MEMBERSHIP SURVEY FINDINGS

BACKGROUND of ORGANISATION

1. How would you describe the make up of your area?

(a) Politically (e.g. mainly unionist/nationalist or mixed)?

> Of 25 respondents 44% identified their community as mainly unionist, 24% as mainly nationalist and 32% as mixed. Of that 32% all but one group said they were mixed but segregated e.g. Duncairn or Springfield.

(b) Religiously (e.g. mainly catholic/protestant or mixed)?

> 44% of respondents identified their community as mainly protestant, 24% as mainly catholic and 32% as mixed. Of that 32% all but one group said they were mixed but segregated e.g. Duncairn or Springfield.

(c) Ethnically?

> 80% of respondents said there had been an increase in the ethnic minority populations within their community or across the city generally. Only 20% of respondents said there was no ethnic minority population in their area.

(d) Other (Please indicate)
> No respondents answered

2. Has your area changed in the last 20 years?

- Yes: 90% of respondents said their area had changed in the last 20 years.
- No: 10% of respondents said their area had not changed in the last 20 years.

(If yes, please outline how)
- The greatest change in areas was due to redevelopment with improved housing stock being identified by 52% of groups.
- Population decline as a feature of change was identified by 40% of groups.
- Increased anti social behaviour as a feature of change was identified by 40% of groups.

- The negative impact due to the decline of traditional industries was identified by 35% of groups.

■ ■

PART 1 – AUDIT of INTERFACE ISSUES

Interface Issues

3(a) How would you rate the attractiveness of the physical environment in interface areas throughout Belfast? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
The average level of attractiveness of the physical environment in interface areas across Belfast was 3.28

Themes:
- 52% of the groups commented on the physical blight of the interfaces.
- 60% of the groups commented on the interfaces physical condition being affected by statutory 'neglect' or 'abandonment'.

3(b) In the last ten years has the level of attractiveness of the physical environment in Belfast interface areas become:

1. much higher   0%
2. higher   16%
3. no change   28%
4. lower   36%
5. much lower   20%

Themes:
- Statutory neglect was again commented on by 35% of groups.
- A sense that no significant change had happened or would happen was prevalent amongst 35% of groups.

3(c) (Community groups only) How would you rate the attractiveness of the physical environment in your own interface area? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
Groups identified the average level of physical attractiveness in their own areas at 4.1.

Themes:
- 55% of groups commented on the unattractive visual nature of the physical structures at the interfaces and issues such as dereliction and debris.

- Statutory 'neglect' was again cited by 25% of groups in relation to their own area.

3(d) (Community groups only) In the last ten years has the level of attractiveness of the physical environment in your own interface area become:

1. much better   5%
2. better   35%
3. no change   25%
4. worse   20%
5. much worse   15%

Themes:
- 60% of groups reiterated their view of the levels of attractiveness being low and/ or unchanged.
- 20% commented on environmental initiatives which had increased levels of attractiveness.

4(a) How would you rate the level of social vibrancy in interface areas throughout Belfast? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
Groups identified the average level of social vibrancy in interface areas across the city at 4.3.

Themes:
- 20% of groups identified social vibrancy as being lessened by violence.
- 5% of groups identified it as being strengthened at times of violence.
- 15% of groups identified it as being inconsistent across the city.

4(b) In the last ten years has the level of social vibrancy in Belfast interface areas become:

1. much higher   0%
2. higher   30%
3. no change   30%
4. lower   30%
5. much lower   10%

Themes:
- 30% saw no significant change in the levels of social vibrancy across the city.
- 20% identified anti social behaviour as impacting negatively on the levels of social vibrancy across the city.

4(c) (Community groups only) How would you rate the level of social vibrancy in your own interface area? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
The groups identified the average level of social vibrancy in their own interface areas as 4.8.

Themes:
- 15% of groups identified population decline as negatively impacting upon levels of social vibrancy.
- 15% of groups identified a lack of youth services as negatively impacting upon levels of social vibrancy.
- 15% of groups identified improved housing as positively impacting upon levels of social vibrancy.

