

KEY & LET PROGRAMMES

Evaluation 2012/13

September 2013

Young Enterprise Northern Ireland &
Junior Achievement Ireland

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
1: INTRODUCTION.....	9
2: METHODOLOGY	10
(a) Stakeholders	10
(b) Population and Samples	10
(c) Research Methods	11
(d) Administration	11
(e) Analysis	12
3: FINDINGS FROM TEACHERS - KEY & LET PROGRAMMES	13
(a) Community Relations	13
(b) Planning for the Future.....	20
(c) Personal and Social	22
(d) Business and Entrepreneurship.....	24
4: FINDINGS FROM PARTICIPANT & CONTROL GROUPS - KEY PROGRAMME	27
(a) Respondent Profile	27
(b) Community Relations	29
(c) Planning for the Future	36
(d) Personal and Social.....	40
(e) Entrepreneurship and Business.....	41
5: FINDINGS FROM PARTICIPANT & CONTROL GROUPS - LET PROGRAMME.....	44
(a) Respondent Profile	44
(b) Community Relations	46
(c) Planning for the Future	53
(d) Personal and Social.....	55
(e) Entrepreneurship and Business.....	57
6: CONCLUSION	59

Report compiled and written by Dr. Julie Byrne on behalf of Young Enterprise Northern Ireland and Junior Achievement

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

KEY and LET Programmes

1. This evaluation is focused on two programmes developed and delivered by Young Enterprise Northern Ireland and Junior Achievement Ireland; the KEY Programme and the LET Programme. These programmes aim to change participants' knowledge, skills and attitudes in key areas such as community relations, planning for the future, personal and social skills, business and entrepreneurship.
2. Programme participants are recruited from schools across Northern Ireland and the border counties of Ireland. However, this evaluation focuses on Controlled and Maintained schools in Northern Ireland, mainly in recognised interface areas which are also disadvantaged as defined by the school meals criterion.
3. The programmes consist of classroom based and outdoor activities in a residential setting delivered by programme staff and with the support of teachers from their home schools. These residential learning events are cross community and include participants from Protestant, Catholic and mixed schools.

Evaluation Methodology

4. A convenience sample of programme participants and a control group from the same participating schools was selected by the Young Enterprise Northern Ireland staff. Participants and the control group completed questionnaires at two time points: before the programme (a pre questionnaire) and after the programme (a post questionnaire). A total of 3,004 questionnaires were completed, collected and analysed.
5. Teachers from participating schools were invited to contribute to a focus group discussion on the impact of the programmes on participants' attitudes and behaviour. Twelve teachers in total contributed to the focus group discussions; five in the KEY focus group and seven on the LET focus group.
6. The results of this evaluation are structured under the key subject areas of the programmes i.e. community relations, planning for the future, personal and social skills, business and entrepreneurship. The results of focus groups conducted with teachers on both programmes are presented first followed by the results of questionnaires administered to the participant group and control group on each programme.

Findings from Teachers – KEY & LET Programmes

Community Relations

7. Mechanisms for sustained cross-community interaction such as the KEY and LET programmes play an important role in opening up geographically and culturally isolated communities where interaction with people from other faiths or cultures is not the norm. In some cases this is a literal opening up with kids who meet on the programmes feeling that they can visit each other's areas.
8. The KEY programme has helped to develop the structural capital in communities by developing links between neighbouring schools e.g. school offering A levels to students from another school in the community.
9. It's important to note the network effect of cross community friendships on the KEY and LET programmes. Because group socialising is the norm amongst this age group, two young people who make a cross community connection on the KEY or LET programmes then bring a wider group of friends together when they meet up in city centre venues.
10. The residential and intense nature of the exposure to people from different communities seems to be effective in challenging existing mind-sets by providing positive experiences to counter negative beliefs transmitted through some family or community members. The programmes help to create an alternative perspective on cross community relations which the young people feed back to their own parents, friends and family.
11. This residential element of the KEY and LET model seems to be very important in building cross community friendships combining as it does, the intensity of living side by side alongside the casual opportunities for interaction. Despite the many advances in Northern Irish society, many social activities are still segregated by faith and by gender. The cross community and cross gender exchange afforded in the down time around the KEY programme is critical in providing young people with the opportunity to interact in unstructured ways and learn about each other's worlds.
12. Formal classes and outdoor activities on the KEY and LET programmes provide a neutral vehicle for engagement. Young people get to work together as a team on a classroom activity or to experience an outdoor activity. This means the children are too busy on the task in hand to dwell on each other's communities of origin thereby allowing them to create a bond working on a shared activity before exploring the details of their backgrounds.
13. External involvement is key to the personal development young people experience on the programme and all teachers felt that the relationships built up with KEY trainers and outdoor activity trainers was an important element of the programmes' success. Experiencing a relationship with supportive adults outside of the school environment was identified as being an important part of participant development on and beyond the programme.
14. The KEY and LET model compared very favourably against the Shared Education model which many schools and teachers also had experience of.

