

Good relations: a conceptual analysis

Nick Johnson and John Tatam

Institute of Community Cohesion
(iCoCo)

Good relations: a conceptual analysis

Nick Johnson and John Tatam

Institute of Community Cohesion (iCoCo)

© Equality and Human Rights Commission 2009

First published Autumn 2009

ISBN 978 1 84206 231 9

Equality and Human Rights Commission Research Report Series

The Equality and Human Rights Commission Research Report Series publishes research carried out for the Commission by commissioned researchers.

The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Commission. The Commission is publishing the report as a contribution to discussion and debate.

Please contact the Research Team for further information about other Commission research reports, or visit our website:

Research Team
Equality and Human Rights Commission
Arndale House
The Arndale Centre
Manchester
M4 3AQ

Email: research@equalityhumanrights.com

Telephone: 0161 829 8500

Website: www.equalityhumanrights.com

You can download a copy of this report as a PDF from our website:
www.equalityhumanrights.com

If you require this publication in an alternative format, please contact the Communications Team to discuss your needs at:
communications@equalityhumanrights.com

Contents	Page
Executive summary	i
1. Introduction	1
1.1 Aims	1
1.2 Methodology	2
2. The statutory framework	3
3. Overview of literature	6
3.1 Social capital	6
3.2 Community cohesion	7
3.3 Communitarianism	9
3.4 Human security	10
3.5 Integration	11
3.6 Beyond race and religion or belief?	12
3.7 Summary: potential elements of 'good relations'	12
4. Promoting and undermining good relations	14
4.1 Contact	14
4.2 Conflict	15
4.3 Diversity	16
4.4 Deprivation	20
4.5 Segregation and separateness	20
4.6 Prejudice	23
4.7 Other predictive factors of good relations	24
4.8 International approaches	26
4.9 Promoting good relations in Northern Ireland	26
5. Research findings	29
5.1 The salience of 'good relations'	29
5.2 Scale and comparability	30
5.3 Measuring groups or individuals?	31
5.4 Causal factors or domains?	32
5.5 Addressing the multi-strand mandate of the Commission	33
5.6 The case for class	34
5.7 The relationship with the Equality Measurement Framework	34
5.8 Summary	35
6. Potential measurement domains	37
6.1 Interactions with others	38
6.2 Attitudes to others	40
6.3 Participation and influence	41
6.4 Personal security	42

	Page
6.5 Sense of belonging	43
6.6 Building the matrix	44
6.7 The importance of 'place'	45
6.8 Conclusions and next steps	46
Bibliography	48
Appendix 1: Questions for policy seminar and interviews	53
Appendix 2: Contributing experts	56

Executive summary

In December 2008, the Equality and Human Rights Commission commissioned the Institute of Community Cohesion (iCoCo) to produce a conceptual basis for the development of a measurement framework for good relations. Hitherto, good relations has been an integral part of race equality work, and in recent years, it has also been applied specifically to issues of religion or belief, and increasingly disability following the introduction of the Disability Discrimination Act (2005).

This report examines what is actually meant by good relations and how this reflects, or stems from, theoretical approaches and public policy, and begins to suggest ways in which good relations might be measured. It therefore forms the initial output from the Commission's programme of work on good relations that will result in the establishment of a Good Relations Measurement Framework (GRMF).

Methodology

The first stage of the process consisted of a review of the existing research literature and theoretical approaches to good relations. The resulting policy paper was discussed at a policy seminar in February 2009 and subsequently in a series of interviews during March 2009 with leading experts in the field, including academics, policymakers and practitioners. Our aim was to achieve as consensual approach to this as possible so that our recommended approach might have intellectual credibility and a degree of respect.

Key findings

The key findings from the analysis include that:

- As a relatively new term, the phrase 'good relations' comes with few preconceptions. Overall, this is helpful as it allows it to be defined in line with the Commission's multi-strand mandate and can be a fresh approach to these issues. However, such is the amount of work that directly relates to or impacts upon good relations that the Commission should not attempt to 'reinvent the wheel' with its definitions and approach. Instead, it should borrow and co-opt where appropriate.
- The policy and intellectual theories that most directly correlated with good relations include social capital, community cohesion, communitarianism, human security and integration.

- Theories and practices that underpin our understanding of good (and bad) relations include contact and conflict theory, the relationship of each of these to diversity, segregation and separateness and prejudice.
- While there was universal acceptance of the need for a national set of indicators, it is felt that an assessment of good relations is highly dependent on context, particularly of local situations. It should therefore be possible to replicate this on a local scale, even if that is not necessarily a role for the Commission.
- The primary focus should be upon relations between individuals, though this should not be absolute and in some fields, such as religion or belief, group identity and relations would be key.
- There is a need to acknowledge, but not necessarily measure, causal factors. Instead, the focus should be upon actual indicators of good relations.
- Two of the largest themes that may adversely affect good relations are clearly poverty and disadvantage on the one hand, and disconnection through segregation and separation on the other. These also appear to have a relationship where one exacerbates the other. Therefore the relationship between the GRMF and the Commission's recently published Equality Measurement Framework is crucial.
- It is important to include ideas of socio-economic status in measuring good relations. In some cases, this might be even more important than measuring good relations in terms of the Commission's stated equality groups.
- There is a lack of comparative international evidence on good relations, except in the case of Northern Ireland.

Domains

On the basis of this review of the literature and the engagement with experts, we set out some potential ways in which good relations might be spelt out and thus measured; pointing readers to **some** potential data sources which might exist. We use the terminology 'domains' for these areas – largely because this appears to be the chosen phrase of the Commission. These proposed domains are:

- The most crucial element was **interactions with others** where direct physical contact in a number of spheres is vital in achieving good relations.

- This should be supported by an assessment of **attitudes to others**. Importantly, this should assess what people think of others rather than general perceptions of social attitudes.
- Levels of engagement and empowerment were seen to be important factors in good relations and ways should be found of measuring an individual's levels of **participation and influence**.
- Notions of **personal security** have a huge influence upon the ways in which people participate and interact with one another.
- Overall, good relations should include some degree of all people having a **sense of belonging** and feeling of mutual interest with their fellow citizens.

The relevance of 'place'

In developing a measurement framework for good relations, these domains should form the basis of a matrix alongside notions of place. This is in part about geographical location as good relations are more likely to be developed and influenced in the neighbourhood rather than the nation. It is also about the physical spaces where interaction might take place: schools, workplaces, places of worship or sports clubs.

Conclusions

This report examines how the GRMF can be built on the basis of established approaches and provides a new way of examining how people relate to one another and how this might be measured. In our view, it is feasible to define the GRMF in a way that is meaningful for academics, policy-makers, practitioners and people as a whole.

1. Introduction

The Equality and Human Rights Commission is required to present a triennial report to parliament that describes the state of equality, human rights and good relations in Britain in a way that allows priorities for future improvements to be identified. As part of the preparation for the first triennial report in 2010, the Commission is establishing measurement frameworks for equality, human rights and good relations. The Equality Measurement Framework (EMF) was published in July 2009 (Alkire et al, 2009), but as this was after the completion of the fieldwork for this report, is not discussed in any detail here.

The Commission's stated aims are that the Good Relations Measurement Framework (GRMF) will:

- contain indicators that paint a comprehensive picture of the current state of the nation in terms of good relations;
- have the confidence of the Commission and its major stakeholders, including the government, statisticians and academics; and
- be developed through a consultative process to support legitimacy.

In thinking about a measurement framework for good relations, we need to understand what we might mean by 'good relations' and what factors underpin it. This paper therefore considers various interpretations of social and community relations which might be characterised as 'good relations'. Many of these have been applied primarily, in the past, to issues of race, and/or religion or belief, but they are not necessarily based in those and could have wider applicability. Whether they are the most relevant for the Commission is one of the things to be considered. The report then examines evidence for and against the influence of various factors on these views of social and community relations.

The report aims to provide a basis for discussion and debate over whether this is the right underpinning and whether it is 'fit for purpose' for a multi-strand Commission. It also highlights areas that require further development or consideration.

1.1 Aims

The aims of this study were to:

- provide a review of the existing research evidence on what factors affect 'good relations' and social cohesion in Britain;
- identify how 'good relations' is measured in other countries and by international surveys or organisations;
- deriving from this review, provide a comprehensive list of broad factors of relevance to 'good relations';
- determine the domains of a GRMF that would enable indicators to be collected to capture societal progress; and
- conduct an initial consultation and testing of the conclusions with experts and key stakeholders.

This is the first stage in the process of developing a GRMF. As such, there is an element that our work has not directly addressed. We have tried to avoid straying into the area of what data might be currently available and tailoring our work accordingly. Our objective has been to approach this from a high-level, conceptual angle.

1.2 Methodology

On beginning this work, our first task was to undertake a thorough literature and conceptual review around good relations. We believe that this was vital so that any credible measurement framework draws upon the various academic and policy approaches and constructs something that is greater than the sum of its parts. We then developed this into a draft paper where we began to set out potential domains for measurement of good relations and causal factors. This was shared with colleagues at the Commission and provided the basis for a discussion held in early February 2009.

Following this discussion and subsequent comments received, a revised paper was produced which became the basis of a rigorous consultation and challenge process. This involved convening a seminar in February 2009 where some of the key theories were debated and the initial domains tested. This was augmented by a series of key interviews during March 2009 with some leading stakeholders from academia, government and practitioners, concentrating on people who are prominent in public policy research and formulation, equalities and human rights. These interviews used the same paper as a key document but also explored some of the issues in more depth.

2. The statutory framework

The Equality and Human Rights Commission was created by the Equality Act 2006. Section 10 of the act defined the Commission's responsibilities in respect of promoting good relations, as to:

- (a) promote understanding of the importance of good relations:
 - (i) between members of different groups, and
 - (ii) between members of groups and others

- (b) encourage good practice in relation:
 - (i) between members of different groups, and
 - (ii) between members of groups and others

- (c) work towards the elimination of prejudice against, hatred of, and hostility towards members of groups, and

- (d) work towards enabling members of groups to participate in society.

'Group' in this context was defined as those sharing a common attribute in respect of any of the following seven categories:

- age
- disability
- gender
- proposed, commenced or completed reassignment of gender
- race
- religion or belief
- sexual orientation

However, subsection 4 made it clear that there was to be a particular focus on groups defined by race, religion or belief:

In determining what action to take in pursuance of this section the Commission shall have particular regard to the importance of exercising the powers conferred by this Part in relation to groups defined by reference to race, religion or belief.

(Section 10 (4))

Furthermore, the closest form of good relations now currently in operation relates to race. Under the Race Relations Act 1976 (as amended), public authorities have a statutory general duty to promote race equality. The duty is made up of three distinct parts: to work to eliminate unlawful racial discrimination, to promote equality of opportunity, and to promote good race relations.

In 2005, the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE), one of the three predecessor bodies merged into the Equality and Human Rights Commission in October 2007, produced a guide for public authorities on promoting good race relations (CRE, 2005). In the foreword, its then chair, Trevor Philips, stressed the continuing commitment of CRE to promoting equality and challenging discrimination, but identified integration as 'paramount' and increasingly this became the focus for good relations. This is discussed further below. The CRE said that equal participation in all aspects of public and civic life and interaction between different groups in society were essential.

