it includes some who choose not to declare their "national belonging", as well as smaller minorities such as Croats, Greeks, or as Egyptians, who are not Arabic-speakers, but mainly speak the dominant language in the area in which they live.[12]

Finally, these figures show that the minority groups in Slovenia and Macedonia consist of very small populations. Except for the Albanians in Macedonia, all of the minority groups in these two cases have fewer than 80,000 members. In both countries, therefore, there are numerous linguistically distinct minority groups that number fewer than 20,000 people. Operating under the assumption that any minority language population demands an institutionally complete media, each of these groups demands a diverse selection of media across multiple platforms. However, can the market or the state in Macedonia or Slovenia supply such an offer in at least six or, if all those in the "other" categories are included, nearly 20 different languages?[13]

As mentioned above, the supply of media by the market will depend largely on the demand from advertisers. Demand for advertising depends on several factors, not least of which is the amount of money that firms have to spend on advertising. Demand for advertising from domestic firms will depend on the number of firms and the strength of the economy. In general, small states are limited in the extent to which domestic firms can generate demand for advertising (Picard, 2011). Advertiser interest in reaching particular audiences also depends on how attractive they are as potential consumers and this is particularly the case for companies operating internationally that can choose to direct their investments in advertising to where they think it will give them the most return. One can easily see how small and poor states with unique languages are not particularly attractive to large international companies as advertising markets. The costs of adapting advertisements into the necessary language, engaging agencies to do media buying, which is the planning and acquisition of advertising time slots, might not be worth the investment. The size of the advertising "pie" or the amount of money in each market for advertising can be a good indicator of the demand for advertising for media in general. Assessing the size of this "pie" presents a challenge in this region and for these cases because of the lack of reliable and comparable data for each market. In some cases, the gross value of advertising, calculated by the extent of ad placement multiplied by the official price

lists of the media companies, is tracked by some private agencies or regulatory agencies.[14] However this figure is often misleading as it does not take into account the discounts given to media buyers, who often make bulk buys of advertising time from stations at discounted prices for multiple clients, and large regular clients. As this practice is common in both the states under consideration (Beličanec & Ricliev, 2012), I rely here on the most recent available data on actual revenues.

For Slovenia, the most recent calculation of actual revenue in advertising was calculated for television by a team at the University of Ljubljana for 2010 based on data individually obtained from each company. They reported a figure of €69.4 million revenue for television advertising revenues alone (Milosavljević, 2012).[15] In Macedonia the national regulatory authority, the Broadcasting Council, is the only institution tracking advertising income rather than the gross value of advertising and does so based on reports from broadcasters. According to their calculations the total income from advertising for television and radio in 2011 was approximately €26.45m (1,480.18m MKD for television and 133.45m MKD for radio).[16] To put these figures in context, in 2011, the advertising turnover for Danish television stations alone was 2,256m DKK, or just over €303m,[17] while they serve a population only just over twice as large. The advertising figures here indicate that demand for advertising in Macedonia and Slovenia is not conducive to sustaining a highly pluralistic and institutionally complete media offering to mainstream media, much less minority language media for populations the size of the ones shown above.

The demand for advertising in the broadcast media in both Macedonia and Slovenia even on mainstream majority language media is limited. The domestic economy does not produce much demand for advertising and the majority populations do not seem to be very attractive to international advertisers. One can deduce that the very small minority language populations in Macedonia and Slovenia are even less attractive targets for advertisers. In terms of their potential as consumers, as segments of the already small and relatively poor populations of these two countries, the smaller the minority group is, the less likely it is that advertisers will see an interest in reaching it. An advertiser like Nestlé or Coca Cola, for example, that already has an advertisement adapted into Albanian or Hungarian for markets in Albania and Hungary is more likely to be ready to take the step to place it in the media in those languages in Macedonia, where there are at least half a million Albanians, or in Serbia, where the Hungarian-speaking population numbers just over a quarter of a

million. The costs of adaptation are already sunk and the sizes of those minority language groups in those countries are relatively large. The same would not be the case for just over 2,258 Italians or even 6,243 Hungarian-speakers in Slovenia. The attractiveness of advertising to minority language groups without a kin-state such as the Vlach or the Roma in these states could be even less.

In summary, in both these cases there is extensive demand for media supply in minority languages based on the number of different language groups native to these two small countries. However, there is little demand from advertisers for media as vehicles to reach potential consumers in these markets overall, and much less for media in minority languages. Although the interests of advertisers to fund media might be low or non-existent for minority language groups, they are not completely without media in their own languages. Therefore, in investigating the institutional completeness of the minority language media in Macedonia and Slovenia, I will proceed with an examination of supply.