Planning for the Future

15. Both programmes, but especially the KEY programme, try to get participants to think about the future they want for themselves and to connect that aspiration or dream with concrete choices or actions. Teachers identified a number of examples where individual participants had connected personal effort with better results and had also improved their attendance at school or attitude in class.
16. They identified some evidence that some participants had expanded their horizons as a result of being on the programme and had chosen a new path.
17. There was ample evidence that the KEY programme had been successful in its efforts to equip participants with tangible skills to influence their future path and open up more options. The interview skills delivered as part of the KEY programme were particularly successful in embedding valuable knowledge and skills for the future.

Personal and Social Skills

18. The programmes provide a wonderful, once-off opportunity for most kids as few would have the family income to experience the outdoor activities. However, for some children with particularly low family incomes, having three meals a day whilst on a residential or learning to ride a bike is a special experience in and of itself. For these children, the programmes can provide a break from a difficult existence and a glimpse of what is possible in life. For children on the LET programme the residential are often their first long period away from home. For some children this presents an opportunity to learn basic skills, such as washing dishes, which will be of use for the rest of their lives;
19. Most of the teachers had examples of the positive effect both programmes have on the confidence and communication skills of participants. This effect is most noticeable among shy participants and can surprise teachers and parents alike. The ripple effect of such shifts in confidence and skill for these children can be seen in school, both in terms of academic contribution in class and socially. Some teachers connected the outdoor activities component of the programme with this shift in confidence. They thought that overcoming fears to participate in some scary outdoor activities teaches the participants an important lesson about the rewards of doing challenging things. The feeling of achievement associated with overcoming your fears coupled with discovering a new talent was a potent and rare feeling for some participants.

Business and Entrepreneurship

20. There was widespread positive feedback from teachers on the highly applied aspect of the business and entrepreneurship aspect of the programmes. The process of conceiving a product or service, developing the business idea and finally selling directly to the public was lauded as an incredibly positive experience for most participants and a life enhancing experience for some. In addition to developing existing skills many participants discovered new talents in the business arena which surprised teachers and parents. Teachers thought that these highly positive experiences in business and enterprise could open up new career paths. Some teachers had specific examples of previous KEY and LET participants who had chosen to start-up businesses after their experiences on the programmes.

Findings from Participant & Control Groups – KEY Programme

Community Relations

21. Before the programme started, both the participant and control groups were asked to rate their experience mixing with people from different religious communities on their most recent cross community experience. Their views were broadly similar, with those students who would end up going on the KEY programme a little more positive about prior experiences. After the programme, the control group's rating of their most recent experience had not changed very much, 19% viewed their non-KEY cross community experience as very positive compared with 16% when asked before the programme. However, when KEY participants were asked to rate the KEY programme in terms of their experience mixing with others from different communities, an impressive 80% of them rated the experience as very positive. This compared with a 27% very positive rating of other cross community experiences (table 14). This clear distinction points to the unique success of the KEY experience in terms of cross community interaction.
22. There were some sizeable movements in participants' friendship groups. The number of participants who said they had more than 10 friends from a different religious community rose from 25% to 39% (table 10). The same figure dropped among control group members. The percentage of participants who said they had no friends at all from a different religious community dropped from 12% to 5%. The same figure rose slightly in the control group. This points to a very tangible effect of participation on the KEY programme – more friends from different religious backgrounds.
23. Approximately half of both groups think that religion will always make a difference to the way people feel about each other in Northern Ireland (table 15) but the KEY participants were much more optimistic about future relations between Catholics and Protestants – at the end of the programme, 42% of participants compared with 20% of the control group thought relations would be better in five years' time (table 16).
24. There were differences too between the groups in personal preferences regarding interaction with people from different religions with the control group less open to these interactions both before and after the programme (table 17-19). The KEY programme appears to have succeeded in opening up participants' views even more. There was a small increase in the percentage of KEY participants who wanted to live in a mixed neighbourhood -65% after the programme compared with 57% before. The control group was less willing to live in a mixed neighbourhood after the programme - 43% compared with 48% before (table 17). 59% of participants after the programme compared with 29% of the control group wanted to send their children to a mixed religion school (table 18). The percentage of participants who wanted to work in a mixed workplace rose from 74% to 82% while the corresponding percentage of control group members dropped slightly from 65% to 59% (table 19).
25. The control group's view on the importance of flag flying has not changed over the interval between questionnaire collections – 35% think it is an important expression of cultural identity. This was the same percentage of participants who thought it was important at the start of the programme; however this dropped to 27% by the end of the programme (table 24). Some KEY