In addition, the guide also identified five key principles which were all necessary to achieve good race relations:

- **Equality** – equal rights and opportunities for everyone in all areas of activity.
- **Respect** – acceptance of the individual right to identify with, maintain and develop one's particular cultural heritage, and to explore other cultures.
- **Security** – a safe environment, free from racism, for all.
- **Unity** – acceptance of belonging to a wider community, and of shared values and responsibilities, rooted in common citizenship and humanity.
- **Cooperation** – interaction by individuals and groups to achieve common goals, resolve conflict, and create community cohesion.

Equality and legal and physical security are clearly key elements of the Equality Measurement Framework (EMF) (Alkire et al, 2009). The other three principles reflect many of the themes covered in this report: respect for cultural difference, a common sense of belonging and shared values, and productive interactions.

While good race relations have been the subject of legislation, good relations in respect of religion and belief were not, prior to the Equality Act 2006. However, over the last 25 years, extensive work has been done to promote good interfaith relations

through bodies such as the Inter Faith Network for the UK and, more recently, also the Scottish Inter Faith Council, the Northern Ireland Inter Faith Forum and the Inter Faith Council for Wales, as well as a growing network of national, regional and local interfaith bodies.

However, for the purposes of this report, we have sought to go beyond these issues and have tested the compatibility of potential domains across all strands wider areas of policy related to equality and good relations.

3. Overview of literature

The term ‘good relations’ has been most often used in relation to race and religion or belief. However, there is a range of approaches to social and community relationships which could also be seen as falling under this heading, particularly given the breadth of the remit of the Equality and Human Rights Commission. We also believe that it is important for a Good Relations Measurement Framework (GRMF) to have credibility; it must at least recognise existing theory and practice in related fields. This was reinforced by our discussions throughout the process where many contributors were keen to stress that a GRMF should not seek to reinvent the wheel unless absolutely necessary. It was felt that there were already a number of areas of policy and practice that had a close relationship to good relations. Below we have set out some of the key issues within these.

3.1 Social capital

The term social capital has been in use since the 1920s, but has been much more widely referenced since Robert Putnam’s work, in particular his book, *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American Community* (2000). Putnam’s ‘lean and mean’ definition is simply ‘social networks and the associated norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness’ (Putnam, 2007).

Social capital is associated with:

... people’s sense of community, their sense of belonging to a neighbourhood, caring about the people who live there, and believing that people who live there care about them.

(Portney and Berry, 2001:102, cited in Letki, 2008)

Positive attitudes towards and beliefs about one’s neighbours contribute to cohesion within the local community, and therefore to residents’ willingness to participate in local affairs and to cooperate in everyday matters. As a result, life in communities with high levels of social capital – so called ‘civic communities’ – is good.

Ben Cave Associates (2007) argued that social capital must be understood as the combination of both cognitive elements (trust, attitudes, etc.) and structural elements (social networks) which reinforce each other to generate the stream of outcomes that has been associated with the concept. Cognitive elements generally received more attention perhaps because they were easier to measure.

Social capital can have negative as well as positive effects. Bourdieu (1986), for example, shows how it can be used practically to produce or reproduce inequality, demonstrating for instance how people gain access to powerful positions through the direct and indirect employment of social connections.

An important distinction in discussions of social capital is that between bonding and bridging capital. **Bonding** social capital refers to the relations within homogeneous groups. By contrast, **bridging** social capital looks at heterogeneous relations, ones that exist between groups (Putnam, 2000).

This would seem to have significant value in terms of assessing good relations. The literature points to the importance of bridging social capital (that is, of social networks characterised by trusting and reciprocal relations) between individuals and groups of different backgrounds to integration. In Putnam's words, bridging social capital requires that we:

... transcend our social and political identities to connect with people unlike ourselves.

(Putnam, 2000: 411)

Robert Furbey et al (2006) looked at the contribution of 'faith communities' to social capital. The research found positive examples of bridging capital where different faiths were able to work together to identify community needs and solutions. But the research also suggested that social capital can be negative in its consequences and that faith networks are not always benign. Faith communities have not always encouraged difference or welcomed participation and debate. Power inequalities within faith communities can also make it more difficult for social networks to develop, particularly for women and young people.

3.2 Community cohesion

Although the Community Cohesion Panel chaired by Ted Cattle did not invent the term 'community cohesion', its widespread adoption followed their report into the 2001 disturbances in some northern towns (Cattle, 2001). The report, and others at the time, argued that the fragmentation of communities along faith and ethnic lines, reinforcing levels of disadvantage and discrimination and the lack of contact between those communities, was a major and underlying cause of the unrest. Different communities were described as living 'parallel lives'.

The various reports into the 2001 riots did not formally define community cohesion but rather proposed a range of activities that were:

... designed to close the gap between communities, to engender a common sense of purpose and to encourage positive interaction between different groups so that tolerance, understanding and respect would develop.

(Cantle, 2008: 62)

In 2002, the Local Government Association (LGA), the Home Office, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM), the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) and the Inter Faith Network produced their 'Guidance on Community Cohesion' which included the following definition which was widely adopted across government at all levels and the third sector. LGA et al (2002) argue that a cohesive community is one where:

- there is a common vision and sense of belonging for all communities;
- the diversity of people's different backgrounds and circumstances are appreciated and positively valued;
- those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities; and
- strong and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds in the workplace, in schools and within neighbourhoods.

More recently the Commission on Integration and Cohesion (CIC, 2007a) has reinforced support for the concept of community cohesion and proposed a wider definition which includes trust in local institutions, the rights and responsibilities of individuals and recognising the contribution of new arrivals. In its response to the CIC report, the government has accepted these six points in a slightly modified (and briefer) definition:

Community Cohesion is what must happen in all communities to enable different groups of people to get on well together. A key contributor to community cohesion is integration which is what must happen to enable new residents and existing residents to adjust to one another. Our vision of an integrated and cohesive community is based on three foundations:

- People from different backgrounds having similar life opportunities.
- People knowing their rights and responsibilities.

- People trusting one another and trusting local institutions to act fairly.

And three key ways of living together:

- A shared future vision and sense of belonging.
- A focus on what new and existing communities have in common, alongside a recognition of the value of diversity.
- Strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds.

As the response recognises:

This is different from the old definition of community cohesion in two key ways. First, it reflects a greater emphasis on the importance of citizenship and community empowerment to building cohesion – ranging from rights and responsibility to a shared future vision. Second, in its recognition of the increasing importance of integration to cohesion – how important a sense of having things in common is to building trust and positive relationships between new and existing residents.

(Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG), 2008)

These wider definitions are bringing community cohesion much closer in concept to social capital and social cohesion. At the same time, the focus of community cohesion, which was firmly on race and religion or belief, is being widened to cover other differences like age, sexual orientation and even class.

3.3 Communitarianism

Communitarians seek actively to bolster social capital and social cohesion through a strong emphasis on both rights and responsibilities and education. In many respects, it is a progressive response to excessive individualism contained in some liberal thought. The argument is that any individual's well-being is directly related to the society around them and that their actions, behaviour and attitudes should be seen in relation to the communities they have grown up in and are living in (Bell, 1993).

Amitai Etzioni has been a leading contemporary proponent whose views have been influential with politicians on both sides of the Atlantic (Etzioni, 1995). His populist vision is of a nation working together in a manner that reflects societal needs as well as personal goals. Etzioni demonstrates the value of reframing policy discussions

and moral discourse around the connection between rights and responsibilities. He argues that:

... too often the dominant interests are not those of major segments of the population [but of] groups that represent narrow, self-serving goals, such as parking lot owners ... beehive owners ... or sugar farmers ...
(Etzioni, 1995: 14)

He also believes that we:

... require a set of social virtues, some basic settled values that we as a community endorse and actively affirm.
(Etzioni, 1995: 25)

Critics have argued that Etzioni's vision downplays the diversity of perspectives that surround moral and political matters. The emphasis on transmission also privileges the values of those who control the curriculum and constrains the creation of educational settings that reflect the voices of participants – their values, interests, and needs (Kahne, 1996).

3.4 Human security

The notion of human security grew out of a post-war emphasis on the individual rather than the nation as the proper focus for security. Taking the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as its starting point, human security holds that a people-centred view of security is necessary for national, regional and global stability. If fundamental individual needs are not met, then problems will ensue. This applies at a range of levels. The model assumes that the security and stability of each social grouping above the individual (household, community, society, country and international community) depends on the extent to which those needs have been met.

The concept of human security was given a major boost by the United Nations Development Programme's 1994 Human Development Report (UNDP, 1994). The UNDP defined in this report threats to human security in seven areas: economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, political security and community security. The UN set up the Commission on Human Security in the wake of the 2000 Millennium Summit's call for a world 'free of want' and 'free of fear'. The Commission on Human Security reported in 2003 and focused not only on the need for states to protect individuals from a range of threats but also

to empower individuals to develop their own potential (Commission on Human Security, 2003).

However, critics have argued that the concept is too vague to be of much value (Paris, 2001). It has primarily been used in the context of the developing world where its criteria such as health, access to food etc are clearly more absolute than they would be in a UK context. It is also focused upon individuals and not communities.

3.5 Integration

Integration is presented variously as both describing 'good relations' and as a mechanism for increasing social capital and cohesion (the antithesis of segregation which is covered in the next section). Integration is also increasingly being described in association with cohesion. The new DCLG definition of cohesion, for example, is in fact a definition of an 'integrated and cohesive community'.

Philips (2005) argues that an 'anything goes' multiculturalism has led to deeper division and inequality and that we need an integration that binds us together without stifling us. He argues that:

We need to be a nation of many colours that combine to create a single rainbow.

An integrated society has three essential features (Johnson, 2007):

- Equality: everyone is treated equally, has a right to fair outcomes and no one should expect privileges because of who or what they are.
- Participation: all groups should expect to share in how we make decisions but also expect to carry the responsibilities for making the society work.
- Interaction: no one should be trapped within their own community, and in the truly integrated society, who people work with, or the friendships they make, should not be constrained by race or ethnicity.

These themes were repeated and reinforced in the final report of the CRE, *A Lot Done – A Lot To Do* (2007). This argued that:

To achieve an integrated Britain, we need to achieve equality for all sections of society, interaction between all sections of society and participation by all sections of society.

(CRE, 2007: 2)

From a political perspective, Blunkett (2004) has also emphasised the importance of this approach to integration and cohesion for communities to work effectively. People from all backgrounds need to feel confident about their identity and to have respect for other people's identity, within a positive, inclusive sense of Britishness, underpinned by shared values.

3.6 Beyond race and religion or belief?

We are aware that the ways these areas of policy have been applied in recent years have been most strongly correlated with issues of race and religion or belief. This was also a criticism from some of the people consulted as part of this project. However, the majority were also convinced that these concepts are not race and faith exclusive in themselves, it is merely that their application in the UK hitherto has been limited. Indeed, many of the international applications of social capital theory, human security and communitarianism are not principally about race. From our own experience, community cohesion is a concept that has rapidly moved beyond race and religion or belief and is increasingly seen in other areas such as intergenerational relationships and gender.

Furthermore, we have sought out and requested any additional intellectual or research areas that might be more directly relevant to other strands but none of our team or respondents were able to offer anything beyond the concepts outlined above.

We strongly believe that all of these concepts have resonance far beyond race and religion or belief and that as we identify the potential domains of a GRMF, this will become apparent. In most cases, it will require a more imaginative interpretation than is presently the case.

3.7 Summary: potential elements of 'good relations'

We have described a range of overlapping concepts of social and community relations which, while not explicitly described in terms of 'good relations', could be seen in these terms.