4.2. *Supply*

In both Macedonia and Slovenia, the state is a significant supplier of media in minority languages. Both PSBs have legal obligations to provide certain minority language programming that stem from the constitutions of their respective states (see relevant laws Republic of Macedonia, 2005; Republic of Slovenia, 2005). Not all the national minorities represented in Table 1 above have the same constitutional status, and therefore the PSB obligations for service in their languages are not necessarily equal or proportional to their presence in the overall population. Macedonia and Slovenia differ in this regard but both draw on the legacy of the legal definitions and treatment of national minorities in the former Yugoslavia.

The current Slovenian Constitution differs little from the 1974 Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Slovenia in Yugoslavia in terms of its treatment of national minorities, in that it gives specific status and rights to the Italian and Hungarian "*narodni skupnosti*" or national communities. The 1974 Constitution listed them in Article 1 alongside the Slovenian "*narod*" (people). Now they are dealt with in Articles 5 and 64, which promise to 'protect and guarantee the rights of the autochthonous Italian and Hungarian national communities'. Article 64 details the rights to self-government, education and media and assures state funding for these activities. Article 11 makes those languages official in places where they exist

alongside the official state language of Slovenian. The Roma are also mentioned, but only as a community, not as a national community, whose status and special rights are to be further established by law. The three national minorities that are largest in number are not afforded special status, nor are the Albanians, Macedonians or Montenegrins, all of whom number more than the Italians in present-day Slovenia.

Article 1 of the 1974 Constitution of the Socialist Republic of Macedonia declared it the national state of the Macedonian "*narod*" (people) and of the Albanian and Turkish "*narodnosti*" (nationalities). Articles 2 and 3 further confirmed that individuals from the other Yugoslav "peoples" have equal rights alongside the Macedonians and the nationalities (Albanian and Turkish). When Macedonia became independent in 1991 its constitution continued the tradition but expanded the list, saying in the preamble that it is a state 'in which full equality as citizens and permanent co-existence with the Macedonian people is provided for Albanians, Turks, Vlachs, Romanies and other nationalities'. It also stated in Article 7 that, where a nationality was the majority in a municipality, its language could also be used alongside the official state language of Macedonian. This was amended after the Ohrid Framework Agreement,[18] which ended the conflict of 2001, to refer to individuals belonging to the Albanian, Turkish, Vlach, Serbia, Roma, and Bosniak "*narod*", thereby changing the status of those national minorities and extending the list.

In both cases the history of affording group rights to certain national minorities is still reflected in the services provided by the PSB systems. The Slovenian PSB, Radio Television Slovenia (RTVSLO), has two regional centres that operate autonomously and produce television and radio programmes in Italian and Hungarian. Both regional centres have been in operation for several decades. RTVSLO also produces some radio and television programming in the Romani language that is broadcast on national channels. Macedonian Radio Television (MRT) has one national television channel and one national radio channel dedicated to broadcasting in minority languages, each of which mostly contains programming in Albanian, but also programming in five other minority languages. The Turkish language section is the largest among these and according to an analysis made by the Broadcasting Council of Macedonia in 2010, it produces approximately 16.5 hours per week for television and 35 hours per week for radio. The other four minorities listed in the constitution are provided approximately 1.5 hours per week on television

and 3.5 hours per week on the radio in their own language.[19] Each of the departments for these four languages consists of two to three individuals. The supply of minority language broadcasting by PSB in each case appears constrained by the legacy of legal status and capacity, mainly in terms of human resources, but also cultural products such as music and archive material developed in the Yugoslav period.

However, the capacity to supply programming in minority language is also limited by the overall resources available for PSB in the two countries. The table below provides the 2011 budgets for each country's PSB and the main outputs that are produced with those budgets.

Table 2. The Budgets and Supply of Programming from PSB systems in Slovenia and Macedonia

State (PSB)	**Slovenia (RTVSLO)**	**Macedonia (MRT)**
Total Income of PSB 2011 (in Euros)	€ 109,775,230	€20,458,600 (1,271,298,592 MKD)
TV	3 national channels in Slovenian, 2 regional with several hours daily in Italian in Kopar and in Hungarian in Maribor, a few hours per week in Romani on the national channel	2 national channels in Macedonian (one is Parliamentary Channel) and 1 national channel mostly in Albanian with 1 hour daily in Turkish and 1 hour a day divided and on alternate days among Romani, Serbian, Vlach
Radio	3 national channels in Slovenian, 2 regional in Slovenian and one regional each in Italian and in Hungarian, a few hours per week in Romani on the national channel	2 National channels in Macedonian and 1 national channel mostly in Albanian with 1 hour daily in Turkish and 1 hour a day divided and on alternate days among Romani, Serbian, Vlach
Online	RTVSLO.si portal in Slovenian, with some content in English	mrt.com.mk portal with one version in Macedonian and a separate version in Albanian