participants seem to have become more aware of the impact of flag flying on others – 62% after the programme compared with 50% before, think flag flying intimidates people (table 25). By the end of the programme, 63% of participants think more should be done to control flag flying compared with 48% at the start. An increased number of the control group also agree that more control is needed – 46% compared with 39%. This may perhaps show that the KEY programme helped some participants acquire sensitivity towards the impact of these kinds of displays on other communities and increased their openness towards appropriate societal responses.

Planning for the Future

26. Both groups made use of school supports to discuss their future. Careers teachers and other teachers were more likely to be called on for support than the careers office in school. KEY participants' usage of these school career supports increased over the duration of the programme whereas control group usage remained roughly the same (table 36). Both groups drew more heavily on family and friends to discuss their future. KEY participants were fortunate to have access to KEY staff to discuss their future and over half of participants had taken this opportunity.
27. One of the clearest benefits of participating on KEY programme is the improvement in job search skills. The percentage of participants and control group rating their skills as high in this area was very similar before the programme but very different after the programme – 46% of KEY participants would rate their CV preparation skills as high compared with 9% of the control group, 44% of participants would rate their interview preparation skills as high compared with 15% of the control group (table 37). There is also a general increase in awareness among KEY participants of the various places to look for a job e.g. online, newspapers etc. (table 38). Recognition of the importance of qualifications and work experience in finding a job was higher among KEY participants both at the start and after the programme (tables 39 & 40).

Personal and Social Skills

28. The KEY programme aims to improve skills across a range of areas but there three linchpin skills incorporated into all aspects of the programme; communication skills, team working skills and goal setting skills. Both groups were asked to rate their own skill level in these areas. These are self-ratings so it is possible that the actual skill level has not changed however the difference in self-perception between the two groups is noticeable. The percentage of control group respondents who would rate their skill level as 'high' in these areas has barely changed. However, the KEY participants' skill ratings in all three linchpin skills have increased. By the end of the programme 71% of KEY participants compared with 48% at the start would rate their team working skills level as high. In terms of communication skills, 63% would rate themselves as 'high' compared with 46% at the start. Finally, 49% of KEY participants rate their goal setting skills as high compared with 32% at the beginning (table 41).
29. The same is true in relation to communication skills. Both groups started with similar ratings in relation to their communication skills in various settings but after the programme the participant group scored higher than the control group across each one of these skills (table 43). These are self-perceived skill levels so again, it is important to say that it is possible the underlying skill has

not changed. Nonetheless, even if these improvements in self-perception are just that, they demonstrate and increased confidence about skill level among participants which is useful in improving confidence and shaping future actions.

30. In addition to concrete knowledge and skill acquisition the KEY programme aims to improve participants' attitudes about themselves focusing on feelings of confidence, self-worth, and control over their own lives. To measure shifts in these attitudes, participants are asked to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with a range of statements. Although both groups showed very similar results for these attitudes, after the KEY programme, those who had participated scored higher than the control group in every one of these measures (table 42).

Business and Entrepreneurship

31. When it came to the skills of actually working in business the percentage of KEY participants who believed their skill was at a high level had increased in each of five key business skills whereas the control group had decreased in three. For example the percentage of KEY participants who would rate their skill level is high in relation to selling products more than doubled over the duration of the programme from 20% to 44% (table 45). This seems directly attributable to the KEY exercise of developing and selling a product at a local market which is a clear highpoint of the programme according to the teacher's focus group.