4(d) (Community groups only) In the last ten years has the level of social vibrancy in your own interface area become:

1. much better   10%
2. better   35%
3. no change   5%
4. worse   40%
5. much worse   10%

Themes:
- 20% of groups identified the inter-communal violence of 2002 as having negatively impacted upon social vibrancy in their area.
- 15% of groups reiterated that population decline had negatively impacted upon social vibrancy upon their area in the last ten years.

5(a) How would you rate the level of economic vibrancy in interface areas throughout Belfast? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
The groups identified the average level of economic vibrancy in interface areas throughout Belfast as 2.96.

Themes:
- 60% of groups identified a lack of economic investment in interface areas throughout Belfast.
- 20% of groups identified a decline in traditional industries throughout Belfast.

5(b) In the last ten years has the level of economic vibrancy in interface areas throughout Belfast become:

1. Much better   0%
2. Better   8%
3. No change   48%
4. Worse   32%
5. Much worse   12%

Themes:
- 30% of groups said the level of economic vibrancy was always low.
- 20% of groups said it was difficult to invest in Belfast's interface areas.

5(c) (Community groups only) How would you rate the level of economic vibrancy in your own interface area? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
The groups identified the average level of economic vibrancy in their own interface areas as 3.2.

Themes:
- 30% of groups said there was 'no' economic activity in their area.
- 30% of groups said their area had received economic investment.

5(d) (Community groups only) In the last ten years has the level of economic vibrancy in your own interface become:

1. much lower   30%
2. lower   25%
3. no change   20%
4. higher   25%
5. much higher   0%

Themes:
- 25% of groups identified the decline in traditional industries as negatively impacting on economic activity in their area.
- 25% of groups identified a lack of economic investment in their area.
- 15% of groups said employment and economic vibrancy had improved in their area.

6(a) To what extent has the catholic/nationalist community in Belfast come to terms with the legacies of the past? (where 10 is very much so and 1 is not at all):

Results:
The groups identified the average extent to which the catholic/nationalist community in Belfast had come to terms with the legacies of the past as 4.56.

- 40% of groups identified the catholic/ nationalist community as having 'better' leadership than the protestant/unionist community in helping it to come to terms with the legacies of the past.
- 35% of groups said that the legacies of the past were not being addressed in catholic/nationalist communities.

6(b) To what extent has the protestant/unionist community in Belfast come to terms with the legacies of the past? (where 10 is very much so and 1 is not at all):

Results:
The groups identified the average extent to which the protestant/unionist community had come to terms with the legacies of the past as 3.33.

Themes:
- 64% of groups identified the leadership of unionism as being less able to deal with the legacies of the past.
- 25% of groups identified protestant/unionist communities as being less able to deal with the legacies of the past as they had not acknowledged their role in the past.

6(c) (Community groups only) How would you rate the extent to which the catholic/nationalist community in your own interface area has come to terms with the legacies of the past?(where 10 are very much so and 1 is not at all):

Results:
The groups identified the average extent to which the catholic/nationalist community in their own interface area had come to terms with the legacies of the past as 3.95.

Themes:
- 30% of groups said violence at their own interface had worsened thus the legacies of the past were not being dealt with by any group.
- 20% of groups said issues such as policing and parades had to be resolved in order to move on from the past for the catholic/nationalist community.

6(d) (Community groups only) How would you rate the extent to which the protestant/unionist community in your own interface area has come to terms with the legacies of the past? (where 10 is very much so and 1 is not at all):

Results:
The groups identified the average extent to which the protestant/unionist community in their own interface community had come to terms with the legacies as 2.68.

Themes:
There were no statistically dominant themes but a very wide range of responses:
- Internal divisions and feuds within protestant/ unionist communities have prevented dealing with the past.
- Lack of leadership has prevented dealing with the past.
- In some protestant/unionist areas communities have come to terms with the legacies of the past more so than in other areas.

7(a) How would you rate the level of freedom of movement in accessing facilities and services between interface areas throughout Belfast? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
The groups identified the average level of freedom of movement in accessing facilities and services between interface areas throughout Belfast as 2.95.

Themes:
- 72% of groups identified issues around safety, fear and perceptions about safety as having a negative impact on how people move and access facilities and services between interface areas throughout Belfast.
- 15% of groups identified that the existence of walls, barriers and restrictions negatively impacted on freedom of movement in accessing facilities and services between interface areas throughout Belfast.