As I have argued previously, PSBs in the two countries struggle to provide a full range of content genres to their audiences even on their majority language channels (Broughton Micova, 2012). This is not just a matter of the limited finances typical of PSB in small states because of the low tax base for the license fee (Picard, 2011), but also a consequence of the capacity of the two states' small populations to generate material from which to create or provide content. As one can see from Table 2, above, the budgets for RTVSLO and MRT are not large, yet each one still operates three

national television channels, three national radio channels and more. Nevertheless, together, the total revenues for the Slovenian and Macedonian PSBs in 2011 were barely above the €125 million that the incoming Dutch Government promised to cut from its PSB budget that same year (Government of the Netherlands, 2012). According to managers and producers in MRT and RTVSLO, limited finances are not the only constraints on their ability to supply a broad range of content. Even for those responsible for programming in Slovenian and Macedonian languages there is a lack of subject matter or material for content. A television producer in RTVSLO explained in an interview that finding attractive subject matter for documentary programmes is a challenge in Slovenia and that the country has limited capacity to produce drama or films, often relying on talent from around the region.[20] The Director of the Macedonian language television channel in MRT and a radio producer in RTVSLO both complained that music is a particular problem because there is not enough in Macedonian or Slovenian or by artists from those countries.[21] The Director from MRT explained that it is not just an issue of having music or music videos to put on air, but also of having guests for studio shows or generating content for entertainment news.

While in Slovenian and Macedonian the provision of institutionally complete broadcast media presents a challenge, those responsible for minority language programmes rely heavily on content from kin-states. The Head of the Italian service of RTVSLO explained that his channel uses a great deal of content from RAI, the PSB in neighbouring Italy.[22] The Editor-in-Chief of the Albanian language television service in MRT concurred, saying that she fills programme by trading with PSBs in both Kosovo and Albania.[23] While within the context of the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) and regional cooperation PSBs can often share and exchange programming, commercial stations are not within those networks. In Slovenia there are no domestic commercial television stations in minority languages, but in Macedonia there is one national and several local Albanian-language commercial stations, as well as local radio stations. The manager of a local private Albanian language television station explained that he relied heavily on stars and content from the Albanian population within the region, though he also stated that it was difficult for him to get musicians or other celebrities from Prishtina or Tirana to come to his local station.[24] He also described the great difficulty in getting advertisements from

the local business community, a lack of interest from larger advertisers and a recent dependence on state-funded public service campaigns.

In both Slovenia and Macedonia some programming in Romani language is produced by the PSBs, but there are also private media that have been to some extent supported by civil society. Moreover, in Macedonia there are two commercial television stations broadcasting in Romani language in the capital Skopje as well as one non-profit Romani language radio station in a smaller town. Over the years all three have received various forms of support from the Open Society Foundation and other international donors. TV Shutel and TV BTR are run by Roma and are based in the only municipality in the country with a majority population of Roma. These stations offer more than the daily 30-minute or hour-long news programmes provided by the PSBs in these two countries, but there is little evidence to suggest that what they provide is a full range of content genres.[25] In Slovenia a local civil society organization, the Roma Information Centre,[26] runs a local radio station that produces programming in Romani and shares weekly programming in Romani with nine other local stations. In Macedonia one commercial Turkish-language radio station continues to exist, while one Turkish-language non-profit radio was launched but closed after one year after it failed to raise funds. Several local television stations are registered as providing some programming in other languages in addition to Macedonian and/or Albanian languages. For example TV EDO in Skopje and TV Lazani in Dolneni village also broadcast in Bosnian and TV Kanal Tri in Strogovo village and TV Cegrani outside of the town of Gostivar broadcast in Turkish. However according to civil society monitors, the quality of the content is exceedingly low and made up largely of music video request shows, call-on quizzes, or similar inexpensive-to-produce programmes (see Saracini *et al*., 2012). It is likely that the problems of funding and finding material described by those responsible for programming in the PSBs and in private Albanian-language broadcasters mentioned above are even greater for those serving the smaller language communities.

