



Leicester
City Council

WARDS AFFECTED
All Wards

FORWARD TIMETABLE OF CONSULTATION AND MEETINGS:

Cabinet

8th December 2008

Assessing Community Cohesion – Young People

Report of the Director of Partnership, Performance & Policy

1. Purpose of Report
 - 1.1. This report presents the main findings of a project to assess community cohesion amongst a selected sample of young people in the city. Cabinet are asked to discuss the findings of the research, agree to link future research with the resident's survey, request the Children & Young People's Services to take into account the findings with the Children Services Plan, commission the Mainstream Moderation Forum and the Community Cohesion Executive to consider the information within their work programmes.
2. Summary
 - 2.1. Cabinet at its meeting on 12th March 2007 agreed the use of the Community Cohesion Assessment Instrument to assess cohesion in Leicester. Cabinet received a report in September, which outlined the findings of the research carried with the adult population in ten Super Output Areas (SOAs) across the city. There was a subsequent request asking that the research also be carried out amongst young people and to include representation of Muslim young people.
 - 2.2. Young people were asked questions on levels of participation, community effect, trust, social networks, diversity, sense of belonging and reciprocity. In total, 541 young people participated in the research through on line surveys and focus group discussions.
 - 2.3. The key messages from the research are:
 - 2.4. Overall, young people in our discussion groups saw diversity as something positive.
 - 2.5. 67% of young people (adults 60%) agreed that their neighbourhood 'is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together'. 72% of "Asian/ Asian British and Black/Black British" young people agree with this compared to 58% of "White British" young people.

- 2.6. Many young people, especially those from the outer city estates referred to inter generational tensions. They felt targeted and misunderstood by adults and sometimes the police.
- 2.7. Young people have a strong (very strong and fairly strong) sense of belonging to 'England' 88% (adults 78%) and Leicester 87% (adults 77%) followed by their own neighbourhood 75% (adults 70%).
- 2.8. Over three quarter of young people 81% (adults 71%) find their neighbourhood to be a friendly place to live and 71% of young people feel that their neighbourhood is a place where people look after each other. More Muslim young people have a positive feeling about the neighbourliness in their area.
- 2.9. 68% of young people (adults 53%) feel that they can influence decisions that affect their area when working with others in the neighbourhood.
- 2.10. 65% of all respondents (adults 36%) had given unpaid help (informal volunteering) in the last twelve months (at least once a week or once a month).
- 2.11. The level of formal volunteering of young people was higher than that of the adults with 16% of young people saying they had never given unpaid help to any groups, clubs or organisations compared to 44% of adults.

3. Recommendations

- 3.1. Cabinet is recommended to:
 - i) Discuss the overall encouraging findings, certain challenges and implications as detailed in paras.4.7 to para. 4.50.
 - ii) Agree that future research and consultation is embedded into the residents' survey.
 - iii) Request the Children & Young People's Services to take into account the findings within the Children & Young People's Plan (2009).
 - iv) Commission the Mainstream Moderation Forum to consider the findings within their work programme and the Community Cohesion Executive to consider the findings in their action plan to develop the community cohesion strategy. This will include:
 - a) Acknowledging that the socio-economic well-being of young people and their communities is a pre-requisite for cohesion:
 - Recognise that investment in the neighbourhood leads to a stronger sense of pride, belonging and neighbourliness.
 - Take into account the lack of financial capital many young people have.
 - Note that despite investing into regenerating neighbourhoods, young people might not be able to take full advantage of the services.
 - Acknowledge the perceived competition for resources and educational opportunities especially felt by young white people from deprived areas.