Findings from Participant & Control Groups – LET Programme

Community Relations

32. Before the programme started, both groups were asked to rate their experience mixing with people from different religious communities on their most recent cross community project. Their views were broadly similar. After the programme, the control group's rating of their most recent experience had not changed very much, 20% viewed the experience as very positive compared with 17% when asked before the programme. However, when participants were asked to rate the LET programme in terms of their experience mixing with others from different communities, an impressive 79% rated the experience as very positive. This compared with a 21% very positive rating for other cross community projects before they undertook the LET programme (table 62). As with the KEY programme, this clear distinction highlights a very successful methodology in terms of cross community interaction.
33. In terms of interaction with friends from different religions there is more interaction among the participant group after the programme and some small comparisons between the two groups worth noting. The LET participant group has halved the percentage who say they have no friends at all from a different religion and increased the percentage with more than 10 such friends from 20% to 32%. The reverse of these shifts can be observed among the control group (table 58). This points to a very tangible effect of participation on the LET programme – more friends from different religious backgrounds. (pg42)
34. There were differences too between the groups in personal preferences regarding interaction with people from different religions with the participant group more open to these interactions

after the programme. There was an increase in the percentage of LET participants who wanted to live in a mixed neighbourhood -62% after the programme compared with 52% before. The control group was marginally less willing to live in a mixed neighbourhood after the programme - 44% compared with 49% before (table 65).

Planning for the Future

35. LET participants' usage of all career discussion outlets increased over the duration of the programme whereas control group usage remained roughly the same (table 84). LET participants were fortunate to have access to LET staff to discuss their future and a quarter of participants had taken this opportunity.

Personal and Social Skills

36. Both groups started with similar ratings in relation to their communication skills in various settings but after the programme the participant group scored higher than the control group across in relation to specific communication setting. For example 69% of participants compared with 53% of the control group would be happy standing up and talking in front of a group of people. 91% of participants compared with 77% of the control would be happy to talk in a group of people their own age (table 87). These are self-perceived skill levels so again, it is important to say that it is possible the underlying skill has not changed. Nonetheless, even if these improvements in self-perception are just that, they demonstrate and increased confidence about skill level among participants which is useful in improving confidence and shaping future actions.

Business and Entrepreneurship

37. When it came to the skills of actually working in business the percentage of LET participants who believed their skill was at a high level had increased in each of four key business skills whereas the control group had decreased in all four. For example the percentage of LET participants who would rate their skill level is high in relation to budgeting increased from 32% to 43% over the duration of the programme (table 89). These differences in skill did not impact on the respondents' ability to see themselves working in business in the future, c60% of both group could envisage opting for this career choice (table 90).

1: INTRODUCTION

This evaluation is focused on two programmes developed and delivered by Young Enterprise Northern Ireland and Junior Achievement Ireland; the KEY Programme and the LET Programme. These programmes aim to change participants' knowledge, skills and attitudes in key areas such as community relations, planning for the future, personal and social skills, business and entrepreneurship.

Participants are recruited from schools across Northern Ireland and the border counties of Ireland. They participate in classroom based and outdoor activities in a residential setting with the support of teachers from their home schools. These residential learning events are cross community and include participants from Protestant, Catholic and mixed schools.

This evaluation focuses on shifts in certain key attitudes among a specific sub-set of the participating schools – those in interface areas in Northern Ireland. To determine whether the KEY and LET programmes are associated with any change in these attitudes, participants were asked the same questions before the programme began and as the programme ended. To examine whether any differences in attitude can be attributed to the KEY and LET programmes, a control group of similar young adults from similar schools were also asked to complete these two questionnaires. Teachers from participating schools were invited to contribute to a focus group discussion on the impact of the KEY and LET programmes on participants' attitudes and behaviour. This evaluation focused mainly on attitudes and observed behaviours towards those from different backgrounds, communities and religions. Some information was also collected on the effect the programmes have on attitudes and observed behaviours in relation to planning the future, considering business and entrepreneurship as a career choice as well as overall shifts in participants' personal attitudes and social skills.

The following section offers a description of the methodology used in this research then the information on both programmes, both qualitative from the focus groups and quantitative from the questionnaires, is presented under key themes; community relations, planning for the future, personal and social, business and entrepreneurship. Finally, some conclusions are offered.

2: METHODOLOGY

(a) Stakeholders

There are a number of stakeholders who could reasonably be expected to have a perspective on knowledge, skill and attitudinal changes. These include the participants themselves, their school teachers, KEY tutors, parents and community leaders. For the purposes of this research information was gathered and analysed from the following groups:

- a) Participating students on the KEY and LET programmes in the 2012/13 intake
- b) Control group of non-participating students in the same schools
- c) Teachers from participating schools who had attended the programmes

(b) Population and Samples

The population for this piece of research consisted of Controlled and Maintained schools in Northern Ireland, mainly in recognised interface areas which are also disadvantaged as defined by the school meals criterion.