In summary, in both Macedonia and Slovenia the evidence indicated that supply of publicly-funded media in minority languages is constrained somewhat by the way minorities have been legally-recognized in the past, and the capacity developed during the Yugoslav period, which is no longer appropriate for populations as they are now distributed. One of the consequences is that in neither case does the provision of minority language programming by the PSB adequately match the

current composition of national minorities. In addition the PSBs are limited in their resources overall and there are indications that they struggle to provide an institutionally complete media offering in the majority languages, and much less in minority languages. The challenge in providing domestically-produced programming is not just financial, however. Broadcasters in the two countries are also constrained by the extent of material in the form of events, stars, music and other subject matter that can be generated by small populations. Here the size of the overall population in the region speaking languages in question and kin-state connections seem important factors in the ability of broadcasters to provide for their audiences, as both PSB and private broadcasters rely heavily on content from neighbouring countries. The regional connections are even more evident when one looks at the use of media in these two cases.

4.3. *Use*

In looking at supply I have focused on that which is provided domestically in Macedonia and Slovenia but one important characteristic about the media sector in both these countries is the high rate of penetration of multi-channel subscription-based services. Already in 2009, the Broadcasting Council (BC) in Macedonia reported 66% penetration of household cable subscriptions and only 23% of households dependent on terrestrial broadcasting. With the introduction of a multi-channel subscription service on DVB-T – the first step towards digital switchover – the number of households relying only on the domestically available free-to-air channels decreased further. In December 2012 the BC reported 80.5% of households using cable, IPTV or DVB-T subscription services (Broadcasting Council of Republic of Macedonia, 2012: 65), and the country completed analogue switch-off in June 2013. Following digital switchover in Slovenia at the end of 2010, dependence on terrestrial free-to-air broadcasting was only around 18%, with approximately 80% of households choosing cable or IPTV subscriptions. These data show that in both Macedonia and Slovenia more than 80% of the population have access to foreign television channels.

Some of these services also offer radio channels, and radio and other content is also available online. In Macedonia, 58.1% of households had broadband connections in 2012 (State Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia, 2012) and in Slovenia, 436,994 households had broadband or approximately 54% by the fourth

quarter of 2012.[27] This indicates that a majority of the population also has access to foreign radio and other online content. These figures for subscription television services and broadband connections are not broken down by nationality, so it is not possible to see to what extent those belonging to minority language groups in particular have access to foreign media, especially from kin-states. Based on other socio-economic factors, it is expected that the Roma are the least likely to have access to broadband and subscription television services; they are also one of the few groups without a kin-state providing media in their language.

A look at audience data reveals that in both Macedonia and Slovenia foreign channels are popular across the populations, indicating that they are used as complements to the media offered even in the language of the majority communities. In Macedonia the audience share of foreign channels was 21% in 2010 and 20% in 2011. In 2011, only one domestic national channel had a higher share at 22% and all local and regional channels combined had a share of only 8%, while MTV2 – the national PSB channel for minority languages – had a share of only 2.2% (Broadcasting Council of Republic of Macedonia, 2012). Except for ALSat M, the national commercial Albanian-language station that has a 7% audience share, the audience data indicate that the channels providing content in minority languages are not used extensively by the population. A similar picture can be observed in Slovenia, where 2011 audience data from AGB Neilson[28] show the shares of TV Koper-Capodistria and TV Maribor that offer programmes in Italian and Hungarian at 0.2% and 0.53% respectively. There is evidence that to fill in the gap in domestic programming in other minority languages, people turn to the channels of neighbouring countries. The Peace Institute of Ljubljana conducted a survey of minority language group members in 2009 and found that nearly a third of them regularly watched news programmes on foreign channels and that, based on their most cited programmes, a large portion of their viewing was of foreign channels (Nahtigal, 2009: 107). AGB Neilson's 2011 data showed that Croatian channels held a share of 3.17%, and the category of "other channels" had a share of 26.58%. Data from day-after recall surveys conducted from 2002 to 2011 by the agency Mediana[29] indicated that the category of "other channels" was largely foreign channels rather than local domestic channels, although not all are from neighbouring countries. Asking the question 'when did you last watch X channel?', they found nearly 20% of respondents replying 'yesterday' to both Discovery Channel and National Geographic

Channel peaking in 2010 at over 20% each, putting these channels in fifth and sixth place after the Slovenian national channels. These were followed by the two channels of the Croatian PSB HRT and by 2011 just over 2% of respondents report having watched TV Koper-Capodistria the day before.