A measurement framework would want to capture the most relevant or important of these elements. The question we have subsequently been asking is which of these is

the most appropriate in the context of the responsibilities of the Equality and Human Rights Commission?

4. Promoting and undermining good relations

A measurement framework might also want to measure those factors that have a positive or negative impact on good relations. We therefore examined the evidence and debates around these factors and sought to see whether some of these might be considered as suitable domains for measurement.

4.1 Contact

Many of the concepts described earlier in this paper place a central emphasis on the positive effects of interaction and the formation of good relationships between people from different groups.

Various studies have considered the role of intergroup contact and the way in which attitudes to 'others' is shaped by that contact or lack of contact. 'Contact theory' argues that the lack of any previous experience of an 'out group', for example, may mean that the development of contact between the 'out group' and the 'in group' is more difficult to establish because of prejudices that have not been explored and broken down. Information about the 'out group' can help to reduce those fears and improve the likelihood of more positive relations developing through contact. Even when the initial contact reinforces the pre-existing prejudices, this may be broken down over time as trust and empathy develops through repeated contact (Pettigrew, 1998). Abrams (forthcoming) noted that intergroup contact tends to be associated with improved intergroup understanding and positive attitudes.

Hewstone, a social psychologist, has carried out considerable work in this area including intergroup work to address the conflicts in Northern Ireland. With colleagues, he has argued that contact theory has tended to focus on knowledge rather than effect as the causal factors for improved relations:

Knowledge, rather than effect, has been at the heart of research on the contact hypothesis. The causal sequence traditionally implied in most contact research is that lack of or biased knowledge about the out-group (i.e., stereotypes) promotes prejudice, which in turn promotes discrimination.... From this premise, contact with out-group members is meant to increase or rectify the knowledge about the out-group and reverse this sequence of events ... Intergroup contact cannot, however, be considered only in terms of its cognitive processes ... a deeper understanding requires recognition of the role of affective processes. (Paolini, Hewstone et al, 2006: 2)

Friendship appears to be a particularly important form of contact. However, Hewstone and his colleagues also point to some evidence that suggests that the quality of contact really matters only at the early stages of group acquaintance, and that thereafter generic contact can also be valuable. In which case:

... working towards increasing people's opportunities for (any) intergroup contact may be more efficient than creating the conditions for positive and carefully structured contact experiences.

(Paolini, Hewstone et al, 2006: 12)

4.2 Conflict

The counter view is provided by conflict or threat theory. Conflict theory argues that continual struggles exist among all different aspects of a particular society. Individuals and groups struggle to exercise influence and control over others in order to maximise their benefits. It is through such conflict that society is changed. The theory has its roots in the work of Marx and Weber and has been widely used in relation to discussion of class conflict, but has also been applied to conflicts in other areas including ethnicity and gender (Stark, 2006).

Realistic group conflict theory states that if the members of one group perceive and/or experience threat from an out group, their prejudices toward the out group are heightened (Levine and Campbell, 1972). As noted by Sidanius and Pratto:

The perception that one group's gain is another's loss translates into perceptions of group threat, which in turn causes prejudice against the out group, negative stereotyping of the out group, in group solidarity, awareness of in group identity, and internal cohesion, including tolerance of in group deviants, ethnocentrism, use of group boundary markers, and discriminatory behaviours.

(Sidanius and Pratto, 1999, cited in Brief et al, 2005: 831)

Critical to this perspective, and in complete contrast to contact theory, is the claim that the more groups are brought into physical proximity with people of a different background, the more likely they are to perceive a threat to their group's power or access to resources. Increased proximity therefore leads to increases in in-group solidarity and hostility to the out group. For example, Arthur Brief and his colleagues found in their American study of diverse workplaces, that as the proximity of white people to black people in the communities in which the white people lived increased, they perceived their relationships with others at work as poorer the more diverse the workforce (Brief et al, 2005).

In their study of Sparkbrook, inner Birmingham, Rex and Moore (1967) argued that there was a clear rationale for a more powerful and privileged majority group participating in systems which discriminated against less powerful and minority groups:

Once we understand urban society as a structure of social interaction and conflict, prejudiced behaviour may be shown to fit naturally into, or even required, by that structure. Prejudice may be seen as a social as well as a psychological phenomenon. Moreover, once it is so understood, 'discrimination' in according rights to an out group might be seen to follow as a logical consequence given the beliefs that are held.

(Rex and Moore, 1967, cited in Cantle, 2008: 119)

In his 2006 Johan Skytte Prize lecture, Putnam (2007) quotes extensively from empirical work which, he argues, shows that, generally, increased diversity and contact are negatively correlated with solidarity. For example:

- across workgroups in the US, as well as in Europe, internal heterogeneity (in terms of age, professional background, ethnicity, tenure and other factors) is generally associated with lower group cohesion, lower satisfaction and higher turnover;
- across countries, greater ethnic heterogeneity seems to be associated with lower social trust; and
- across American census tracts, greater ethnic heterogeneity is associated with lower rates of car-pooling, a social practice that embodies trust and reciprocity.

This leads directly to the discussion about the impact of diversity on cohesion and social capital.

4.3 Diversity

There is considerable debate and disagreement about the impact of diversity. Much of the work undertaken so far has concentrated upon diversity in terms of race and religion or belief. However, that does not mean that this could not have wider implications and value.

Putnam has been particularly influential in making the case that increased diversity leads to a reduction in trust and other aspects of social capital, at least in the short-

term. His views were taken up by, for example, David Blunkett when he was a Cabinet Minister (2004).

In a study of 30,000 people from across the US carried out simultaneously with the Census – and thus providing a wealth of contextual data – Putnam found that those living in the most diverse communities had both lower trust of their neighbours and also lower trust of members of their own ethnic group. However, he also found no correlation between diversity and ‘ethno centric trust’; that is, trust in one’s own race minus trust in other races. These findings, he concluded, meant that neither contact nor conflict theory corresponded to the social reality. Rather it appeared that in diverse neighbourhoods people were just ‘hunkering down’ (Putnam, 2007: 169).

While the picture was clearest for trust, Putnam found that it also applied to a range of other elements of social capital (though not organisational activity or some aspects of political involvement) including:

- lower political efficacy; that is, confidence in their own influence;
- lower frequency of registering to vote, but more interest and knowledge about politics and more participation in protest marches and social reform groups;
- less expectation that others will cooperate to solve dilemmas of collective action: for example, voluntary conservation to ease a water or energy shortage;
- less likelihood of working on a community project;
- lower likelihood of giving to charity or volunteering;
- fewer close friends and confidants; and
- lower confidence in local government, local leaders and the local news media.

Importantly, he also claimed to show that these relationships held when he controlled for a wide range of other variables including crime and poverty. However, he draws a distinction between good race relations and overall levels of social capital. He concluded that:

Diversity does **not** produce ‘bad race relations’ or ethnically-defined group hostility, our findings suggest. Rather, inhabitants of diverse communities tend to withdraw from collective life, to distrust their neighbours, regardless

of the colour of their skin, to withdraw even from close friends, to expect the worst from their community and its leaders, to volunteer less, give less to charity and work on community projects less often, to register to vote less, to agitate for social reform **more**, but have less faith that they can actually make a difference, and to huddle unhappily in front of the television. Note that this pattern encompasses attitudes and behavior, bridging and bonding social capital, public and private connections. Diversity, at least in the short run, seems to bring out the turtle in all of us. (Putnam, 2007: 150–51).

An article by Goodhart in *Prospect* magazine, *Too Diverse?* has also been influential. He argues that there is an inherent tension between ‘solidarity – high social cohesion and generous welfare paid out of a progressive tax system – **and** diversity – equal respect for a wide range of peoples, values and ways of life.’ And this is becoming more acute as the diversity, individualism and mobility that characterises modern economies increases (Goodhart, 2004: 30).

Legrain, on the other hand, has argued that there is no causal link between levels of diversity and a willingness to support a welfare state: the low level of commitment to the welfare state in the USA is a reflection of its history of individualism not its diversity. He points to Keith Banting’s evidence from Canada, a much more diverse state than the USA, which found:

... no evidence of majorities turning away from redistribution because some of the beneficiaries were ‘strangers’.
(Banting, 2005, cited in Legrain, 2007: 250)

Legrain also challenged the notion that diversity per se is associated with reduced cohesion or social capital more generally. A comprehensive study of 21 countries concluded that:

Despite several such findings for US society, in Europe it was not confirmed that rising ethnic diversity or even the rate of influx of foreign citizens had any significant detrimental effects on social cohesion.
(Hooge et al, 2006, cited in Legrain, 2007: 248)

Others have challenged the notion that diversity per se is associated with reduced cohesion or social capital, at least in the UK, arguing instead that it is a by-product of related factors, principally deprivation. Laurence and Heath (2008) carried out a systematic statistical analysis of the 2005 Citizenship Survey to identify both the

socio demographic and attitudinal predictors of community cohesion in England at both the individual and community level. Community cohesion was defined by the indicator 'to what extent do you agree or disagree that this local area is a place where people from different backgrounds get on well together'.

Laurence and Heath's key finding is that, once other factors are accounted for, ethnic diversity is, in most cases, positively associated with community cohesion, although the picture is complex. Living in an area that has a broad mix of residents from different ethnic groups was consistently shown to be a positive predictor of cohesion. However, having an increasing percentage of in-migrants born outside the UK, is a negative predictor. Having friends from ethnic groups other than one's own is a strong positive predictor of cohesion. Part of the positive effect of diversity is a result of increased proportions of inter-ethnic friendships (that is, bridging).

Letki's (2008) study went further. She used data from the 2001 Citizenship Survey to test statistically the predictive impact of various factors against 12 indicators of social capital. She found that when the association between racial diversity and economic deprivation was accounted for, there was no evidence for the eroding effect of racial diversity on interactions within local communities. She also demonstrated that interactions improve perceptions of a neighbourhood, regardless of its economic status or social composition, but these interactions were far less frequent in poorer neighbourhoods. Thus while there was no deficiency of social capital networks in diverse communities, there was a shortage of them in economically disadvantaged ones.

Wood et al (2006) also showed that it was possible for some areas to have high levels of diversity and high scores for the cohesion Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI). This conclusion was based on their identification of groups of areas that seemed to have particular problems with cohesion and where evidence suggested diversity had increased greatly since the last census. These groups included:

- urban areas that were just starting to experience diversity, often through internal UK migration, such as some of the outer London boroughs and southern commuter towns;
- rural areas that were just starting to experience diversity, often from eastern Europe, such as the areas around the Wash; and
- ethnically diverse urban areas experiencing new migration from non-commonwealth countries, such as inner cities in the major metropolitan areas.

The fact that these areas were explicitly defined by their geographic location is instructive. The importance of local understanding and context consistently emerged as a key aspect of the literature related to good relations. This is an issue we return to in our conclusions.

4.4 Deprivation

The most significant predictor of social cohesion and a feeling of neighbourhood was disadvantage, both community and individual, followed by crime and fear of crime. Irrespective of the level of diversity in a community, disadvantage consistently undermines perceptions of cohesion and operates in a similar fashion for all communities. However, not all deprived areas have low cohesion. According to research from the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (2007), deprived diverse areas have higher average cohesion scores than deprived, homogeneous white areas. It is therefore deprivation that undermines cohesion, not diversity. The Commission on Integration and Cohesion (CIC) (2007a) concluded that diversity can have a negative impact on cohesion, but only in particular local circumstances. They argued that it had an effect largely when there was a lack of experience of diversity and when diversity was linked to deprivation.