A convenience sample of programme participants and a control group from the same participating schools was selected by the Young Enterprise Northern Ireland staff. The following figure outlines the number of participant and control group members who completed and returned two questionnaire delivered at two time points: before the programme (a pre questionnaire) and after the programme (a post questionnaire). The colour coding in this table is used for results tables throughout the document

	LET pre		LET post
LET Participants	416		392
Control Group	353		259
Total	769		651
	KEY pre		KEY post
KEY Participants	597		547
Control Group	310		130
Total	907		677

Figure 1: Number of Questionnaires Returned

Two focus group discussions were organised, one for each of the two programmes, and a sample of teachers who accompanied participants from their schools on the programme were invited to attend. Twelve teachers in total contributed to the focus group discussions; five in the KEY focus group and seven on the LET focus group.

(c) Research Methods

Participants

Pre and post questionnaires were used with the participants group and control group. This method has proven to be very useful in past annual evaluations. Pre and post questionnaires ask broadly the same questions before and after participation in the programme. They facilitate the production of hard statistical data and tracking of aggregate movements in attitude over the course of the programme. Questionnaires were completed in a setting supervised by Young Enterprise Northern Ireland staff as close to the actual start and finish of the programme as possible.

Control Group

The use of a control group is a standard approach in research design. Its purpose here was to compare two groups who are broadly similar apart from participation on the KEY and LET programme. As with the participant group, pre and post questionnaires were used to determine the control group's attitudes at roughly the same time participants were starting and finishing the programme. The extent of attitude change for this group was compared with the attitude change in the participating group. Any difference in the extent or nature of the attitude change may be linked to participation on the KEY programme. Trying to collect information at the same time for each group is a way of trying to ensure that external events e.g. protests over flag flying impacts on both groups rather than on only one because of the timing of collection.

Teachers

Teachers are key informants on the personal changes experienced by participants. Their input to the research is critical and can help to contextualise findings from the questionnaires. A sample of teachers from these specified schools who attended the programme was invited to participate in a one hour focus group discussion held in the Young Enterprise Northern Ireland offices in Belfast.

(d) Administration

Young Enterprise Northern Ireland staff took responsibility for distributing and collecting the questionnaires for the participant and control groups. They were also responsible for communicating with the teachers regarding participation in the focus groups and for making all arrangements for the focus group including it video recording.

The figure below outlines the distribution and collection dates of all questionnaires.

	Distributed:	Collected by:
Pre - programme questionnaires		
LET Participants	11/9/13-4/10/13	26/10/13
LET Non-participants	11/9/13-4/10/13	26/10/13
KEY Participants	25/9/13-4/10/13	26/10/13
KEY Non-participants	25/9/13-4/10/13	25/10/13
Post-programme questionnaires		
LET Participants	4/2/13-30/4/13	30/4/13
LET Non-participants	4/2/13-30/4/13	20/6/13
KEY Participants	27/3/13-11/5/13	11/5/13
KEY Non-participants	27/3/13-11/5/13	28/6/13

Figure 2: Questionnaire Distribution and Collection Periods

Quantitative research was conducted via bespoke surveys available via www.surveymonkey.com. KEY and LET Training Officers asked participating students to complete a questionnaire on the first day of camp, and again at the end of the final residential. Most students completed these themselves on Survey Monkey. There were some occasions, when the internet connection at camp was slow, that the TOs distributed paper copies of the questionnaire to the students, and then input the results into Survey Monkey manually. For logistical reasons, the baseline questionnaires from non-participating students i.e. those in the control group were distributed to schools before the beginning of the first residential. The majority of these were completed online, and some were completed on paper. In this case, the TOs input them manually. Links to the follow-up questionnaires were emailed to teachers the week before the final residential. Again, some were completed online, and some completed in hard-copy format, which required the KEY and LET staff to input them manually onto Survey Monkey.

(e) Analysis

The questionnaires were analysed using SPSS the statistical package for the social sciences, version 21. In total eight different questionnaire types were distributed, collected and analysed for this piece of research.

Focus groups were video recorded and transcribed then thematically analysed.