As Moring (2007) argued, bilingualism can play a significant role in the extent to which minority language groups use minority language or kin-state media in a complementary fashion to majority language media. However, in Slovenia and Macedonia there is also evidence that the majority language populations are complementing institutional incompleteness in the media offered in their languages. One of the reasons that there is such a high degree of use of foreign media in Macedonia and Slovenia is the extent of bilingualism or multilingualism in the two countries. Because of their history as part of Yugoslavia and the similarities among south Slavic languages, many people understand Serbian, Croatian and Bosnian, and therefore freely consume media and music in these languages. English is also widely understood, particularly among younger generations, although most cable and IPTV operators provide subtitles in at least one of the regional languages on the popular English-language channels such as Discovery, National Geographic, and movie channels. Therefore, it is not just Croatians in Slovenia who watch HRT or Serbs in Macedonia who watch Pink, but Slovenians and Macedonians also watch those channels to complement those on offer in Slovenian and Macedonian. They are also using English-language channels to fill in the gaps in regional production in genres such as documentary, film and premium drama. The audience data suggest that functional completeness is largely linked to media from kin-states, and not only for minority language populations in Slovenia and Macedonia. It also shows that Slovenian- and Macedonian-speakers are using those same media or other foreign media to a significant extent.

Conclusion

Despite their small populations both Slovenia and Macedonia have numerous national minorities, many of which have kin-states in the region but are native to those two countries. The fact that these two countries were part of the larger Yugoslavia has left a legacy of protection for minority language groups, but this history has also resulted in some groups being accorded more privileges in terms of media provision than others. In Slovenia, the PSB system provides television and radio programming for

the Italian and Hungarian minorities despite their small numbers, while no such provision is made for the much larger minorities with former Yugoslav kin-states. In Macedonia, the Albanian-speaking minority has a largely institutionally complete media offering, including the most extensive television and radio provision from the PSB. This may be appropriate to their numbers, but provision of PSB programming for the other minorities disproportionately favours the Turkish-speaking minority whose collective language rights and protection date back to the Yugoslav period. In both cases there is a history of distinguishing between "peoples" and "nationalities" that carried through from the hierarchies of the Yugoslav period into the constitutions of the independent states, though this was changed in Macedonia by the Ohrid Framework Agreement following the 2001 conflict.

In terms of the number of different languages served by the PSB and the existence of private broadcasters operating in minority languages, there is more institutional completeness for national minorities in Macedonia than in Slovenia. However in both cases the quantity and quality of broadcast media output is constrained by the small PSB budgets, lack of advertising interest and lack of material from which to generate content that is typical of small state media systems. These limitations are not only problems for minority language media, but producers from PSB and private media report struggling to provide a complete offering in the Slovenian and Macedonian languages.

Content and material from neighbouring kin-states is used by PSB and private channels in Macedonia and Slovenia to fill the programmes in minority languages. At the same time, minority language populations have access to, and use heavily, channels from neighbouring kin-states with institutionally complete media in their languages. Larger neighbours, kin-states of many of the minorities, also seem to play a role in the functional completeness of media for Slovenian- and Macedonian-speaking populations as Serbia and Croatia in particular have a much more complete offering and language is not a barrier. Majority and minority populations in these two countries also use foreign channels from outside the region, mainly the global English-language channels.

The situations identified in these cases raise two important issues for consideration by future research and policy-makers interested in addressing the needs of populations speaking minority languages. I return to the justifications for minority language rights elaborated by McGonagle (2011) mentioned at the outset of this

article. There is a need to protect the cultural and linguistic identity of minority language groups. However, for this purpose, given the size of the populations and capacity of the states and markets in South East Europe, I argue that this should be examined and addressed at the regional level as doing otherwise might lead to unrealistic expectations and unachievable targets. For example, Slovenia has ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages. In its third round of monitoring the Committee of Experts generally complimented the country for its media provision in Hungarian and Italian, as well as its efforts to improve it in Romani (Council of Europe, 2010a). However, the Committee of Experts' criticism led to recommendations by the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers that the country apply the provisions of Part 2 of the Charter, which also covers the media, to the German-, Serbian- and Croatian-speaking minorities, and re-evaluate the status of Bosnian (Council of Europe, 2010b). Considering the number of German-speakers in Slovenia, the limited capacity of the market and the state to provide completeness even in Slovenian, as well as the availability of broadcast content in German through multi-channel platforms, what is reasonable to expect of the Slovenian state in terms of "encouragement of the mass media"? (Council of Europe, 1992, art. 7 para. 3)