The links between disadvantage and levels of cohesion and social capital are well established. Laurence and Heath (2008) showed that this applied at both the community and individual level. Conversely they found that reducing individual level disadvantage; for example, by increasing income or improving an individual's level of qualifications, can offset the negative impact of high crime rates and high levels of community disadvantage on perceptions of cohesion.

4.5 Segregation and separateness

The Cantle report found:

... increasing evidence of 'parallel lives', in which physical separation of different communities was compounded by a complete separation in education employment and other spheres.... Segregation and separation – whether at the spatial social or any other 'layer' is a significant barrier to community cohesion. It entrenches differences and creates a real or perceived constraint to learning about and understanding of, other cultures.

(Cantle, 2008: 76)

Self-segregation may be in one sense 'voluntary'. However, this does not recognise that the 'choices' people make are in reality constrained by the institutional

framework and by structural and economic factors, as well as by the prejudice of landlords, employers and local people and by the discriminatory activity of housing market institutions like estate agents. Also, self-segregation often reflects the negative choice of people who only feel safe in an area dominated by their community (Cantle, 2008).

There is some dispute about the extent of segregation. For example, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister's (ODPM) 2006 *State of the English Cities* report concluded that for the period 1991 to 2001:

... the pattern of distribution of ethnic minority (sic) across particular cities barely changed across the decade.
(ODPM, 2006: vol. II, 123)

Cantle, however, points to the fact that between the 1991 and 2001 census, the white population reduced by around 43,000 in Manchester, 90,000 in Birmingham and 340,000 in London, while the black and ethnic minority population increased by 15,000, 58,000 and 600,000 respectively. There is also evidence of growing numbers of ethnic 'enclaves'. For example, in Bradford between 1991 and 2001, the number of districts in which 'South Asians' comprised over 75 per cent of the population had increased from 29 to 77 (OPDM, 2006).

Wood et al (2006) undertook a basic analysis of the extent of ethnic mixing and separation. They took the 78 authorities in England, Wales and Scotland with a black and ethnic minority population above the national average of seven per cent as shown by the 2001 census. They then calculated the 'isolation ratio' for each and compared this with the percentage of white residents. The formula produces a statistic that can be interpreted as the ratio of two probabilities. They are the probability that your neighbour is:

- black or ethnic minority if you are black or ethnic minority yourself, and
- black or ethnic minority if you are white.

This ratio is then a measure of how isolated the two groups are from one another. The higher the ratio, the greater is the isolation. The formula is relatively crude in that it does not distinguish between different black or ethnic minority groups. Nevertheless, the results are interesting.

The London effect is overwhelming, with London boroughs clustered at the top of the list and therefore all exhibiting low levels of isolation. Although, in general, the inner London boroughs where the overall levels of the black or ethnic minority population are high or very high tend to have lower isolation ratios than the outer London ones, this is not just an inner London effect, with three outer London boroughs (Sutton, Harrow, Barnet) in the top 12.

The bottom of this list, that is, those areas with the highest isolation ratios, is populated exclusively by towns and cities from Yorkshire and Lancashire, with Manchester with its fairly low level of isolation (in this company) being the only exception:

Nevertheless, it is quite clear that, even leaving London out of the picture, there are deep differences between different parts of the country. For example, at 14 per cent, Reading has almost exactly the same overall BME [black or ethnic minority] level as Oldham but an isolation ratio of about 1.5 compared with Oldham's 8. Likewise Northampton and Burnley share the same overall BME level of 8 per cent but very different isolation ratios of 1.6 and 8.7.

(Wood et al, 2006: 89)

Wood et al argue that there is a need to move beyond a simple understanding of the degrees of physical proximity of ethnicities to the quantity and quality of interaction of different people. The key questions include:

- How easily or frequently do different ethnicities mix?
- How open is the city; that is, how easy is it to enter and move between different communities or institutional networks?
- To what extent do people of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds actually cooperate?

Wood et al argue that openness and interculturalism are two important concepts here:

We start from the standpoint that, the more open a person is to the world around them and the more open a group is to other groups, the better. There may be times when a group needs to defend itself or close itself off from external influences but these will be exceptional circumstances. The

good society for which we strive is an open society.... Our take on interculturalism moves on from this, however. We see it not as a tool for communication but as a process of mutual learning and joint growth. This then implies a process of acquiring, not only a set of basic facts and concepts about 'the other', but also particular skills and competences that will enable one to interact functionally with anyone different from oneself regardless of their origins.

(Wood et al, 2006: 7–8)

The CIC was sanguine about segregation. It did not necessarily regard it as a problem that some forms and degrees of segregation and separation between communities will continue to shape the pattern of life in some towns – given increasing levels of interaction between people. What was important was that segregation does not become polarisation and that separation does not express itself in ignorance, prejudice and fear of other people. Segregation could provide the security needed to gain confidence. It may take migrants generations to become established and gain the confidence for integration and therefore forming separate communities and living parallel lives was not necessarily negative.

There are also arguments that ethnic enclaves (as opposed to ghettos) can provide minority communities with protected spaces from which they can move towards integration (Ben Cave Associates, 2007: 11). Cantle (2008) too has acknowledged that some segregation can be beneficial. He argues that there are many potential layers of separation based on housing, language, employment, leisure, education, faith and beliefs, lifestyle and social structure.

4.6 Prejudice

In *Processes of Prejudice*, Abrams (forthcoming) suggests that prejudice and good relations should be seen as two independent aspects of social relations: either or neither can be present:

- **Harmonious cohesion** occurs where people feel part of a cohesive group and focus on sustaining harmonious and positive relationships within that group (which may include bridges to other groups) and have a positive outlook towards members of other groups. This is a situation of good relations with low prejudice.
- **Malign antipathy** is the opposite, where there are high levels of prejudice and low good relations.

- **Rivalrous cohesion** occurs where relationships within a community are strong and cohesive but this is partially a result of, or may generate, the presence of a common enemy, (either within or outside). Examples might include times of war or where a previously ethnically homogeneous community faces substantial immigration.
- **Benign indifference** reflects an absence of good relations or prejudice.

Abrams concludes that while there are good theoretical grounds for assuming that reductions in prejudice will improve good relations and vice versa, research evidence is not yet available to be sure about the mutual influences of these two phenomena. Furthermore, any attempt to specify categories of prejudice is likely to be focused primarily upon negative elements – they might properly be assessed as indicators of ‘bad relations’ rather than ‘good relations’. This is an issue we return to when discussing the engagement process.

It might also be questioned whether it is the prejudice itself that is damaging to good relations or whether it is whether people act upon it that really matters. Clearly, a reduction of overall admitted prejudice will be beneficial to good relations but if that prejudice has a limited impact upon behaviour, then its impact upon overall good relations will also be limited.

4.7 Other predictive factors of good relations

There is a wide range of other potential predictors of good relations and the associated concepts outlined earlier in this paper. The link between many of these and inequality is well established, but is not explored in any detail here as equality, though fundamental to good relations, is obviously the subject of the Equality Measurement Framework (EMF) (Alkire et al, 2009).

We have already referred to Laurence and Heath’s (2008) findings that both community and individual factors affected an individual’s view of cohesion and that disadvantage (individual and community) had a strong negative correlation with cohesion (in terms of the BVPI) and diversity a positive correlation. They also found that the following were important predictors:

- Crime and fear of crime is a strong negative predictor.
- Feeling able to influence local decisions.

- Having friends from ethnic groups other than one's own is a strong positive predictor of cohesion; part of the positive effect of diversity is a result of increased proportions of inter-ethnic friendships (that is, bridging).
- Vulnerable groups have more negative perceptions of cohesion – women, individuals with a disability or long-term illness, individuals who lack access to services and council tenants are all less likely to think that their local area is cohesive.
- Feeling that an individual would be unfairly treated because of their race (especially by local housing authorities), coupled with a feeling of racial prejudice has a strong negative impact on cohesion.
- Volunteering is a positive predictor of cohesion – individuals who engage in formal volunteering are more positive about cohesion. These individuals are likely to feel more empowered, have more interaction and form networks with individuals in their communities that they may not be in contact with otherwise.

Analysis by the DCLG correlating single factors with the BVPI figure, referred to in the CIC report (2007a) suggested the following correlations:

- | | |
|---|--------|
| • Satisfaction with the areas as a place to live | High |
| • Deprivation (Indices of Multiple Deprivation score) | High |
| • Perception of high levels of anti-social behaviour | Medium |
| • Satisfaction with council overall | Medium |
| • Satisfaction with cleanliness | Medium |
| • Satisfaction with participation opportunities | Medium |
| • Agree can influence local decision making | Medium |
| • Satisfaction with parks and open spaces | Medium |
| • Crime: burglaries per 1,000 of population | Medium |
| • Crime: violent crime per 1,000 of population | Medium |
| • Crime: robberies per 1,000 of population | Medium |

It is interesting to note that a similar list could be developed to mirror support for extremist political parties with those areas with high levels of dissatisfaction (and poorly performing public authorities) being particularly vulnerable to far right activity.

We can argue from the above that cohesion is built from complex interactions between people and the place they live in, and between people and other groups. It justifies the case for the importance of perception measures, but also supports a case

for looking beneath those perceptions to get a sense of what might be influencing them.

4.8 International approaches

There is a lack of international material that has a direct bearing on good relations. Many of the concepts described above have an international resonance – in particular contact theory, social capital and human security. Some others, notably community cohesion and integration (as described above) are increasingly being used internationally having started off as intellectual approaches rooted in British circumstances. As such, we have found nothing that could be directly applicable to the idea of ‘good relations’ as set out in the Equality and Human Rights Commission’s mandate.

In part, this was because many European Union countries tended to focus on immigrant integration rather than good relations. Notions of integration and good relations were also frequently seen as an issue about migration rather than about other groups or strands. Such notions are almost entirely rooted in immigrant experiences or where they address the wider population, are linked to debates over multiculturalism and race relations, such as in Canada or Australia. In recent years, debates have extended to include issues of religion or belief but almost universally tend to focus upon the Muslim community in the context of international terrorism.

In terms of measurement, the one possible international comparator we found was the Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey (SCCBS) developed at Harvard University. However, this purely measures and tracks social capital and stems from Putnam’s original work in *Bowling Alone*. Its relevance and potential for adaptation to the UK was addressed in research commissioned by the Commission for Racial Equality in 2007 (Ben Cave Associates, 2007).

Good relations do not seem to have much salience beyond the UK at this stage; and even that is somewhat limited as we come to discuss later. Indeed, some international contacts with whom we explored the idea felt unable to contribute much due to the fact that good relations was a ‘very Anglo-Saxon’ concept.

4.9 Promoting good relations in Northern Ireland

There is one part of the UK where good relations is already used. Given its history of sectarianism and violence, promoting good relations between the different communities of Northern Ireland has been a priority since the Good Friday Agreement. Whilst being wary of drawing too many direct comparisons with the rest of the United Kingdom because of that Province’s unique history, we believe that there

are some salient issues. It is also the only direct example of the term 'good relations' actually being used as part of a measurement system.

In March 2005, the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM) published *A Shared Future: Policy and strategic framework for good relations in Northern Ireland*. The overall aim of this policy is:

... to establish, over time, a shared society defined by a culture of tolerance: a normal, civic society, in which all individuals are considered as equals, where differences are resolved through dialogue in the public sphere and where all individuals are treated impartially. A society where there is equity, respect for diversity and recognition of our independence. (OFMDFM, 2005: 10)

Eleven priority outcomes were agreed and measures selected to allow progress against these outcomes to be monitored. While many of the priority outcomes clearly reflect, to a greater or lesser extent, the particular history of Northern Ireland relationships, they also have a resonance with the range of domains which are discussed elsewhere in this paper.