- b) Cohesion work should continue to build on the strong sense of belonging to Leicester. This work should celebrate the positive findings of this research by:
- Ensuring that the 'One Leicester' Strategy builds on young people's experiences and reflects their needs.
 - Engage young people in shaping the future direction of this strategy.
 - Ensure that the 'One Leicester' Strategy whilst nurturing a strong sense of belonging to Leicester also encourages young people to look beyond Leicester.
- c) Strategies must continue to strengthen connection and co-operation between young people and their communities who might otherwise not have the opportunity to interact i.e.
- Strengthen initiatives for creating bridges between different areas (postcodes), neighbourhoods, schools, colleges and communities of identity and interests thus enhancing bridging social capital.
 - Develop a programme of intergenerational work.
 - Strengthen integrated youth services within the city bringing together the different institutions and organisations, which work with young people, including voluntary sector providers.
 - Develop ways of communication and dissemination of information to and between communities that is relevant and accessible to young people.
 - Explore and implement ways to counter institutionalised and intergenerational stereotypes and distrust of young people especially in the more deprived areas of Leicester.
 - Counteract the dominant view of young people as problems and build on the positive findings of this research.
 - Arrange activities where young people from different communities and neighbourhoods can celebrate their pride in the city.
 - Celebrate with young people the different dimensions of diversity and explore the positive outcomes of it as highlighted by the young people themselves in this research.
- d) Continue to invest in structures and routes to enable young people to influence the decisions that affect them i.e.
- Build and explore further on the positive findings of this research in how young people feel that they can influence decisions by working together.
 - Develop processes for young people who traditionally do not engage especially young people who identify as NEET.

- Address the need for young people from all diverse backgrounds have a say in local and citywide decision-making.

4. Report

- 4.1. Leicester now has a national and international reputation for community cohesion. It has a history of good practice for community relations and has invested with partners to develop multi agency initiatives at a local level to sustain integration and cohesion. One of these initiatives is the innovative and experimental Community Cohesion Assessment Instrument, which Leicester City Council developed with the Centre for Social Action at De Montfort University to explore the nature of community cohesion in selected areas of Leicester and to collect baseline information. This project is based on an understanding that community cohesion is a key aspect of sustainable communities. It concerns the social health and well-being of communities: what makes an area 'a good place to live' which is as vital to a vibrant community as economic and environmental success and good quality public services.

Assessing Community Cohesion

- 4.2. The initial scope of the project was to consult with the adult population in ten Super Output Areas (SOAs). The scope of the project was later broadened to include separate consultation with young people (14 -16 year olds). This is the report on its findings.
- 4.3. The research strategy was based on a 'non-probability' sampling. This type of sampling does not seek to access a representative, cross-section of people in the whole population but accesses a focused and "hand picked sample" which contributes better to the exploration of the subject as specified by the contract brief. As such the selection was not a random selection but a 'purposive' sampling. The process also took into account the data already gathered from the adult population and knowledge of the research topic (i.e. cohesion) and gave careful consideration as who would most likely provide the best information. As such, some relevant questions were asked:

Who are there groups that are important for this research?

Are there any groups, which traditionally are left out, or have difficulties in participating in research?

Consideration also had to be given to resources and time. As such the sampling had to be restricted to specific areas and access negotiated within a limited period of time.

- 4.4. The online surveys were available from February 2008 until May 2008. The focus groups began in March 2008 and were completed by May 2008. They provided an opportunity to examine specific findings through targeted in-depth discussion. More information is provided in Appendix 1 (research methodology) and Appendix 2 (research questionnaire) and Appendix 3 (map to show the schools and groups that participated in the research).
- 4.5. The analysis of results shows trends and patterns, by revealing participants' perceptions and feelings, illustrating the state of community cohesion. It also highlights areas where cohesion is weak and/or absent.

- 4.6. In the young people research it was not possible to assess how levels of deprivation relate to cohesion. However the location of schools involved in the survey gave us some ideas about the make up of the areas. The outcomes seem to have a strong similarity with the adult survey in which several cohesion indicators were directly related to levels of deprivation. In the youth survey this is the case with the perception of the neighbourhood:

| |
|--|
| Neighbourhood is a friendly place to live. |
| Overall the neighbourhood is a good place to live. |
| I like to live where people are different to me |
| Generally speaking, most people can be trusted. |
| ...people in neighbourhood who can be trusted. |

MAIN FINDINGS

- 4.7. The following outlines the main findings of the research and the implications.