7(b) In the last ten years has the level of freedom of movement in accessing facilities and services in interface areas throughout Belfast become:

1.	much lower	4%
2.	lower	48%
3.	no change	32%
4.	higher	12%
5.	much higher	4%

Themes:
- 60% of groups again identified fear and safety issues as negatively impacting on freedom of movement over the last ten years.
- 30% of groups identified fluctuations in freedom of movement depending on circumstances e.g. For some areas levels of freedom of movement have fallen since the intercommunal violence of 2001/ 2002.

7(c) (Community groups only) How would you rate the level of freedom of movement in accessing facilities and services in your own interface area? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
The groups identified the average level of freedom of movement in accessing facilities and services in their own interface area as 2.95.

Themes:
- 55% of groups identified issues around safety and fear dominating levels of freedom of movement.
- 15% of groups identified restrictions on freedom of movement as an issue affecting young people in particular.

7(d) (Community groups only) In the last ten years has the level of freedom of movement in accessing facilities and services in your own interface area become:

1.	much higher	0%
2.	higher	15%
3.	no change	35%
4.	lower	40%
5.	much lower	10%

Themes:
- 60% of groups reiterated the negative impact of safety and fear issues on freedom of movement in accessing facilities and services in their own interface area.
- 15% of groups identified higher levels of access where local barriers had been opened thus improving freedom of movement e.g. Lanark/Springfield.

8(a) How would you rate the levels of intercommunity tension/intimidation/violence between the two main communities in Belfast? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
The groups identified the average levels of intercommunity tension/ intimidation/violence between the two main communities in Belfast as 5.6.

Themes:
- 28% of groups identified there being constant underlying levels of the above, but particularly tension, between the two main communities in Belfast.
- 52% of groups identified these levels as being inclined to rise depending on events and the time of year.

8(b) In the last ten years have the levels of intercommunity tension/intimidation/violence between the two main communities in Belfast become:

1. much lower   4%
2. lower   16%
3. no change   32%
4. higher   32%
5. much higher   16%

Themes:
- Many groups identified periods of fluctuation in the above levels over the last ten years.
- 20% of groups said the levels had worsened since 1994.
- 25% of groups said the levels of the above had improved since 1994.
- 45% of groups identified the levels as having worsened since the inter-communal violence of 2002.

8(c) (Community groups only) In your view how would you rate the levels of intercommunity tension/intimidation/violence in your own interface area? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
The groups identified the average level of intercommunity tension/intimidation/violence in their own area as 5.05.

Themes:
- 10% of groups identified the above levels as having improved in their own area.
- 65% of groups identified the time of year, particularly the summer parading/marching season, as the dominant influence on the above levels in their own community.

8(d) (Community groups only) In the last ten years have the levels of intercommunity tension/intimidation/violence between the two main communities in your own interface area become:

1. much better   10%
2. better   20%
3. no change   20%
4. worse   30%
5. much worse   20%

Comments:
- 15% of groups identified positive impacts upon the above levels as a result of dialogue initiatives in their interface area.
- 50% identified the negative impact upon the above levels resulting from the inter-communal violence of 2002 in their interface area.

- 20% identified the negative impact of the parades issue on the above levels in their interface area.

9. Views on Inter-community Dialogue

9(a). How would you rate the level of intercommunity dialogue between the two main communities in Belfast? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
The groups identified the average level of intercommunity dialogue between the two main communities in Belfast as 4.4.

Themes:
- 45% of groups identified locality and local conditions as significantly impacting on levels of dialogue in Belfast.
- 15% of groups identified confidentiality as an important factor in increasing levels of dialogue.

9(b) In the last ten years has the level of intercommunity dialogue between the two main communities in Belfast become:

1. much higher   4%
2. higher   56%
3. no change   16%
4. lower   16%
5. much lower   8%

Themes:
- 50% of groups identified the Peace Process as having positively impacted upon the levels of intercommunity dialogue over the last ten years in Belfast.
- 30% of groups said that levels of intercommunity dialogue are continuing to improve in Belfast.

9(c) (Community groups only) How would you rate the level of intercommunity dialogue between the two main communities in your own interface area? (where 10 is very high and 1 is very low):

Results:
The groups identified the average level of intercommunity dialogue between the two main communities in their own interface area as 4.15.