In Slovenia and Macedonia, the need for media to protect linguistic and cultural identity seems met for those minorities with larger kin-states mainly, by content and channels from those kin-states, and there is perhaps even more completeness for this purpose than for the Slovenian- and Macedonian-speaking populations whose numbers are much smaller regionally. By contrast, the need for media that nurtures the cultural and linguistic identity of those without larger kin-states, such as the Roma and the Vlach, are not met. Slovenia and Macedonia, being small states, are not able to provide for these groups adequately through PSB, nor are their populations large or concentrated enough in any one state to support sufficient private media. It may be that, with the high levels of multi-platform subscription take-up and broadband penetration, regional solutions might be found for these linguistic communities. However there are trade-offs or risks involved in reliance on kin-state media or regional solutions. They may have negative consequences in terms of participation in social and political life within states such as Slovenia and Macedonia. News media based in Italy or Albania, for instance, understandably do not pay much attention to the political issues in Slovenia or Macedonia, or give voice to Italian and Albanian political or civil society groups active within Slovenia and Macedonia. The

use of media, especially news and information programmes from kin-states, and the absence of the collective experiences that television in particular provides, may lead to further segregation rather than integration in this historically troubled region. Instead of placing vague obligations on states in this region to provide media in minority languages, I suggest careful examination of the cultural and democratic needs that are and are not being met by the media in the region as a whole, with the aim of developing a more nuanced approach to the provision of minority language media within states.

Notes

1 Though I cannot be sure that these were his original words or notion, I give credit to my former colleague Eran Fraenkel for it is from him that I first heard it.

2 According to Klimkiewicz (2003: 156) in this region these terms are not used in reference to immigrant groups but to those who are permanent and traditionally settled in the country. She astutely explains that "the distinction between ethnic and national is determined by whether the given group has its own state, often neighboring the state where the minority is settled."

3 For discussions of defining small states in general and the implications of smallness see Baehr (1975) and Maas (2009); for small states specifically within the European Union, see Thorallsson & Wivel (Thorallsson & Wivel, 2006)(2006).

4 Picard (2011) argued that this was an accepted "critical mass" for the effective operation of television. He further explained that the figure had been used by a 2009 media pluralism study for the European Commission.

5 RTV was established in Novi Sad in 1974 and RTP was established in Prishtina in 1975. Both broadcast in Serbian and as well as Hungarian and Albanian respectively. RTV was closed after the conflict in 1999 and re-opened initially under the auspices of the UN and the OSCE as Radio Television Kosovo; it still has programmes in Serbian as well as other minority languages.

6 Kosovo declared independence in February 2008 and has been recognized by more than half of the UN member states. However at the time of writing it had not yet been recognized by Serbia.

7 The federal system of BiH and the continued involvement of the government of the Republic of Serbia in parts of Kosovo, as well as the lack of reliable data from both, make them also practically difficult to include in this investigation.

8 In both Macedonia and Slovenia the most recent available census data that contain a breakdown according to self-declared nationality is from 2002. Macedonia was due to have a census in 2011, but this was postponed indefinitely because of political tensions surrounding the ethnic composition of the country and disagreements between ruling Macedonian and Albanian political parties. The census held in Slovenia in 2011 was based on administrative records and not a population survey so it has not produced published data on nationality, but instead breaks down the population by citizenship. According to the 2011 data the total population of Slovenia amounted to 2,050,189, of which 82,746 were of foreign citizenship with 38,836 of them being citizens of BiH. The numbers of citizens of Serbia and Croatia were only just over 7,000 each, indicating that the Serbians and Croatians in Slovenia are mostly native with Slovenian citizenship.

9 Population Census Results 2002, Slovenia. Available at http://www.stat.si/popis2002/en/default.htm.

10 Census of population households and dwelling 2002, Macedonia: 21. Available at: http://www.stat.gov.mk/Publikacii/knigaI.pdf.

11 There is no space here to enter into a discussion of the historical, political and linguistic controversies around the distinctions between Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian and Montenegrin languages, and this paper accepts them as recognized by the states as distinct languages. Nevertheless, it is important to note that they are very similar and do not represent barriers to media consumption, but may to some extent in terms of representation in the media.

12 For background on the identity of the Balkan Egyptians see the Council of Europe publication by Rubin Zemon *The History of the Balkan Egyptians* that can be found at: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/ibp/source/FS_1_10.5.pdf

13 For further discussion of some of the issues at stake in this question see Kymlicka & Patten (2003); also see May (2012), who focuses on the provision of education.

14 Mediana in Slovenia, for instance, annually releases such data. as does the Broadcasting Council in Macedonia.

15 For the same year the gross value of television advertising based on official rates was calculated by Mediana at €406,059,512. The Mediana representative when providing the data qualified it heavily, explaining that there are usually many discounts, compensation deals and other behaviour that are not disclosed and not accounted for in their data. Personal communication, 2012.