Diversity in Leicester

- 4.8. 67% of young people (adults 60%) agree that their neighbourhood 'is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together'. 72% of "Asian/ Asian British and Black/Black British" young people agree with this compared to 58% of "White British" young people. More young people with a declared religious affiliation (75%) agreed with the statement than those who do not have a religious affiliation (57%).
- 4.9. 52% of young people "like to live where people are different to them". Neither Ethnicity nor the belonging to a religion is a significant indicator for different responses in this question.
- 4.10. Generally, diversity was seen as something positive by young people in the discussion groups. It was not just about learning from different cultures but also about opportunities in life and the ability to interact with people from different backgrounds. Schools, youth groups, community and religious organisations seem to play an important role in fostering positive perceptions, openness and willingness to interact with diverse groups.
- 4.11. Many young people, especially those from the outer city estates referred to inter generational tensions. They felt targeted and misunderstood by adults and sometimes the police.
- 4.12. Ethnicity and ethnic differences were not identified by young people as 'a big issue' when socialising with other young people. However some young people also identified that there is racism in some areas and people from ethnic minorities 'get picked on'.
- 4.13. Not interacting with other cultures was more about young people not mixing or not speaking the same language and being cliquey in schools. Some young people from the new communities were singled out as groups of young people who do not tend to mix.

- 4.14. There was a difference in attitudes between young people from inner city areas and from outer city areas in our discussion groups. Diversity was generally perceived as more positive in the inner city areas and not so much in the outer. Young people from ethnic minorities also tended to have a more positive view on ethnic, cultural and religious diversity than white young people from the outer city estates.

Implications

- 4.15. Young people see diversity issues in a quite different way than adults. Generally young people see it as a positive part of their life and something they just get on with. As such it is important to acknowledge that community cohesion has different dimensions and aspects for young people.
- 4.16. Many young people in the more deprived outer city areas of Leicester feel that they are being targeted by adults or the police. Intergenerational prejudices lead to tensions and clashes, which become in some areas the major diversity issue from a young people's perspective.

Sense of Belonging

- 4.17. In the pilot study young people felt that asking for sense of belonging to Great Britain was confusing and that this question should be left out.
- 4.18. Young people have a strong (very strong and fairly strong) sense of belonging to 'England' 88% (adults 78%) and Leicester 87% (adults 77%) followed by their own neighbourhood 75% (adults 70%).
- 4.19. There were no significant differences between different ethnic or religious groups.
- 4.20. Some young people in the focus groups identified stronger with their postcode than with their neighbourhood or the area. They felt that by using the postcode they won't be stigmatised as much as if they would use the name of the ward or neighbourhood.
- 4.21. Young people have generally strong sense of belonging to the neighbourhood where they live and dismiss other areas sometimes having strong negative views about them and the people who live in them.

Implications

- 4.22. The strong identification of young people to Leicester and to their neighbourhood is an important finding. However this strong sense of belonging also brings with it rivalries between some groups of young people. These rivalries should not be overstated and are seen by young people as being promoted by a minority of youth gangs.
- 4.23. The strong identification with postcodes seems to be an important element of young people's sense of belonging and identification. This ought to be acknowledged and built into the 'One Leicester' strategy.

Communities

- 4.24. Not many young people talk about community rather they talk about their friends and the school. Many of them do not relate to their neighbours but see that their parents do.

- 4.25. Many young people felt a strong affiliation to religious and cultural communities, which seem to enhance their experience of cohesion and well-being. Other young people identify with their area, postcode or street. The different identifications can cause friction and tensions between groups.
- 4.26. In line with the findings of our research with adults, the research with young people suggests that communities of identity (i.e. religious and cultural) can build resilience to the negative effect deprivation has on community cohesion. 71% of young people felt that their neighbourhood is a place where people look after each other. More young people with a declared religious identity (80%) than people with no religious identity (57%) agree with this statement.

Implications

- 4.27. In Leicester, young people identify with an array of different communities. As with the adult research, in terms of communities of identity (i.e. religious and cultural), which are strongly represented in neighbourhoods, it was found that young people can build resilience to the negative effect deprivation has on community cohesion.
- 4.28. Whilst strong community spirit and belonging is important it has to be recognised that for young people cohesion is not only about bonding but also about creating bridging networks which give access to resources and opportunities.