The outcomes against which the progress towards good relations is to be assessed are:

1. Northern Ireland society is free from racism, sectarianism and prejudice.
2. All places are shared, safe, inclusive and welcoming for everyone.
3. Positive and harmonious relationships exist between communities at interface areas.
4. There is increased sharing in education.
5. Northern Ireland is a community where people of all backgrounds work, live, learn and play together.
6. All workplaces are safe and shared.
7. Ethnic minority people participate in public, political and economic life.
8. Ethnic minority people benefit from equality in health and welfare.

9. Northern Ireland is a place where cultural diversity is embraced, respected and valued.
10. Victims/survivors have a voice.
11. Public service delivery in Northern Ireland provides value for money on a shared, inclusive and equal basis.

5. Research findings

As indicated in Chapter 1, we put some of our initial thoughts and findings to challenge by some leading experts in the field at a seminar and also conducted a number of telephone interviews. The full list of seminar participants and interviewees is attached as an Appendix to this report. Overall, the participants and interviewees were broadly supportive of the approach being taken and the domains and causal factors identified, though there were many different points of detail and emphasis. We structured the discussions around several key questions contained within a policy paper circulated in advance. Some of the thoughts and conclusions from this exercise have been covered in the specific sections, but others are detailed below.

Unless stated, the views are those of the participants and interviewees. In some cases, the Institute of Community Cohesion (iCoCo) has given its own views. Where this is the case, we have made this explicit.

5.1 The salience of ‘good relations’

This emerged as an important area of discussion with rather mixed thoughts. On the one hand, the terminology was welcomed as being useful in differentiating the project from associations with other (perhaps tainted) terminology, and was not seen to be too closely aligned with other concepts. However, as we have seen earlier in this report, once it was broken down into more specific components and domains, the overlap with existing well-documented theories inevitably arose once again. Furthermore, existing preconceptions about those theories influenced views about which would be the most important elements of good relations to consider. Therefore, while a new framework offers advantages, it cannot be expected to take us beyond existing debates.

It was accepted though that the development of a new term, ‘good relations’, was important because the other terms used in the policy paper often had negative connotations and political allegiances. Thus, it was thought that the perceived neutrality of ‘good relations’ will probably work in the Equality and Human Rights Commission’s favour. The relative lack of definition of many of the related terms was seen as positive in that it did not restrict what good relations might be. However, it was also recognised that this would inevitably lead to any list of domains of a measurement framework being contested more vigorously. It might also change over time as different issues become more significant. One suggestion was that the Commission should establish a permanent advisory group of leading experts that could monitor the list of categories for measurement.

The opinion was also strongly voiced that this exercise should aim to build on existing work and understanding of integration, cohesion and good relations measurement, rather than ‘tearing this up and starting from scratch’. This is a view that iCoCo endorses. Clearly, there has been a significant array of policy initiatives in recent years that have had a direct impact upon good relations. Related activities in the last few years have included the Race Relations Amendment Act, the Cattle report, the Commission on Integration and Cohesion, the Equalities Review, the addition of Citizenship to the national curriculum, Lord Goldsmith’s Citizenship Review, the civil renewal agenda, the duty on schools to promote community cohesion, the Governance of Britain green paper, the creation of the Equality and Human Rights Commission itself, the introduction of citizenship ceremonies, and countless reforms to ways of integrating new migrants.

For those delivering on this agenda at a local level, many of these developments have brought new responsibilities and performance indicators. For many of these areas, measurement is already in place. We address these in more detail when discussing potential indicators but relevant data sets clearly include the Citizenship Survey and more local place surveys. Therefore, it is important that a Good Relations Measurement Framework (GRMF) makes links where appropriate and is explicit where it builds on existing forms of measurement and where it provides something new.

From iCoCo’s perspective, one clear advantage is that many of the activities outlined above have been disparate and unrelated. Even if it does no more than choose the most salient aspects and bring them together strategically, a GRMF would improve the understanding and measurement of this field of work. However, we would aim for it to be more than the sum of its parts.

5.2 Scale and comparability

One key issue which was explored in the seminar was whether the data for the GRMF should be high level or low level. We were keen to explore with the experts what they felt the optimum size of area for referencing and collecting data might be. From the perspective of the Equality and Human Rights Commission, would we be seeking to measure data at a local authority level, at ward level, at regional level or at national level?

There was a universal acceptance that good relations were highly contextualised and much of the interest and value would reside at a local level. However, it was generally felt that it was unrealistic to expect the Commission to carry out survey work on a scale which would be valid at a local level. Rather the GRMF should

provide a framework at the national and regional level with enough information to indicate where more detailed work could be done locally, using the same model, by the local authority or other local agencies. It was suggested that the criteria could be trimmed down and repeated at a number of different levels – local, district and national – to allow a wider range of possible analyses.

However, adopting such a national approach was also seen as potentially problematic. If a set of domains and criteria for measurement were to be used uniformly on a national scale, then an answer in one part of the country could mean something entirely different in another. Additionally, a positive national, regional or local authority picture might conceal pockets of tension or even disturbance.

The most important factors affecting good relations will vary from area to area – perhaps a clash between students and the more elderly population might be the main issue in one area and conflict between different racial groups more important in another. It will therefore be necessary to pose some questions in a way that allows these issues to emerge. This is a point we return to later.

International comparability was seen as desirable, but not essential, and also as hard to achieve, for many of the reasons outlined in the review of literature.

Our conclusion is that it is clear that if the Commission were to develop a successful and credible GRMF, it would be a pioneering approach that might subsequently encourage others internationally to follow this approach.

5.3 Measuring groups or individuals?

This was seen by participants as a difficult and potentially complex question. The overall response was initially 'ideally both'. However, most people agreed that the starting point had to be the individual and his or her attitudes. But group identities would influence these attitudes and needed to be captured too. It was also agreed that individuals were members of many groups and the relative importance of these would vary with the context. For example, the key issue for a lesbian at work might be being a woman, but in some social contexts, it would be being a lesbian.

These were not easy issues, but it was argued that the Equality and Human Rights Commission would need to show it had considered them in any GRMF. It was felt that in developing the domains, some might be more suitable for groups, some for individuals and indeed, some for both. This was something that needed to be explored a later stage. It might also be framed by the availability of data in any particular domain.

It was also felt that some of the more contextual issues outlined above might be likely to be identified if the starting point was the state of good relations for individuals and their perceptions of the barriers and enablers to this. It should also be recognised that there might be as much variation within groups as between groups.

However, this did not solve the problem. Even if an individual was being assessed, clarity was required over whether the interest was in their whole range of relations or simply in their relations within a locality. For example, elderly people may relate principally to their locality, whereas young professionals might have interactions across a much wider geographic scale.

The importance of intergroup relations should not be downplayed. This might apply more to issues of race and religion or belief than some other areas where forms of self-identification as part of a group may well be stronger. In particular, there was some fear expressed that the focus upon the individual was seeking to secularise interfaith relations. Faith communities have long-standing structures – lay and clerical – and also have a history of fostering good relations in this context. iCoCo's experience would suggest that this is true.

Furthermore, we would be negligent were we not to remind the Equality and Human Rights Commission that the relevant sections of the Equality Act do focus upon 'group' in terms of promoting and assessing good relations. This was pointed out to us during the discussion process and we were reminded that this was a very deliberate choice of words. Indeed, it was reinforced by ministers during parliamentary discussions where Meg Munn asserted that 'a focus on basic community relations will be at the heart of the commission's work' (written answer to Shahid Malik MP, 2 May 2006). While we recognise the attraction of a focus upon the individual, we do feel that the origins of much good relations thinking and legislation are about group relations.

5.4 Causal factors or domains?

It is acknowledged that many of the causal factors are crucial to the presence of good relations overall. There was significant debate at both the policy seminar and during the interviews as to whether some of these causal factors were more appropriate as part of the domains. There was also a strongly voiced, if minority, opinion that the factors were as important as the domains and so should be contained within the GRMF.

However, iCoCo has concluded that this would extend the scope of any measurement framework too far and while we should acknowledge the causal factors

and seek to identify them as they are key to any public policy interventions, we should concentrate on the domains for measurement.

5.5 Addressing the multi-strand mandate of the Commission

As outlined above, the issues of race and religion or belief have been predominant in discussions around good relations. Indeed, these are also a specific part of the Equality and Human Rights Commission's mandate to have 'particular regard' to these elements. The question of how to deal with different groups for which the Commission has specific responsibilities is more complex in respect of the GRMF than the Equality Measurement Framework.

Some of the factors identified, such as segregation and rapid changes in migration, have traditionally been concerned with race or perhaps religion or belief, though this was not felt to be a problem. It was also felt that they had clear meaning beyond that; for example, issues of personal interaction and contact were also crucial in thinking about intergenerational relationships. However, it is also true that most of the possible 'domains' could be differentiated in terms of the six groups: security from harassment, prejudice and equal participation are perhaps strong examples.

There was general agreement that the framework should aim to cover all groups, not just those related to race and religion or belief. It was accepted that many of the domains and factors were not specific to any particular group and that, provided some subtlety was applied, they could be used, to a greater or lesser extent, across all groups. The key here was not to seek a 'one size fits all' approach. There was a fear that any attempt to make the framework apply comprehensively to all groups would not be ideal for measuring good relations for any particular group. For example, reference has already been made to the notion that measures of prejudice would need to be measured differently for different groups.

However, there were some limited, but strongly held, arguments that the essence of good relations was about race and religion or belief. Indeed, the view was expressed that this was what was originally envisaged when the Equality and Human Rights Commission was created. Some cited its inclusion in the 2006 Equality Act as being there to protect the race relations and emerging interfaith work. While that did not preclude its extension into other fields, the fact that the act stresses 'particular regard' for these areas was felt to be important and the salience of good relations was reduced the more widely it was applied.

iCoCo's view is that such an extension could be beneficial and too limited a focus on simply race, religion or belief might ignore some key drivers for good relations such

as intergenerational relationships and the role of women. Having said that, it is important that any GRMF should allow for more of a focus for some strands where appropriate and that this might well change over time. For example, specific issues related to race and religion or belief (such as segregation) might demand a focus on these exclusively for those groups. In the desire to be multi-strand, the Equality and Human Rights Commission must not ignore pressing issues. The need for meaningful data about society is more crucial than the need to tick boxes for every strand for every issue.

5.6 The case for class

There was strong and widespread support for the view that the framework should try to cover socio-economic or class differences even though this was not one of the Commission's designated groups. Divisions in terms of class and wealth were seen as deep-seated and often creating more fundamental barriers to good relations than race, religion or belief, or other issues. Class was one of the few areas where open prejudice seemed to be acceptable (frequent references to 'chavs' etc.) and it was even suggested that the Commission might have a role in challenging class prejudice.

Therefore, the firm recommendation from iCoCo is that any consideration of good relations should take into account issues of socio-economic or class differences. A GRMF without measuring the fundamental social divisions by wealth and income would lack credibility. This conclusion has also been reinforced by the inclusion of socio-economic status in the new Equality Bill.