16 Figures calculated from the data in the Broadcasting Council's Analysis of the Broadcasting Market, 2011: 10, 36. Full report available at: http://srd.org.mk/images/stories/publikacii/publikacii_2012/analiza%20na%20pazarot%20za%20radiodifuzna%20dejnost%20za%202011.pdf.

17 Figure from Statistics Denmark, where official source are listed as Dansk Oplagskontrol, Reklameforbrugsundersøgelsen i Danmark. Available at http://www.dst.dk/en.aspx.

18 The Ohrid Framework Agreement was signed on 13 August 2001 and ended the violent conflict within Macedonia. The full text of the agreement can be found at: https://peaceaccords.nd.edu/site_media/media/accords/Macedonia_framework_agreement.pdf.

19 A full analysis can be found at: http://www.srd.org.mk/images/stories/publikacii/analiza%20na%20programite%20na%20mrt.pdf.

20 Interview, Anonymous, Ljubljana, July 2010.

21 Interviews Aljoša Simjanovski, Skopje, April 2010 and Janez Ravnikar, Ljubljana, July 2010.

22 Interview Antonio Rocco, Koper/Capodistria, July 2010.

23 Interview, Skopje, April 2010.

24 Interview, Selver Ajdini, Kumanovo, May 2011.

25 A search for their names in the records of the Broadcasting Council (BC) shows that in 2012 and 2013 both stations appeared frequently in the reports of BC sessions, due to warnings for exceeding teleshopping, violations of election coverage rules, and other problems. The BC began the process of revoking the license of TV Shutel for not complying with its general format requirements after monitoring revealed it broadcast more than 90% entertainment programming – mostly re-runs from previous years.

26 See http://www.romic.si/.

27 This figure was extracted from the online database of the State Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia Si-Stat at http://pxweb.stat.si/pxweb/Dialog/statfile2.asp.

28 Audience Measurement data from Peoplemeters measurement system, provided by AGB Neilson to the author upon request.

29 Data from day-after recall survey provided to the author by Mediana Institute for Market Research, Slovenia, upon request.

References

Albarran, A. B. *Media Economics: Understanding Markets, Industries and Concepts* (2nd ed.). Ames: Iowa State University Press, 2002.

Baehr, P. 'Small States: A Tool for Analysis'. *World Politics* 27(3) (1975): 456-466.

Beličanec, R., & Z. Ricliev. *Mapping Digital Media: Macedonia*. London: Open Society Foundations, 2012.

Broadcasting Council of Republic of Macedonia. *Анализа на пазарот на радиодифузната дејност 2011 година (Analysis of the Broadcasting Market in 2011)*. Skopje: Broadcasting Council of Republic of Macedonia, 2012.

Broadcasting Council of Republic of Macedonia. *Strategy for the Development of Broadcasting Activity in the Republic of Macedonia (Proposal) for the period 2013-2017*. Skopje: Broadcasting Council of Republic of Macedonia, 2012.

Broughton Micova, S. 'Born into Crisis: Public Service Broadcasters in South East Europe'. In G. F. Lowe & J. Steemers (eds.), *Regaining the Initiative for Public Service Media*. Gothenburg: Nordicom, 2012.

Burgelman, J.-C., & C. Pauwels. 'Audiovisual Policy and Cultural Identity in Small European States: The Challenges of a Unified Market'. *Media, Culture and Society* 14 (1992): 169-183.

Council of Europe. *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages*. 1992. Retrieved from http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/Treaties/Html/148.htm.

Council of Europe. *European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages: Application of the Charter in Slovenia*. 2010a.

Council of Europe. *Recommendation RecChL(2010)5 of the Committee of Ministers of the application of the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages by Slovenia*. 2010b. Retrieved from http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/minlang/Report/Default_en.asp#Slovenia.

Doyle, G. *Understanding Media Economics*. London: SAGE, 2002.

Government of the Netherlands. Media and Broadcasting: Broadcasters, 2012. Retrieved from http://www.government.nl/issues/media-and-broadcasting/broadcasters.

Klimkiewicz, B. 'Media Policy for Ethnic and National Minorities in Poland, the Czech Republic and Slovakia'. In M. Sükösd & P. Bajomi-Lázár (eds.), *Reinventing Media: Media Policy Reform in East-Central Europe*. Budapest: Central European University Press, 2003.

Kymlicka, W. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

_____ .'Multiculturalism and Minority Rights: West and East'. *Journal of Ethnic and Minority Issues in Europe* 4 (2002): 1-26.

_____ . 'The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism? New Debates on Inclusion and Accommodation in Diverse Societies'. *International Social Science Journal* 61(199) (2010); 97-112.