Perception of the Neighbourhood and Neighbourliness

- 4.29. Over three quarter of young people 81% (adults 71%) find their neighbourhood to be a friendly place to live. 93% of Muslim young people compared to 79% out the rest of the young people who disclosed their religion agreed with this statement.
- 4.30. 71% of young people feel that their neighbourhood is a place where people look after each other. 81% of Muslim young people compared to 70% of the rest of the young people who disclosed their religion agreed with this statement.
- 4.31. Only 4% of young people think that their neighbourhood is a bad or very bad place to live; 31% think it is 'ok' and 65% think it is a good or very good place to live. 77% of Muslim young people compared with 61% of the rest of the young people who disclosed their religion agreed with this statement. This overall positive attitude towards the neighbourhood was also reflected in our focus groups.
- 4.32. In the discussion groups, young people referred to good or bad areas in terms of what is there to do, or not to do. This was especially noticeable in some of the more deprived areas and for young people who socialise more on a neighbourhood and street level than on other levels (religious groups, cultural groups, school and college).
- 4.33. Many young people in our discussion groups were also proud of their areas. Investment into and regeneration of deprived areas had a positive effect on young people's perceptions and neighbourliness. However young people were more critical about some of the improvements because of accessibility especially if they felt that they could not afford those services.
- 4.34. In terms of community cohesion, some young people identify more with the street and their neighbourhood and others with their school, college or religious group and

place of worship. There was a strong feeling of some young people to be targeted and 'kicked around' unjustly by adults and the police when they were socialising on the streets. Young people feel judged because of other young people and older gangs causing problems.

- 4.35. Negative issues identified by young people in their neighbourhoods are drug problems, drinking, gangs and troubles caused by other young people of other areas. This was especially the case for young people from outer city areas.

Implications

- 4.36. These findings are of importance since they suggest that the young people of this research have a stronger sense of belonging to their neighbourhood and a sense of neighbourliness than adults. An encouraging finding, which should be acknowledged and celebrated.
- 4.37. Following the brief to focus especially on Muslim young people, the strong neighbourliness felt by this group is of importance and an encouraging finding.
- 4.38. As with the adult research, young people also highlight that lack of resources and opportunities have a negative impact on perceptions of neighbourhood and neighbourliness. Good infrastructures and good access to services, diverse leisure activities and youth and community facilities are all seen by young people as vital for a good community spirit and for community cohesion to flourish.
- 4.39. Structural forces have an impact on the groups causing them to 'close ranks' when confronted with the perceived threat from outsiders. These groups of young people tend to be more 'inward looking', neighbourhood based and tightly bonded thus they might be perceived by outsiders as gangs. Because of conflicts arising between different sections within the community and bearing in mind that teenagers are often marginalized and excluded from the mainstream this might impact upon young people's ability to harness bridging and linking networks which are important for nurturing community cohesion.

Trust

- 4.40. 33% of young people (adults 22%) in Leicester said that most people in our society could be trusted. 30% of Muslim young people compared to 46% of all other young people who disclosed their religion agreed with this statement.
- 4.41. 26% of young people (adults 23%) in Leicester said that many of the people in their neighbourhood could be trusted.
- 4.42. However in another question, which explored if young people felt that most people who lived in their neighbourhood trusted one another, 57% of young people (adults 47%) agreed with this statement. The strongest group to agree with this statement are Muslim young people (69% agree with this statement).

Implications

- 4.43. Trust and trusting relationship with other people in society is fundamental for community cohesion to flourish. As such it can be argued that without the general trust that people have in each other, society itself would disintegrate. As with the findings around neighbourliness and neighbourhood perceptions the finding in the

youth research around trust is encouraging. Generally young people are more trusting in society and in their neighbourhoods than adults. However trust is also fragile and can be broken or destroyed. Adults and governments have a strong responsibility in not destroying this important aspect of community cohesion and social relationships. As such adults should also ask themselves a vital question: 'Do we trust young people?'

- 4.44. Whilst Muslim young people have a strong trust in other people from their neighbourhoods, it has to be noted that they have a lower sense of trust in the society as a whole. To explore the causes of this has not been the remit of this research: we might speculate that it points to the recent sense of 'being targeted' by the media and general government policy. Further exploration is needed.