Themes:
- 55% of groups identified local conditions and issues as having a significant impact on levels of intercommunity dialogue.

- 45% of groups said there were new opportunities for intercommunity dialogue in their own interface area.

9(d) (Community groups only) In the last ten years has the level of intercommunity dialogue between the two main communities in your own interface area become:

1. much higher   15%
2. higher   35%
3. no change   5%
4. worse   35%
5. much lower   10%

Themes:
- 40% of groups identified the impact of violence in leading to higher levels of intercommunity dialogue in their own interface area in the last ten years, as there exists a desire to prevent further violence.
- 25% of groups identified the impact of violence leading to a breakdown in intercommunity dialogue over their own area in the last ten years, as the impact of violence had eroded trust and the confidence to engage in dialogue.

▪▪▪

PART 2 – MEMBERS' NEEDS

1. What support would you like from the Belfast Interface Project in relation to the following?

(a) Improving the attractiveness of the physical environment in interface areas.
- BIP should act as a 'voice' for the membership in lobbying government and the statutory agencies on their behalf. This was the clearest response from 48% of groups.
- A minority of groups felt this area was not part of BIP's remit.

(b) Improving social and economic vibrancy in interface areas.
- BIP to act as a lobbyist on behalf of its membership with government and statutory agencies was again the clear response from the groups with 48% identifying this as a role.
- A number of groups felt BIP could provide support in providing information on funding opportunities relating to the above.
- A small number of groups felt BIP could provide support for groups to form partnerships on social and economic issues in interface areas.

<u>(c) Addressing the legacies of the past.</u>
- Again 48% of groups felt BIP should act as the facilitators of such discussions or act as advisors to the groups on how to conduct the discussions.
- 32% of groups said that BIP should have a role in building discussion networks/partnerships amongst groups to address the legacies of the past.
- A small number of groups felt BIP should not facilitate such discussions and it was the responsibility of groups to proceed with this.
- Other suggestions were to use the news-sheet and website to raise issues about addressing the legacies of the past.

<u>(d) Improving freedom of movement in accessing facilities and services for people living in interface areas.</u>
- A large section of the membership felt that BIP could not provide support in this particular area.
- Members who felt that BIP could provide support in this area again identified BIP acting as a lobbyist body to government and the statutory agencies.
- One group suggested that BIP could provide support by providing information on statutory plans and policies on service provision.

<u>(e) Addressing intercommunity tension/intimidation/violence.</u>
- A large number of groups said BIP could provide support in this area as facilitators between groups and communities facing the above problems either in a preventative and relationship building capacity or when violence occurs.
- A large number of groups said BIP could help create dialogue projects in which they could participate to work on these issues.
- A number of groups said BIP could promote 'good practice' around training for groups on working with the above issues.

2. What type of information/features do you think would be useful in an 'Interface News-Sheet'?

- The first issue of the news sheet *Interface*, with the aim of promoting good practice was seen as a very positive step by many of the groups.
- Many groups suggested that features providing information on funding opportunities and sources would be very useful.
- Groups felt that information on government policy and strategy would be important to include.
- Features raising discussion on the 'legacies of the past' were cited by some groups as of potential benefit.

3. What type of resource or other information do you feel it would be useful to make available on a website for interface community groups?

Groups suggested the following items though with no clear preferences:

- Information on training programmes.
- Information on funding opportunities, sources and deadlines.
- Links to other groups' sites.
- Links to international sites e.g Palestine / Israel.
- A discussion forum.

4. Can you identify any themes that it would be useful to focus on for our annual membership conference?

The following were suggested, though it should be noted that many groups felt it was for BIP to decide the themes.
- Promotion of good practice.
- Issues around young people and the interfaces.
- Examining the roles and activities of the statutory agencies.
- Reflecting on the last 35 years/ conflict.

5(a) What do you think are the three main issues in relation to physical regeneration in interface areas facing your group/agency/organisation?

(i) Housing: nationalists emphasised issues concerning a need for increased quantity of social housing and unionists emphasised the need to improve the quality of housing stock.
(ii) Economic regeneration: groups identified the need for public and private investment to create employment within interface areas.
(iii) The role of statutory agencies: groups felt statutory agencies needed to 'take risks' in supporting regeneration projects in interface areas and accept that projects might not always work.