3: FINDINGS FROM TEACHERS - KEY & LET PROGRAMMES

The focus group discussions were transcribed and teachers' comments analysed firstly using the main themes for the report;

- (a) Community Relations
- (b) Planning for the Future
- (c) Personal and Social Skills
- (d) Business and Entrepreneurship

Under each main theme, the comments were further analysed for sub-themes. A summary of these sub-themes is presented at the start of each section below and supported with illustrative quotes. The focus groups for both programmes have been analysed and presented together as many of the same sub-themes arose in each. Where a sub-theme applies mainly or only to one of the programmes this is mentioned in summary commentary.

(a) Community Relations

Rural communities can be geographically and culturally isolated and interaction with people from other faiths or cultures is not the norm. Mechanisms for sustained cross-community interaction such as the KEY and LET programmes play an important role in opening these communities up to others. In some cases this is a literal opening up with kids who meet on the programmes feeling that they can visit each other's areas.

...our school is in a loyalist stronghold and a lot of our children wouldn't have ever come into contact with a Catholic at all because X town itself is 95% Protestant. So there's very little opportunity for cross-community interaction, maybe a wee day out. This is residential and maybe the first day, they'll not mix but the further on they go...my children now, they all meet up in Belfast with kids from Y area, which is the other extreme. And they're on Twitter and Facebook, building relationships, there's boyfriend/girlfriend...so this has been amazing for our kids....But it does bring down those barriers. In our school, we have mainly working class, white children, we don't have even different races so this is very different from them and it's brilliant. And I just wish all the children could have an opportunity like this but they couldn't afford it. And they're not being taught this at home, they're being brought up, well not all of them, with discrimination at home, so this is very valuable you know?

KEY TEACHER #3

We're kind of isolated where we are, geographically as well as culturally. We're in a mixture between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland; we're in the situation of knowing everybody and knowing nobody. So for us, bringing 10 children down, lacking a little bit of confidence, certainly not knowing anybody from any other cultural backgrounds, whether Republic of Ireland or Northern Ireland, totally and utterly amazed me in terms of the transformations. I think the LET programme is more valuable now than ever before because of the position where young people are asking 'what is it all about' and thinking about the future, I think the LET programme is a very important addition and should be kept on.

LET TEACHER #2

Yeah things have moved on [in Northern Ireland] but it depends on where you are, the more urban you are the more things have moved forward because the economics, all of that, is moving faster. The more rural and isolated you are, the more engrained it still is because you're still talking about communities that are still in many ways isolated.

LET TEACHER # 4

Even schools very close together may have no contact. The KEY programme has helped to develop the structural capital in communities by developing links between neighbouring schools e.g. school offering A levels to students from another school in the community.

I'm from X school, mainly Catholic, just down the road, literally, half a mile, is Y school. It's integrated but mainly Protestant. The kids didn't know each other even though they are that close, it's just different communities. But the first residential, from the beginning really, they started building friendships. By the end of it, they were chatting away and meeting up after it. Now our school does some mixed classes where our students go over to Y school. So whenever they're over there, they can see the kids they know again and have a wee chat. That's good because they're walking around the school chatting to people feeling comfortable.

KEY TEACHER #1

Well, we're so close to another school [name] but we never really met and now that school is coming to us and asking if any of our kids want to do A levels. That never would have happened before. We've kids now looking at their prospectus and seeing what they could do and that was just unheard of, years ago, totally unheard of....the children just don't see the school as.. 'oh my God, I couldn't just walk down the corridor without being bullied' and that feeds in year after year based on what they hear from LET, it takes a while but by the time it gets to making that choice...you see we don't do A levels any more so that's a big chance for us.

LET TEACHER # 1

We were with {c}, just down the road and that was totally different match for us and you know, I was even a wee bit apprehensive because there would be a wee bit of animosity between the schools but when they went down, it blew me away. And the kids were meeting down the town, even in areas that were perceived as either a Catholic area or a Protestant area. Our pupils were going down the town to meet kids in these areas after school and that was a biggie, especially for us in {X} so you know, we've come a long way in NI but in our specific community that was a big advance and that was only trialled this year and it was a real benefit.

LET TEACHER # 5

Yeah, and we were with our local school for the KEY as well and it really does help to develop those relationships. They're only about 15 minutes walk for us but it has always been them and us so it really has helped. And even the thought...there used to be separate buses picking us up but this time we all went on the same bus and even that was a bit 'oh my God'. It was just brilliant, kids calling out to each other 'come down the back'.