Sense of Power, Investment and Participation

- 4.45. 33% of young people (adults 27%) definitely or tended to agree that they can influence decisions that affect their area on their own. 68% of young people (adults 53%) feel that they can influence decisions that affect their area when working with others in the neighbourhood.
- 4.46. 65% of all respondents (adults 36%) had given unpaid help (informal volunteering) in the last twelve months (at least once a week or once a month). This was higher amongst female (74%) than male (57%) young people.
- 4.47. The level of formal volunteering of young people (including Muslim young people) was higher than that of the adults with only 16% of all young people in the research saying they had never given unpaid help to any groups, clubs or organisations compared to 44% of adults.

Implications

- 4.48. It seems that young people invest in their communities and neighbourhoods more than adults. It is important to highlight this positive finding and build on it.
- 4.49. However it also has to be recognised that there is a big difference between female and male young people in terms of informal volunteering.
- 4.50. The strong sense amongst young people that community action can change things in the community is an important finding and it might be an indicator that investment through work with young people is paying off. This should be further nurtured by encouraging high levels of youth participation in Leicester's cohesion strategy.

5. FINANCIAL AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1. Financial Implications

The 2008/09 revenue budget includes the sum of £206,900 for Community Cohesion. This is a recurrent budget, and is available for projects that enhance cohesion within the City by bringing communities together (Andy Morley, Chief Accountant, Ext. 29 7404).

5.2. Legal Implications

The report's recommendations are in line with the authority's powers and obligations under the Race Relations Act 2000, Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and Local Government Act 2000 (Peter Nicholls, Head of Legal Services, Ext. 29 6302).

5.3. Other Implications

| OTHER IMPLICATIONS | YES/NO | Paragraph References Within Supporting information |
|-------------------------------|--------|---|
| Equal Opportunities | Y | |
| Policy | Y | |
| Sustainable and Environmental | | |
| Crime and Disorder | | |
| Human Rights Act | Y | |
| Elderly/People on Low Income | | |

6. Background Papers

I&DeA report: Taking Forward Community Cohesion in Leicester (2002/03)
 The Community Cohesion Strategy for Leicester (2007)
 Social Capital & Stronger Communities in Leicestershire (May 2007)
 The Diversity of Leicester – A Demographic Profile (2008)

7. Consultations

Corporate Directors Board – 14th October 2008
 Chino Cabon (Critical Friend to the Project) - The Race Equality Centre
 Jo Dooher (Critical Friend to the Project) - Audit Commission
 Penny Hajek - Children & Young People’s Services
 Mainstream Moderation Group
 Community Cohesion Executive Group

8. Report Authors

Carine Cardoza
 Project Lead Officer
 Partnership Executive Team
 Leicester City Council
 Tel: 252 6089

Thilo Boeck
 Senior Research Fellow
 Centre for Social Action
 De Montfort University
 Tel: 257 7879

carine.cardoza@leicester.gov.uk

tgboeck@dmu.ac.uk

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Key Decision | No |
| Reason | N/A |
| Appeared in Forward Plan | N/A |
| Executive or Council Decision | Executive (Cabinet) |

Research Methodology

The initial scope of the project was to consult with 500 young people within the City aged between 14-16. The brief was later extended to include representation from Muslim young people.

A two-stage strategy for contacting young people for this project was used using an online survey and then in-depth focus groups to gather more qualitative data.

The on-line survey was designed using a steering group of young people from the Active Citizenship Encouragement (ACE) Project on 6th February 2008. The young people made valuable recommendations concerning the content of the survey, presentation and the wording of some of the questions and, with their help, the site was launched two weeks later.

Sessions within Schools

An interactive session on community cohesion was developed to fit in with the citizenship curriculum during which students could complete the questionnaire. This session was offered to all schools in the City through Heads of Citizenship. Due to restrictions of time (the target age group of 14-16 year olds were involved in revision for end of term examinations by the time the youth consultation began in earnest), Three schools came forward and hosted sessions: Fulhurst Community College, the Darul Ulloom School and Crown Hills. Rushey Mead and New College, however, agreed to promote the questionnaires to their students.

In order to widen the scope of the research to students from other schools within the City, over 60 youth groups were contacted working within each of the ten LSOA's identified for the adult research. Groups were identified from Voluntary Action Leicester's (VAL) Groups Database and encouraged to complete the survey. Facilitators within the groups were either given the information to deliver the questionnaires themselves or, in some cases, VAL staff held drop in sessions at computer suites within schools and community venues.