Can you identify any areas of good practice in relation to any of these?
- Responses on good practice on housing generally acknowledged that the stock was good but that areas, particularly nationalist ones, needed more.
- A number of groups viewed the Stewartstown Road Regeneration Project as an example of good practice in economic regeneration.
- Examples of good practice by the statutory agencies were not prevalent.

5(b) What do you think are the three main issues in relation to social and economic regeneration in interface areas facing your group/agency/organisation?

(i) Employment and training for communities. Groups felt that training needed to be relevant to the actual jobs that communities could access rather than generalised. It was suggested the private sector could work with groups around this issue.
(ii) More social housing. Again prevalent amongst nationalist groups but also cited by some unionist groups who felt that redevelopment can lead to fewer houses being built in those unionist areas.

(iii) Addressing low educational attainment. A broad concern for many groups but particularly in unionist areas.

Can you identify any areas of good practice in relation to any of these?
- The majority of groups said they could not identify any major examples of good practice in the above areas other than to repeat that housing stock was good but more was needed. Individual projects such as the Ashton Centre providing training were given as lone examples.

5(c) What do you think are the three main issues in relation to coming to terms with the legacies of the past, facing your group/agency/ organisation?
(i) The prevalence of sectarianism (and racism) in communities.
(ii) The lack of discussion about the legacies of the past.
(iii) The inability of people/groups/communities to think beyond themselves.

Can you identify any areas of good practice in relation to any of these?
- Very few examples of good practice were given. A small number of groups cited integrated schools in relation to (i) and (iii).
- 'The Other View' publication and Community Dialogue were suggested as forums promoting discussion in these areas.

5(d) What do you think are the three main issues in relation to freedom of movement in accessing facilities and services in interface areas facing your group/agency/organisation?

(i) Fear and safety.
(ii) Restricted physical access.
(iii) Changing behavioural patterns.

Can you identify any areas of good practice in relation to any of these?
- Most groups could not come up with examples of good practice in relation to the above.
- The Stewartstown Road Regeneration Project was cited by two groups.

5(e) What do you think are the three main issues in relation to tension/intimidation/violence facing your group/agency/organisation?

(i) Parades and the marching season.
(ii) Suspicion/ mistrust of the 'other'.
(iii) Attacks on homes.

Can you identify any areas of good practice in relation to any of these?
- Again very little good practice was identified by groups. Individual examples focused on mobile phone networks, local forums and bodies such as Springfield Inter Community Development Programme (now called Interaction Belfast) and the work of groups in Inner East Belfast to reduce

violence.

5(f) What are the three main other issues facing your group/agency/ organisation?

(i) Funding.
(ii) Anti social behaviour.
(iii) Staff stress and 'burnout'.

Can you identify any areas of good practice in relation to any of these?
• Groups could not identify examples of good practice in these areas.

6(a) Has youth led interface violence been a major issue for your community/ organisation?
• All but one group said yes it had been a major issue.

6(b) Is it still a major issue?
• For most groups it is still a major issue but for a quarter it has become less of an issue and for three groups it has ceased to be an issue.

6(c) How has your community/organisation addressed youth led interface violence in the past?
• The majority of groups have used diversionary projects, particularly in the summer, to reduce youth led interface violence. Additionally some have complemented these with longer term citizenship and single identity programmes and/ or participated in inter community projects for young people.
• At times of violence a number of groups have been involved in direct street interventions to stop young people engaging in violent activity.

6(d) Is there more that your community/organisation could do to address youth led interface violence?
• A majority said yes but they need more financial and personnel resources. A number of groups said there was nothing more they could do.

7(a) Has your organisation produced any reports/articles etc. that it may be useful to include in a bibliography of interface-related material?

The following publications were identified by groups:
• Ballynafeigh Community Relations Survey 1992-4. Ballynafeigh Community Development Agency, 1992.
• Leading From Behind. East Belfast Community Development Agency, 2002.