5.7 The relationship with the Equality Measurement Framework

In undertaking this work, we have been aware of the emerging Equality Measurement Framework (EMF), but have not in any way been constrained by it. There will clearly be some areas of overlap between the two measurement frameworks, but that is inevitable given the mutual dependence of equality and good relations. The Equality and Human Rights Commission will need to decide how much it wants an overlap or is willing to separate some domains between the two measurement frameworks. Our view is that it is important that as they develop, the two are presented alongside one another. This not only enables more comparable data collection and analysis, but also might enable more strategic public policy interventions. It is also vital that equality and good relations are seen as part of the same challenge of social change and not as competing elements within it.

Nevertheless, it has also become clear that the GRMF will be a very different creature from the EMF. For example, the issues of context outlined above were seen

to be less crucial to an EMF than to a GRMF. This was seen as an area in which the GRMF would be fundamentally different from the EMF; in the latter, what is being measured might be more open to absolutes. For example, while causal factors would differ, educational attainment or levels of employment were the same wherever someone lived. However, the same indicator (such as trust in neighbours) could mean something fundamentally different in different parts of the country.

Consequently, the framework needs to recognise that certain aspects of good relations can be both positive and negative. The topic of segregation was frequently raised as a crucial example here. Certain types of segregation are voluntary (Muslims attending mosques, gay and lesbian football teams or societies) and can be beneficial (allowing new migrants to preserve heritage and offer mutual support) but where segregation is persistent and pervades most aspects of life, it can be divisive and harmful.

5.8 Summary

The engagement process was a relatively consensual one with most participants agreeing on the majority of issues. Strong exceptions to this have been detailed above. We were encouraged that the original literature review was frequently commended. Where some criticised it for its focus on race and religion or belief, no significant alternative sources have been provided. In particular, the academic community felt the work to be robust. In addition, while there was some discussion over emphasis, the outlined domains were felt to be covering the right areas and missing no major areas for consideration.

An additional point is that there was a strong lobby that we should strive to avoid too much jargon, a sentiment that iCoCo would wholeheartedly endorse. For the purposes of this report, we have used some of the same terminology as the EMF (for example 'domains') although this term in particular did come under some attack for being too mechanistic. Overall, it was felt that too much work in this area was dominated by buzzwords and key phrases and not enough time was spent breaking this down into policy implications and interventions. We would endorse that view and encourage a GRMF that does not measure for measurement's sake – it must both point to potential interventions and their impact and then be able to assess their relative success. Additionally, some questioned who a GRMF was designed for: parliament, policymakers, service providers or the general public. It was important to be clear about the audience.

In conclusion, our research findings are that:

- 'good relations' as a term is a mixed blessing: while its newness means it does not have baggage, it is also competing with well-established theories and practice in a similar field of work and gaining traction will not be easy;
- comparability is seen as important but the real value of good relations measurements will be at the local level;
- measurement should address both groups and individuals, although the focus of data should be on the latter;
- casual factors should be acknowledged but not included in any measurement framework;
- good relations should apply across the Equality and Human Rights Commission's mandate but not with a 'one size fits all' approach;
- socio-economic factors must be included; and
- the GRMF should develop alongside the EMF and each should make reference to the other.

6. Potential measurement domains

It is clear that the Good Relations Measurement Framework (GRMF) will need to identify a number of key domains against which good relations can be measured. The term 'domains' is taken from the Equality Measurement Framework (EMF) as we have attempted to ensure consistency of terminology. However, some respondents objected to the term and thought it to be unhelpful jargon. We leave it to the Equality and Human Rights Commission to consider this as both measurement frameworks are finalised, although we would encourage the terminology used to be more user-friendly.

We have considered a range of potential factors which can either be seen as constituting good relations or contributing (positively or negatively) to good relations. The distinction between the two is by no means clear cut. Potential domains range from people's direct attitudes to, and relationships with, other people to less direct elements; for example, shared values and levels of participation.

We also recommend a shorter list of potential domains than that for the EMF. This is because we feel that they will need to be broken down in more detail and repeated at a number of different levels to allow for some of the contextual issues raised earlier in this paper.

We produced a draft set of domains as part of the consultation and challenge process. Some of the debates that arose from this are highlighted above. Others are covered in more detail below under the relevant headings. Many of the potential measures discussed below are well established but identifying existing data sets or ways of measuring are not the subject for this report. There was not universal agreement as to what should be in each domain or even under which domain heading some factors should be grouped. However, there was more debate about where things should fit and how they should be named than their substantive inclusion. Given the nature of the discussion around 'good relations' and its recent development as a concept, this kind of debate is healthy. However, we would not like a discussion on the detail of how to phrase something or whether it is under the right domain heading to obscure the more significant debate of whether the right things are being measured in total.

We recognise that such placement will always be contentious but have attempted to draw up a set of domains and factors to be considered under each of them that draws upon our own conclusions from the literature review, discussions with, and views from, the leading experts and our own judgement.

Throughout the process, it was noted that it is easier to define ‘bad relations’ than it is to define ‘good relations’. We have also sought to measure clearly what actually might constitute ‘good relations’ rather than proxy indicators. For example, there is a clear correlation between ratings of people’s satisfaction with the council and with street cleanliness and some potential measures of good relations. However, we would recommend against using correlates in an index as this could lead to tautology. We have therefore focused upon objective measures of good relations.

Our proposed domains are:

- interactions with others;
- attitudes to others;
- participation and influence;
- personal security; and
- sense of belonging.

6.1 Interactions with others

This was consistently felt to be one of the strongest and most important measures of good relations. It was widely accepted that direct social contact with people – both in terms of their quantity and quality – was fundamental to any assessment of good relations overall. Indeed, some seminar participants and interviewees felt that good relations should be defined very tightly as an individual’s relationships with their fellow citizens. The need here would be to focus upon the individual and ensure that the criterion had a personal focus so that it concerned individuals, rather than groups, relating to one another.

Segregation is clearly an important factor in assessing the state of good relations. However, people acknowledge that the issue is far from clear-cut. A degree of segregation, where it is voluntary, can be positive in developing social capital and the confidence of the group concerned. Segregation becomes a problem when it becomes entrenched and applies to most aspects of life, residence, schooling, religious worship, work and leisure, resulting in people leading parallel lives with little or no contact with people from other backgrounds. This can stifle choice and opportunity and perpetuate stereotypes. Some suggested that ‘degree of isolation’ would be a better way of presenting this issue. Measures should cover segregation in terms of at least residence and education and probably also the workplace. Again,

although much of this debate has occurred with regard to race and religion or belief, it is just as relevant to issues of, for example, age.

While the opportunities for contact, and the extent of that contact are important, the nature of the contact is also crucial. It was argued that it would be necessary to distinguish between bridging and bonding interactions. Friendships with people from different backgrounds were seen as a particular issue here, clearly reflecting positive interactions. Friendships are therefore a key indicator of good relations which should be included as a domain and not regarded as just a factor that influences good relations. Some felt that the term ‘interaction’ was itself too neutral as it might not be meaningful, and could be tokenistic.

However, there was a feeling that the issue of choice was critical – if individuals are happily choosing to segregate themselves in certain situations then this perhaps should not be seen as ‘bad relations’. If, though, segregation was being enforced by social codes and norms then this must be seen as an example of ‘bad relations’. There was real doubt, however, that such specific intricacies could be built into the GRMF.

The suggestion was made that ‘socialising’ was what we were aiming for. We believe that this could be contained within this domain. This domain therefore should aim to capture both the opportunities for (and barriers to) contact and the extent and quality of that contact. Clearly such terms as ‘friendships’ are contestable. Its inclusion here is to stress that we need to measure more than passive interaction – it must be meaningful. When analysing potential sources of data to measure this, it is a degree of voluntary socialising – for example, sharing sporting or cultural activities, people visiting each other’s houses, or even going on holiday together – that we would consider to be important.

Some potential elements of this domain might therefore be:

- strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds:
 - in the workplace
 - in schools, and
 - in neighbourhoods;
- extent of opportunities for contact;
- segregation or isolation in terms of residence, education and the workplace; and

- friendships with people from different backgrounds.

6.2 Attitudes to others

Along with 'interactions with others', there was a widespread view that 'attitudes to others' went to the core of what good relations should mean. There was a difference of view about whether we should be aiming to measure what people think themselves or what they think other people think. The Citizenship Survey focuses on the latter but many academics and researchers felt that this failed to capture many of the fundamental issues at the heart of good relations. Defenders of the Citizenship Survey were primarily those in government or involved in its development. The view of the Institute of Community Cohesion (iCoCo) is that we are aiming for a measurement of collected individual views rather than an individual's perceptions of others' views.

Respect for other groups was clearly important. It was felt strongly in some quarters that measures of prejudice should be in this domain rather than being regarded as a causal factor. In part, this was because it might be couched better in the neutral terms of 'attitudes to others' rather than negatively as 'prejudice'.

Prejudice is an important indicator of good relations but would need to be approached in different ways for different groups or individuals because it manifests itself in different ways. Very few people actually say they do not like older people, for example, though behaviour discriminates against them. On the other hand, people may be openly hostile to children and young people. There is a strong stigma associated with learning difficulties and mental health. There are now greatly reduced levels of overt oral prejudice in respect of gender, but behaviour, such as levels of domestic violence, provides a strong indicator. Therefore specific measures would be needed for different types of prejudice.

It was also suggested that perhaps prejudice was not sufficient and that it did not capture issues of dehumanisation which may be particularly prevalent with regard to attitudes towards, and treatment of, older or disabled people.

It is also considered to be important to include some general measures of attitudes to neighbours, irrespective of difference, and we are suggesting that 'trust' and 'caring for neighbours' would be valuable.

Some potential elements of this domain might therefore be:

Positive:

- trust – in neighbours;
- understanding of, and respect for, difference;
- strong sense of the contribution of different groups, including those newly arrived and those with longer attachments to an area;
- caring for others in the neighbourhood;
- openness to other groups and cultures; and
- respect for difference.

Negative:

- prejudice.

6.3 Participation and Influence

This was the subject of some debate and it was difficult to find a consensus. One view was that good relations should be about contact and relationships with other people and as such participation did not fit into this criterion. Participation was seen as about empowerment or the relationship an individual had with the public realm rather than fellow citizens. As such, it was felt this might belong more in the EMF.

Some argued that participation, particularly volunteering, was strongly determined by class and cultural traditions. However, others felt that participation was valuable, though generally less so than attitudes to others and interactions. One suggestion was that a distinction might be made between participation which required networking and collaboration against more passive membership of a group or organisation.

Questions were also raised as to whether the GRMF should concern local or national participation and whether it should cover both formal and informal activities. Overall, iCoCo feels that some element of participation is vital to any GRMF. There may be an issue of weighting but this can be developed once the criteria are more fully developed. This may be linked more specifically with interactions with others, but our conclusion is that an individual's willingness and ability to participate in the life and decision-making of their community, at whatever level, is crucial to their ability to enjoy good relations. For the purposes of a GRMF, we are primarily interested in those forms of participation that require some form of collaboration.

The sense of being able to influence decisions was felt, by some, to be as important as actual participation. This could correspond to a feeling of empowerment and might usefully be linked to some social capital measures of trust in institutions and systems to treat people fairly. Trust in institutions was seen as a key component of community cohesion by the Commission on Integration and Cohesion. Its inclusion in the GRMF received some support, though much below that of interactions with others and attitudes to others. iCoCo believe that it is difficult to have good relations where some groups believe that they will not be treated fairly.