In order not to exclude those groups without access to a computer, paper copies of the questionnaire were made available to young people and the results entered manually into the database by VAL staff. In some cases there was such an enthusiasm to complete forms that the VAL research team needed to return with further surveys to satisfy demand.

Groups who facilitated questionnaires with young people:

- Moat Community College
- Streetvibe Braunstone
- Hope Hamilton Youth Group
- Stocking Farm Youth Centre
- New College
- Inspired Residents Youth Group
- Fulhurst College
- Rushey Mead School
- Build Community Development
- Kirby Frith Residents Association
- Darul Ulloom School
- Crown Hill School

- St Albans Church
- New Parks Youth Centre
- Knighton Scouts
- Chaos Enterprises

Facilitated sessions were held at Crown Hills and Fulhurst College by members of VAL staff while, in others, young people completed the survey independently. In addition to an incentive of £5 per completed questionnaire each entrant was guaranteed an entry into an online prize draw. The draw took place once the research was completed and a Play station 3 console eventually presented in assembly at Crown Hills School on 16th June 2008.

Focus groups formed the second stage of the consultation. The process closely followed the methodology used in the adult research. Groups within each of the ten SOA's with specific responsibility for young people were offered £200 to hold a focus group. Groups were selected using VAL's database of groups within the wards whose primary focus had been identified as 'youth'. Each focus group contained between 6-8 young people and were facilitated by Thilo Boeck of the Centre for Social Action, De Montfort University. The focus groups lasted approximately forty-five minutes and were designed to examine specific findings through targeted in-depth discussion.

Focus groups of young people were held at:

- Hope Hamilton Church Youth Group - Hamilton
- New Parks Youth Club – New Parks
- Streetvibe - Braunstone
- The Green Team - Moat Community College –Spinney Hills
- Inspired Youth Project – Beaumont Leys
- Shubaan - Highfields Centre - Spinney Hills
- Shree Sanatan – Rushey Mead Pavilion

Groups holding focus groups were encouraged to advertise the research to a wider audience of young people within the area. Although the average number of participants for each group was 8 in some groups numbers were much larger in others. For instance, in Braunstone 15 young people attended the focus group session.

As well as being a useful source of information for the research itself the focus groups provided a number of softer outcomes:

- A number of community groups were enabled to take part in and gain the experience and confidence to run focus groups around young peoples' voice.
- Youth leaders, in particular, received an informal master class in focus-group facilitation skills.
- Young people themselves gained confidence and skills from hearing themselves and others, voice their views, making a valuable input to inform public policy.

Appendix 2

School

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|-------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Rushey Mead | 54 | 11.7 |
| | Darul-Ulloom | 36 | 7.8 |
| | Crown Hills Community College | 126 | 27.3 |
| | Fullhurst Community College | 121 | 26.2 |
| | Moat Community College | 28 | 6.1 |
| | New College Leicester | 33 | 7.1 |
| | All Other | 64 | 13.9 |
| | Total | 462 | 100.0 |

Ethnicity

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | White British | 144 | 30.7 |
| | Asian and Asian British | 246 | 52.5 |
| | Black and Black British | 38 | 8.1 |
| | All Other | 41 | 8.7 |
| | Total | 469 | 100.0 |

Religion

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|-------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | No religion | 83 | 23.2 |
| | Muslim | 186 | 52.0 |
| | Hindu | 68 | 19.0 |
| | All other | 21 | 5.9 |
| | Total | 358 | 100.0 |

Gender

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|--------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Male | 265 | 56.3 |
| | Female | 206 | 43.7 |
| | Total | 471 | 100.0 |

Do you consider yourself disabled?

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | No | 457 | 97.6 |
| | Yes | 11 | 2.4 |
| | Total | 468 | 100.0 |

How strongly do you feel you belong to your neighbourhood?

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|---------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Very/fairly Strongly | 353 | 75.4 |
| | Not very/ at all Strongly | 80 | 17.1 |
| | Don't know | 35 | 7.5 |
| | Total | 468 | 100.0 |

How strongly do you feel you belong to Leicester?