_____ , & A. Patten. *Language Rights and Political Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.

Lowe, G. F., C. E. Berg, & C. S. Nissen. 'Size Matters for TV Broadcasting Policy'. In G. F. Lowe & C. S. Nissen (eds.), *Small Among Giants. Television Broadcasting in Smaller Countries*. Gothenburg: Nordicom, 2011.

Maas, M. 'The Elusive Definition of the Small State'. *International Politics* 46(1) (2009): 65-83.

May, S. *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism, and the Politics of Language* (2nd ed.). Abingdale, Oxon, UK: Routledge, 2012.

McGonagle, T. *Minority Rights, Freedom of Expression and the Media: Dynamics and Dilemmas*. Antwerp: Intersentia, 2011.

_____ . 'The Council of Europe's Standards on Access to the Media for Minorities: A Tale of Near Misses and Staggard Successes'. In M. Amos, J. Harrison & L. Woods (eds.),

Freedom of Expression and the Media. Leiden; Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2012.

Meier, W., & Trappel, J. 'Small States in the Shadow of Giants'. In K. Siune & T. Wolfgang (eds.), *Dynamics of Media Politics: Broadcast and Electronic Media in Western Europe*. London: Sage Publications, 1991.

Moring, T. 'Functional Completeness in Minority Language Media'. In M. J. Cormack & N. Hourigan (eds.), *Minority Language Media: Concepts, Critiques and Case Studies*. Clevedon; Buffalo: Multilingual Matters, 2007.

_____ . & R. Dunbar. *The European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages and the Media*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2008.

_____ . & Godenhjelm, S. 'Broadcasting for Minorities in Big and Small Countries'. In G. F. Lowe & C. S. Nissen (eds.), *Small Among Giants. Television Broadcasting in Smaller Countries*. Gothenburg: Nordicom, 2011.

Nahtigal, N. 'Ethnic Minorities and the Media'. In B. Petrović (ed.), *Media Preferences and Perceptions: A Survey among Students, Ethnic Minorities and Politicians in Sovenia*. Ljubljana: Peace Institute of Ljubljana, 2009.

Ortakovski, V. *Minorities in the Balkans*. Ardsley, NY: Transnational Publishers, 2000.

OSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. *Guidelines on the Use of Minority Languages in the Broadcast Media*. 2003.

Picard, R. G. *The Economics and Financing of Media Companies* (1st ed.). New York: Fordham University Press, 2002.

Picard, R. G. 'Broadcast Economics, Challenges of Scale, and Country Size'. In G. F. Lowe & C. S. Nissen (eds.), *Small Among Giants. Television Broadcasting in Smaller Countries*. Gothenburg: Nordicom, 2011.

Puppis, M. 'Media Regulation in Small States'. *International Communication Gazette,* 71(1-2) (2009): 7-17.

Republic of Macedonia. Закон за Радиодифузната Дејност (The Law on Broadcasting Activity), 2005.

Republic of Slovenia. Zakon o Radiotelevizija Slovenia (Radio and Television Corporation Act of Slovenia), 2005.

RTV Slovenia. 'Radio Television Slovenia in Word and Image'. Ljubljana: RTV Slovenia, 2011.

Saracini, P., S. Trpevska, B. Petkovska, Z. Trajkovska, M. Tuneva, & V. Nikodinoska. Состојбата со Медиумите на Јазиците на Заедниците во Република Македонија *(The Situation of Media in the Languages of the Communities of the Republic of Macedonia)*. Skopje: The Macedonian Institute for the Media & the Higher School of Journalism and Public Relations, 2012.

Siegert, G. 'The Role of Small Countries in Media Competition in Europe'. In J. Heinrich & G.G. Kopper (eds) *Media Economics in Europe*. Berlin: Vistas, 2006.

State Statistical Office of the Republic of Macedonia. Usage of information and communication technologies by households and individuals'. *Information Society*. 31 October 2012. Retrieved, from http://www.stat.gov.mk/PrikaziSoopstenie_en.aspx?rbrtxt=77.

Thorallsson, B., & A. Wivel. 'Small States in the European Union: What Do We Know and What Would We Like to Know'. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 19(4) (2006): 651-668.

Trappel, J. 'Born Losers or Flexible Adjustment? The Media Policy Dilemma of Small States'. *European Journal of Communication* 6(3) (1991): 355-371.

Zemon, R. *The History of the Balkan Egyptians* Strasbourg: Council of Europe Retrieved from: http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/ibp/source/FS_1_10.5.pdf.