Some potential elements of this domain might therefore be:

Engagement:

- equal participation in all aspects of public and civic life;
- levels of volunteering; and
- electoral turnout

Empowerment:

- trust in institutions;
- confidence in the criminal justice system;
- feeling of being able to influence decisions at a local and national level;
- feeling of autonomy and control over one's own life choices; and
- belief that an individual would be unfairly treated because of a facet of their identity.

6.4 Personal security

Again, this was an area of debate and proved to be contentious. Among our interviewees, there was an emerging consensus that our original title of 'personal circumstances' sat less easily as a domain. Equality and security were both very important, but might be best seen as causal factors rather than as measures of good relations.

However, other interviewees strongly opposed this view and during the policy seminar, the issue of feelings of personal safety and the link between hate crime and 'bad relations' was readily identified. On balance, the iCoCo view is that we cannot

ignore some degree of personal circumstances and feelings of security as being of importance in measuring good relations.

A key issue on which we requested views was whether equality and similar life opportunities should be measured in a domain. There was universal agreement that such issues were central to creating good relations, but were not necessarily appropriate indicators of good relations. It was also felt that a separate EMF could better address these issues in any case. It is in regard to this domain in particular that the relationship with the EMF will need to be properly assessed. iCoCo, however, sees no harm in duplication of indicators in both measurement frameworks.

Some potential elements of this domain might therefore be:

- security from harassment;
- reported hate crime;
- fear of crime; and
- levels of anti-social behaviour.

6.5 Sense of belonging

Predictably, both the heading itself and what might be suitable factors for measurement did not achieve a consensus. Originally we started with the idea of 'shared values', but this became very hard to quantify with actual potential indicators. In part, this is because the concept of values has become very stretched in recent years. Some felt that shared values was the essence of any debate over good relations while others argued it was a distraction. Values were typically described in terms of global notions of human rights, which provided an underpinning, but not sufficient criteria for measurement. It was also argued that in reality, people would say they agreed on some shared values but the reality is that they would mean very different things by those stated values. For instance, the right to protest could stretch from writing a letter to demonstrations or civil disobedience. Another view was that even where there might be a shared value, such as respecting women, the way this value was pursued, for example in terms of dress, might lead to tensions. In iCoCo's experience, it is the practical application of values that matters more than a statement of commitment.

There was a degree of nervousness that shared values could be interpreted as some version of Norman Tebbit's 'cricket test'. Some had difficulty squaring an emphasis

on shared values with a focus on diversity unless those shared values were defined at a very high level, such as respect for democracy and the rule of law, and a commitment to basic decency, courtesy and tolerance in the treatment of others. There was also significant debate over whether some things were 'values' or simply 'views'. We are sympathetic to this. Even then there is difficulty as, while a focus on rights and responsibilities is important, the frequent point of tension is over basic aspects of behaviour, courtesy, etc. (for example queuing) which go beyond 'responsibilities' but is clearly very tricky territory even to spell out, let alone measure. In a British context, support for aspects of the welfare state such as the NHS may be evidence of notions of wider social responsibility but it is a tenuous claim.

Others felt that it was important to capture this component in a GRMF, though again less important than attitudes to others and interactions. This is a view with which iCoCo would agree and we are therefore recommending a focus on 'belonging', with some notion of sharing values as a potential indicator of this. Whether someone feels they belong and are included depends on how they feel they are treated as well as their own views and values. It is therefore linked clearly to some of the other recommended domains.

Some potential elements of this domain might therefore be:

Belonging:

- a sense of belonging;
- identification with others in the neighbourhood;
- a perception of being 'included'; and
- a feeling that you are treated with respect.

Shared values:

- a sense of common understanding about rights and responsibilities.

6.6 Building the matrix

As outlined earlier, context is everything in seeking to measure good relations. Therefore, these basic domains would require separating and measuring according to a range of different elements. Overall, there are two major ways in which these domains would need to be measured: by group and by place.

Group would be the six mandated strands for which the Equality and Human Rights Commission has responsibility, with the addition of social class. It is important to measure within as well as between groups. Place would hopefully allow for some of the local context issues to be explored.

The response is to build a matrix where each of the domains and its subsections is measured across a range of other factors.

6.7 The importance of 'place'

In a number of the domains outlined above, the idea of place is important. On one level, it clearly goes further than simply being a question of geography. For example, many of the potential measures for contact require a specific location for that contact to be measured. In this, we have focused upon what we believe to be the key areas where interaction takes place: the home, the school and the workplace. These are areas that have widespread, if not quite universal, application. They are also key to how people live their lives. In the past, there has been a tendency to focus upon more cultural forms of interactions. While important, we do not believe these are as meaningful as interactions that are part of everyday life.

The other key element of 'place' is geographic location. We believe that this is fundamental to any measurement of good relations. In part this is because only by having such measurement in a specific area can the appropriate policy interventions be considered. Without the ability to focus upon an area, any measurement framework would largely be an esoteric exercise, devoid of much long-term use.

Furthermore, the shared use of spaces and physical interactions are likely to have more value at the local, community or neighbourhood level than at a national level.

iCoCo's belief is that the overall aim must be for a national set of indicators, but it must then be possible to break this down or replicate the measurement locally. Even then, it must be accepted that causal factors will be important and an understanding of an area will be crucial to interpreting the data contained in any GRMF. For example, even if we were to produce a comparable overall figure for 'interactions with others' across the country, and hypothetically a northern town were to draw the same rating as a village in the western England, we could not say that they have the same good or bad relations. Indeed, such data would still leave much to be understood about the nature of the relations, good or bad, in each area. It would tell us very little about the actual circumstances in an area and thus have a limited impact upon interventions that might be made. The key indicators under the domains have their real value in their local application. This goes beyond the obvious ones associated

with interaction. For instance, reported hate crimes and a person's feeling of personal security matter because of where they live and will have little connection to national data sets. Similarly, feelings of belonging are likely to be to the local neighbourhood or community rather than to the nation state. The point we made earlier about the need to focus on some types or groups would also be lost if measurement were purely national.

6.8 Conclusions and next steps

In the previous section, we have set out what we think the key domains of a GRMF should be and what the components of each of those domains should be. However, unlike the EMF, we suggest that these domains require breaking down by both group and place. This is because in terms of good relations, context is everything.

With regard to the aims of the project at the outset, we believe that this report provides a solid foundation on which to build a measurement framework for good relations. Our work included a thorough review of the existing research evidence on those factors that impact on 'good relations'. Our attempts to draw international examples of where this contextual approach has been developed into actual forms of measurement hit the major stumbling block that notions of 'good relations' do not currently have much resonance beyond the mandate of the Equality and Human Rights Commission, with the exception of the work underway in Northern Ireland.

As set out in the report, we have derived from this review of the literature, theory and practice, a comprehensive list of broad factors of relevance to 'good relations', as set out in Chapter 4. This has led to our initial development of some potential domains that might constitute a GRMF that would enable indicators to be collected.

Throughout the process we have sought to include some leading experts and stakeholders, from helping identify existing literature to challenging some initial thoughts about potential factors and domains. We are clear that this has not been the equivalent of a consultation exercise that takes on board the full range of the Equality and Human Rights Commission's stakeholders. We are unapologetic in that our work has relied upon leading thinkers and contributors to this debate. We have hinted in places where we have concerns that this approach to good relations might not have resonance beyond that circle but understand that this will be a matter for the Commission in the development of a definitive set of indicators.

We believe that our potential set of domains is comprehensive, reflects both the literature and views of those involved, and is robust. We do not pretend it is definitive and should not be contested. We have also very deliberately not examined in any great detail the available sets of data that will be necessary to operationalise the

suggested domains. We were clear from the original brief that this was not part of this project. We think that was for very sound reasons. It is vital that the initial development of the conceptual approach to good relations and how it might be measured is intellectually sound. We recognise that, in due course, compromises might have to be made about what potential indicators are able to be measured and we have emphasised the importance of building on existing work and surveys, where appropriate, rather than starting from scratch. However, that is a matter for the Commission to consider as it develops this area of work. We wish to record at this point our willingness to remain involved in these discussions and provide further context or explanation as to our thinking at appropriate points in the process.

Bibliography

Abrams, D. (forthcoming) *Processes of Prejudice: Theory, Evidence and Intervention*. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Alkire, S., Bastagli, F., Burchardt, T., Clark, D., Holder, H., Ibrahim, S., Munoz, M., Terrazas, P., Tsang, T. and Vizard, P. (2009) *Developing the Equality Measurement Framework: selecting the indicators*. Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission.

Banting, K. (2005) *Canada as a Counter Narrative: Multiculturalism, Recognition and Redistribution* paper presented to the Panel on Canada's Contribution to Understanding Rights and Diversity, Canadian Political Science Association, University of Western Ontario.

Bell, D. (1993) *Communitarianism and its Critics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ben Cave Associates (2007) *Social capital indicators in the UK*. London: Commission for Racial Equality.

Blunkett, D. (2004) 'New Challenges for Race Equality and Community Cohesion in the 21st Century'. Speech to the Institute of Public Policy Research, 7 July.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) 'The Forms of Capital' in Richardson, J., (ed.) *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Macmillan.

Brief, A., Umphress, E., Dietz, J., Burrows, J., Butz, R., Scholten, L. (2005) 'Community Matters: Realistic Group Conflict Theory and the Impact of Diversity', *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 5: 830–44.

Brown, R. (1995) *Prejudice*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Burchardt, T. and Vizard, P. (2007) *Definition of equality and framework for measurement: Final Recommendations of the Equalities Review Steering Group*. London: London School of Economics.

Cantle, T. (2001) *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team*. London: Home Office.

- Cantle, T, (2008) *Community Cohesion: a new framework for race and diversity*. London: Palgrave.
- Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) (2004) *Response to Strength in Diversity*. London: CRE.
- Commission for Racial Equality (2005) *Promoting Good Race Relations – a Guide for Public Authorities*. London: CRE.
- Commission for Racial Equality (2007) *A lot Done, A Lot to Do. Our Vision for an Integrated Britain*. London: CRE.
- Commission on Human Security (2003) *Human Security Now*. New York: Commission on Human Security.
- Commission on Integration and Cohesion (CIC) (2007a) *Our Shared Future*. London: Department of Communities and Local Government.
- Commission on Integration and Cohesion (CIC) (2007b) *Themes, Messages and Challenges; Summary of Key Themes from the Commission for Integration and Cohesion Consultation*. London: Department of Communities and Local Government.
- Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (2006) *2005 Citizenship Survey – Community Cohesion Topic Report*. London: DCLG.
- Department of Communities and Local Government (2007) *The New Performance Framework for Local Authorities and Local Authority Partnerships: Single Set of National Indicators*. London: DCLG.
- Department of Communities and Local Government (2008) *The Government's Response to the Commission on Integration and Cohesion*. London: DCLG.
- Etzioni, A. (1995) *The Spirit of Community: Rights responsibilities and the communitarian agenda*. London: Fontana.
- Furbey, R., Dinham, A., Farnell, R., Finneron, D., and Wilkinson, G. (2006) *Faith as Social Capital: Connecting or Dividing?* Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Goodhart, D. (2004) 'Too Diverse?' *Prospect*, February: 30–37.

HM Government (2007) *PSA Delivery Agreement 21*. London: HMG.

Home Office, Local Government Association, Home Office, Commission for Racial Equality, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (2003) *Building a Picture of Community Cohesion*. Available at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/archived/publications/communities/buildingpicturecommunities> [accessed 10 November 2009]

Hooge, M., Reeskens, T., Stolle, D. and Trappers, A. (2006) 'Ethnic Diversity, Trust and Ethnocentrism and Europe: A Multilevel analysis of 21 European Countries'. Paper presented at the 102nd Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia.