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|---------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Very/ fairly Strongly | 410 | 86.7 |
| | Not very/ at all Strongly | 46 | 9.7 |
| | Don't know | 17 | 3.6 |
| | Total | 473 | 100.0 |

How strongly do you feel you belong to England?

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|---------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Very/ fairly Strongly | 417 | 88.2 |
| | Not very/ at all Strongly | 44 | 9.3 |
| | Don't know | 12 | 2.5 |
| | Total | 473 | 100.0 |

My neighbourhood is a friendly place to live

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Agree | 377 | 80.7 |
| | Disagree | 68 | 14.6 |
| | Don't know | 22 | 4.7 |
| | Total | 467 | 100.0 |

Most people who live in my neighbourhood trust one another

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Agree | 265 | 56.7 |
| | Disagree | 159 | 34.0 |
| | Don't know | 43 | 9.2 |
| | Total | 467 | 100.0 |

I would be happy asking neighbours to look after my belongings

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Agree | 265 | 56.7 |
| | Disagree | 151 | 32.3 |
| | Don't know | 51 | 10.9 |
| | Total | 467 | 100.0 |

So overall, what do you currently think of your neighbourhood as a place to live?

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Very good | 136 | 28.9 |
| | Good | 173 | 36.7 |
| | Okay | 144 | 30.6 |
| | Bad | 9 | 1.9 |
| | Very bad | 9 | 1.9 |
| | Total | 471 | 100.0 |

"Your neighbourhood is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together"

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Agree | 312 | 67.1 |
| | Disagree | 72 | 15.5 |
| | Don't Know | 81 | 17.4 |
| | Total | 465 | 100.0 |

"I like to live where people are different to me"

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Agree | 243 | 51.8 |
| | Disagree | 100 | 21.3 |
| | Don't know | 126 | 26.9 |
| | Total | 469 | 100.0 |

Generally speaking, would you say that in our society...

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|---|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | most people can be trusted | 145 | 33.3 |
| | some people can be trusted | 225 | 51.7 |
| | you can't be too careful in dealing with people | 65 | 14.9 |
| | Total | 435 | 100.0 |

How many people in your neighbourhood can be trusted?

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|-------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Many | 113 | 25.7 |
| | Some | 210 | 47.7 |
| | A few | 103 | 23.4 |
| | None | 14 | 3.2 |
| | Total | 440 | 100.0 |

On average how many times do you help friends, neighbours, school or anyone else except relatives?

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | At least once a week | 200 | 45.7 |
| | At least once a month | 85 | 19.4 |
| | At least once every three months | 52 | 11.9 |
| | Less often | 75 | 17.1 |
| | Never | 26 | 5.9 |
| | Total | 438 | 100.0 |

In the last 12 months, how often have you volunteered to help in any groups, clubs, organisations or your school?

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|----------------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | 2 hours or more a week | 116 | 25.1 |
| | At least once a month | 105 | 22.7 |
| | At least once every three months | 65 | 14.0 |
| | Less often | 102 | 22.0 |
| | Never | 75 | 16.2 |
| | Total | 463 | 100.0 |

I can change things in my neighbourhood on my own.

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|---------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Definitely agree | 35 | 7.6 |
| | Tend to agree | 118 | 25.5 |
| | Tend to disagree | 120 | 25.9 |
| | Definitely disagree | 101 | 21.8 |
| | Don't know | 83 | 17.9 |
| | Neither | 6 | 1.3 |
| | Total | 463 | 100.0 |

I can change things in my neighbourhood when working with others.

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|---------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | Definitely agree | 105 | 23.4 |
| | Tend to agree | 198 | 44.2 |
| | Neither | 45 | 10.0 |
| | Tend to disagree | 18 | 4.0 |
| | Definitely disagree | 13 | 2.9 |
| | Don't know | 69 | 15.4 |
| | Total | 448 | 100.0 |

How safe do you feel in your neighbourhood?

| | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
|-------|-------------|-----------|---------------|
| Valid | safe | 211 | 49.2 |
| | fairly safe | 200 | 46.6 |
| | unsafe | 18 | 4.2 |
| | Total | 429 | 100.0 |

Map to show the schools that participated in the on-line survey
and the focus groups held across the city

(The number within each ward represents the number of participants that took part in the focus groups in that area)