- Towards a Community Relations Strategy, Donegal Pass Community Forum, 2001.
- The Love, The Hurt, The War and The Peace. Forthspring Inter Community Group, 2002.
- Lagan Enclave A History of Conflict in the Short Strand 1886-1997. Ballymacarrett Research Group,1997.
- Lenadoon Community Forum 1992-2002. Lenadoon Community Forum, 2003.
- Beyond The Red Gauntlet. Anne Bill, 2003.

7(b). Are you aware of any other reports/articles etc. that it may be useful to include in a bibliography of interface-related material?

- Many groups cited the Island Pamphlets by Michael Hall as being useful material. Also mentioned were BIP's own publications, the North Belfast CDC publications and the Institute for Conflict Research website. The publication 'The Other View' and 'Building on Peace' by Co operation Ireland were also suggested.

8(a). Are you involved in work that builds capacity in intra community relations in your own community? (including ethnic minorities)

- All groups but one said yes.
- The one group who answered no said it was not in their remit.

The groups cited the following examples of capacity building work in intra community relations:
- Community Development and capacity building in protestant areas.
- Single identity work in citizenship, cultural identity and politics.
- Youth work training and peer education.
- Good relations/ citizenship training with local ethnic minority groups.
- Employing an ethnic minority Development worker.
- Personal and social capacity training
- Traveller support work.
- Race and cultural diversity training.
- Local and Irish history courses on a single identity basis.

What type of support do you find most useful?
The groups identified the following support as useful:
- Financial support eg. from Belfast Regeneration Office.
- Training from the Ulster Peoples College in community development and community relations.
- Education courses from the Workers Educational Association.
- Support from their own communities.
- The Equality Commission.

What other additional support do you need?

- Most groups cited additional funding support, increased staffing and training opportunities as desirable additional support.

What support might you need to provide this (if appropriate)?
N/A

8(b) Are you involved in work that builds capacity in terms of inter-community relations?
- Yes - 84%
- No - 16%

If yes, what kinds of work are you doing to provide this?
The groups cited the following as examples of capacity building work in inter-community relations:
- Participating in local interface groups.
- Participating in mobile phone networks.
- Training in mediation skills with Mediation NI and TIDES training.
- Cross community holiday schemes with young people.
- Community relations training with the Ulster Peoples College.

What type of support do you use for this?
The following organisations were cited as those used for support:
- Belfast Interface Project
- Greater Shankill Community Council
- Mediation NI
- NICVA
- Workers Educational Association
- Ulster Peoples College.

What other additional support could you be doing with?
- Community Relations training and funding.
- Information from statutory agencies on policy development.

8(b) If no, why not?
- The one negative response was that it was not within the groups remit.

8(c) What support might you need to provide this (if appropriate)?
The groups cited funding and training support in this area.

9(a) Who do you consider to be the main providers of support/training in relation to conflict transformation?
The following were identified as the main providers of support/training in relation to conflict transformation:
- Belfast Interface Project
- Community Relations Council

- Mediation NI
- TIDES Training
- Ulster Peoples College
- Workers Educational Association

9(b) Are there any specific types of support/training that you have found particularly useful?

The following were cited as particularly useful:

- BIP single identity communication work
- Mediation NI introduction to mediation courses
- Community Relations and Community Development certificates with the Ulster Peoples College.
- Workers Educational Association facilitative leadership course.
- Youth work with Youth Action

9(c) What other forms of support in conflict transformation would be useful for your group?

- More information/increased awareness of the support available.
- More training opportunities in conflict transformation skills and programmes.
- BIP facilitating dialogue between groups working on conflict transformation was suggested by a number of groups.

10. What more do you think BIP could be doing for its membership?

- The view of BIP as a lobbying body speaking on behalf of its membership to effect policy decisions and implementation by government and statutory agencies emerged as the key role identified by the groups surveyed.
- It is viewed as important that BIP continues to have a more engaged role with its membership through the Membership Communications and Support Project to complement the lobbying role with government.
- Groups particularly see BIP having a major role in acting as facilitators in intercommunity dialogue programmes. A number of groups said BIP should employ more staff for this specific purpose. In between these functions the membership clearly expressed their desire that BIP "keep doing what you're doing" in the other services we provide to member groups.

11. Are there any other comments you would like to make about BIP?

- A number of groups suggested we shorten our surveys.