Institute of Community Cohesion (iCoCo) and Metropolitan Police (2007) *Understanding and Monitoring Tension and Conflict in Local Communities*. Coventry: iCoCo.

Johnson, N. (2007) 'Social Inclusion and Ethnic Minorities: Building an Integrated Society: the United Kingdom Perspective', in *European Yearbook of Minority Issues*, Vol. 5. European Centre for Minority Issues/European Academy. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.

Johnson, N. and Verlot, M. (2008) 'The Future of Multicultural Britain', in Eade, J., Barrett, M., Flood, C. and Race, R. (eds.), *Advancing Multiculturalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Kahne, J., (1996) 'Review of *The Spirit of Community: Rights responsibilities and the communitarian agenda*', *Harvard Educational Review*, Winter.

Laurence, J. and Heath, A. (2008) *Predictors of community cohesion: multi-level modelling of the 2005 Citizenship Survey*. London: Department of Communities and Local Government.

Legrain, P. (2007) *Immigrants: Your Country Needs Them*. Abacus, London.

Letki, L. (2008) 'Does Diversity Erode Social Cohesion? Social Capital and Race in British Neighbourhoods', *Political Studies*, 56: 99–126.

Levine, R. and Campbell, D. (1972) *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes and Group Behavior*. New York: Wiley.

Local Government Association (LGA), Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, Home Office, Commission for Racial Equality and Inter-faith Network (2002) *Guidance on Community Cohesion*. London: LGA.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) (2006) *State of the English Cities*. 2 volumes. Wetherby: ODPM Publications, 2006.

Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM) (2005) *A Shared Future: Policy and Strategic Framework for Good Relations in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: OFMDFM.

Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2003) *Social Capital Harmonised Question Set*. London: ONS.

Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., Voci, A., Harwood, J. and Cairns, E. (2006) 'Intergroup Contact and the Promotion of Intergroup Harmony: The Influence of Intergroup Emotions', in Brown, R.J. and Capozza, D. (eds.) *Social Identities: Motivational, Emotional, Cultural Influences*. Hove: Psychology Press.

Paris, R. (2001) 'Human Security – Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?' *International Security*, 26, 2: 87–102.

Pettigrew, T.F. (1998) 'Intergroup Contact Theory', *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49: 65–85.

Phillips, T. (2005) 'After 7/7: Sleepwalking to Segregation'. Speech given to Manchester Council for Community Relations, 22 September.

Portney, K.E. and Berry, J.M. (2001) 'Mobilizing Minority Communities, Social Capital and Participation in Urban Neighbourhoods', in Edwards, B., Foley, M.W. and Diani, M. (eds.) *Beyond Tocqueville. Civil Society and the Social Capital Debate in Comparative Perspective*. Hanover: Tufts University.

Putnam, R. (2000) *Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of Community in America*. New York: Simon Schuster.

Putnam, R. (2007) '*E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture*', *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30, 2: 137–74.

Rex, J. and Moore, R. (1967) *Race, Community and Conflict*. Oxford: Institute of Race Relations.

Sidanius, J. and Pratto, F. (1999) *Social Dominance: an intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stark, R. (2006) *Sociology*. 10th edition. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

United Nations Development Programme (1994) *Human Development Report*. New York: UN.

Wood, P., Landry, C. and Bloomfield, J. (2006) *Cultural Diversity in Britain, A Toolkit for Cross-cultural Co-operation*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Appendix 1: Questions for policy seminar and interviews

What would be the 'domains'?

It is clear that the Good Relations Measurement Framework (GRMF) will need to identify a number of key 'domains' against which good relations can be measured.

We have considered a range of potential factors which can either be seen as constituting good relations or contributing (positively or negatively) to good relations. The distinction between the two is by no means clear cut. In looking at both elements and causal factors of good relations, potential domains move from people's direct attitudes to and relationships with others to less direct elements – shared values and levels of participation.

Attitudes to others

- Trust – in neighbours and institutions.
- Understanding of and respect for difference.
- Strong sense of the contribution of different groups, including those newly arrived and those with longer attachments to an area.
- Caring for others in the neighbourhood.

Interactions with others

- Strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds, in the workplace, in schools, and in neighbourhoods.
- Openness to other groups and cultures.

Participation

- Equal participation in all aspects of public and civic life.
- Feeling of being able to influence local decisions.
- Levels of volunteering.
- Trust in Institutions.

Personal circumstances

- Equality and similar life opportunities.
- Security from harassment.

Shared values

- Shared values and common purpose.
- A sense of belonging.
- A recognition of both rights and responsibilities.

- Do we need to capture all these aspects in a good relations framework?
- Are these the right elements?
- Which are the most important?
- Which of these elements relate most strongly to good relations?
- What is missing?

Factors that may affect or predict the extent of good relations

- Equality.
- Deprivation.

- Diversity.
- Crime or fear of crime.
- Rapid changes in migration and/or population churn.
- Segregation.
- Prejudice.
- Extent of opportunities for contact.
- Friendships with people from different backgrounds.
- Belief that an individual would be unfairly treated because of a facet of their identity.
- Satisfaction with cleanliness in the area.
- Satisfaction with local council.

Equality and fear of crime are covered by the Equality Measurement Framework (EMF). The GRMF may want to select some of these factors as potential proxies of good relations.

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Which of these factors will be most valuable to monitor in a GRMF?• How far should we seek to measure these factors as well as good relations directly?• How far should measures of good relations be set in the context of those factors that are known to be influential (levels of equality, deprivation and crime)?• Should the context include other measures (diversity, levels of recent migration)? |
|--|

How far should the GRMF differentiate between groups?

The question of how to deal with different groups for which the Equality and Human Rights Commission has specific responsibilities is more complex in respect of the GRMF than the EMF.

As we have seen from Section 10(4) of the Equality Act the Commission is required to have particular regard to groups defined by reference to race, religion or belief in respect of its good relations duties. It is also clear that much of the work on good relations, discussed above, has focused on race.

Some of the factors identified, such as segregation and rapid changes in migration, are concerned with race or perhaps religion and belief. However, it is also true that most of the possible 'domains' could be differentiated in terms of the six groups: security from harassment, prejudice and equal participation are perhaps strong examples.

Decisions will need to be made, therefore, about how far the GRMF should seek, in principle, to systematically differentiate between the six groups for each of its measures (leaving aside the practical difficulties this might present) or how far it should adopt a more pragmatic or tailored approach differentiating between the groups for those factors, like prejudice, which seem particularly pertinent. The Equality Act moreover, makes no provision for measurement by social class or socio-economic status. This could be a weakness in getting a true picture of good relations.

- How far should the GRMF seek to cover all six groups separately?
- What is the right balance between a group and individual on good relations?
- Does there need to be a common framework with the same domains for each of the groups?
- Or should it adopt a more pragmatic approach differentiating between the groups for those factors, like prejudice, which seem particularly pertinent?
- How should the specific mandate for race and religion be reflected?
- Should socio-economic group or class be included?

Are there aspects of good relations akin to those for equalities?

There does not appear to be the equivalent of the three aspects of inequality – outcomes, autonomy and process – for good relations measurement.

Balancing local, national and international perspectives

Another potential difference in emphasis between the EMF and a GRMF is in respect of the importance of the local perspective. Good relations are highly contextual and can vary greatly from place to place. A positive national, regional or local authority picture might conceal pockets of tension or even disturbance.

Over the past three years iCoCo has undertaken an extensive range of benchmarking reviews of community cohesion at the regional and local level. The work indicates that there has been an over-reliance on limited situational data at the local level and this needs to be supplemented with in-depth qualitative analysis. The GRMF should therefore seek to capture at least a sample of local measures as well as giving a broader national or regional picture.

The GRMF will therefore, ideally, need to find a way combine a national, regional or local authority overview with samples of more detailed local data, some of which may be qualitative.

- How can the GRMF best incorporate a picture of relations in local areas?
- Does the GRMF need to be comparable internationally?
- What local level might a GRMG drill down to: region, local authority or even ward level?

Appendix 2: Contributing experts

The following experts participated in the policy seminar or were interviewed and/or commented upon the draft report:

Professor Dominic Abrams, Professor of Social Psychology, Director of the Centre for the Study of Group Processes, University of Kent.

Amanda Ariss, Chief Executive, Equality and Diversity Forum.

Alessandra Buonfino, Programme Leader, the Young Foundation.

Professor Simon Burgess, Director, Centre for Market and Public Organisation, University of Bristol.

Suzanne Cooper, Lead officer on Citizenship Survey, Department of Communities and Local Government.

Dr Harriet Crabtree, Director, Inter faith Forum.

Professor Danny Dorling, Professor of Human Geography, University of Sheffield.

Professor Ed Fieldhouse. Director, Institute for Change, University of Manchester.

Bana Gora, Policy Research Manager (Bradford), Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Andrew Harrop, Head of Public Policy, Age Concern and Help the Aged.

Dilwar Hussein, Research Fellow, Islamic Foundation.

Professor Vivien Lowndes. Professor of Local Government Studies, Department of Public Policy, De Montfort University.

Dr Rick Muir, Senior Research Fellow, Institute for Public Policy Research.

Professor David Mullins, Professor of Housing Policy, Centre for Urban and Regional Studies, University of Birmingham.

Professor Lucinda Platt, Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex.

Erin Van Der Mets, Democracy and Civil Society Programme, Carnegie Foundation.

Joy Warmington, Chief Executive, brap.

Ciara Wells, Deputy Director for Cohesion and Faiths, Department of Communities and Local Government.

Amanda White, Head of Race, Cohesion and Faiths team, Department of Communities and Local Government.

A range of iCoCo Associates, with a wide range of experience, have also been involved in this work and both directly and indirectly fed into its progress.

Contacts

England

Equality and Human Rights Commission Helpline
FREEPOST RRL- GHUX-CTR
Arndale House, Arndale Centre, Manchester M4 3AQ

Main number 0845 604 6610
Textphone 0845 604 6620
Fax 0845 604 6630

Scotland

Equality and Human Rights Commission Helpline
FREEPOST RSAB-YJEJ-EXUJ
The Optima Building, 58 Robertson Street, Glasgow G2 8DU

Main number 0845 604 5510
Textphone 0845 604 5520
Fax 0845 604 5530

Wales

Equality and Human Rights Commission Helpline
FREEPOST RRLR-UEYB-UYZL
3rd Floor, 3 Callaghan Square, Cardiff CF10 5BT

Main number 0845 604 8810
Textphone 0845 604 8820
Fax 0845 604 8830

Helpline opening times:

Monday to Friday: 8am – 6pm

Calls from BT landlines are charged at local rates, but calls from mobiles and other providers may vary.

Calls may be monitored for training and quality purposes.

Interpreting service available through Language Line, when you call our helplines.

If you require this publication in an alternative format and/or language please contact the relevant helpline to discuss your needs. All publications are also available to download and order in a variety of formats from our website

www.equalityhumanrights.com

This report provides a conceptual basis for the development by the Equality and Human Rights Commission of a measurement framework for good relations. It examines what is meant by good relations and how this reflects, or stems from, theoretical approaches and public policy, and begins to suggest ways in which good relations might be measured. The report identifies five potential ways in which good relations might be spelt out and thus measured: interactions with others; attitudes to others; participation and influence; personal security, and sense of belonging.