LET TEACHER # 1

In recent years they're altered, geographically, the schools we've worked with and now they all come from around the same area so the chances of running across the kids in the local supermarket has increased. From a cultural point of view we come from a country school, it's very, very rural; it also has a community that has been very isolated. Now, 13 years ago, it was a push to get a pupil involved in anything that smacked of cross community. The other end of town, there's a Catholic school, never the twain were to meet. To now where the programme sells itself and the parents sign up to it.

LET TEACHER # 7

It's allowed us to establish relationships with other schools across the county, across the border, across Northern Ireland. My first group of kids on LET who are 23/24 years old are still in touch.

LET TEACHER # 7

It's important to note the network effect of cross community friendships on the KEY and LET programmes. Because group socialising is the norm amongst this age group, two kids who make a cross community connection bring their own groups of friends to meet up in city centre venues.

Well the two fellas that I was talking about earlier who are good friends from KEY, it's not just them two, they brought along the friends, who weren't on the KEY programme, with them when they meet up. So actually, there's another group of friendships made and only for the KEY programme, that wouldn't have happened.

KEY TEACHER #2

I have year 12s now who have kept contact with the people they went on their first LET programme with...still in contact, whether it be by phone or Facebook...some of them have met up, they all went away for a day, one day and...unbelievable. That first group, they met in Belfast and went to the cinema. They all had to travel a certain distance, they met up.

LET TEACHER # 3

It's hard to believe that if you were to take kids from [across Northern Ireland] and they were meeting up. If that was in the Irish News, it would be big news and yet, it's happening.

LET TEACHER # 2

The residential and intense nature of the exposure to people from different communities seems to be effective in challenging existing mindsets by providing positive experiences to counter negative beliefs transmitted through family or community vectors. The programmes help to create an alternative perspective on cross community relations which the children feed back to their own parents, friends and family.

...some children are brought up basically brainwashed into thinking something. That's all they're hearing in the house and they're taken out of that environment and they think 'wait a minute, maybe what the people are saying at home isn't right.

KEY TEACHER #1

Now we had a parent, who was very, very apprehensive about his son mixing with Protestants, but the feedback the kid was giving after residential 1 and residential 2, eventually the parent was ok with it, it took a while but it is making that difference.

KEY TEACHER #5

We'd a wee boy, C, and he would be...very much hangs about with all the hard lads, and maybe on the edge...certainly would have been protesting when the flag was removed from city hall. I'm not saying it [KEY] has ruled all that out for him but it has certainly given him food for thought and he's not maybe so quick to get involved in that kind of thing, he stays away a bit more, from sectarian stuff. But it's definitely given him a chance and he wouldn't have had that chance without KEY really.

KEY TEACHER #4

Some of the kids have gone their whole lives never meeting someone from another religion, another community, that is unfortunate and sad to say but that's the way it is and KEY gives them an opportunity to change that.

KEY TEACHER #5

You have to think some of these kids are going to be the doctors, the nurses the lawyers, the ones looking after me when I'm 70, these parents have gone through the troubles, some of them very damaged by the troubles so you're looking at the future of Northern Ireland, those young people that in 20 or 30 years time are going to be shaping a new Northern Ireland. So if you're hitting the parents [with camps] it's too late. Educate the kids to educate the parents.

LET TEACHER # 6

This residential element of the KEY and LET model seems to very important in building cross community friendships combining as it does, the intensity of living side by side alongside the casual opportunities for interaction. Despite the many advances in Northern Irish society, many social activities are still segregated by faith and by gender. The cross community and cross gender exchange afforded in the down time around the KEY programme is critical. After classes, children have the opportunity to interact in unstructured ways and learn about each other's worlds. This creates casual opportunities to learn about social activities such as playing GAA and about social objects such as how to spell the name 'Aoife'.

All their social activities are segregated. They're either in the Boys' Brigade or the Girls' Brigade and when they get older they go to different clubs. So it's segregated right up the point they go to University but a lot of ours don't go to University so they socialise within their own groups and they don't mix at all.

KEY TEACHER #3

Our kids would have never got a chance to play Gaelic, would never even have thought of kicking the ball up, catching in and running (gestures), that was new to them. Whereas when they started that, they were saying 'that's actually a really good game sir' 'I really liked that'. And after when I looked out on the big green area in X camp, they were out playing Gaelic and there was five of mine and five from the other school. That just shows you, that's their view - going from 'why would you play Gaelic' to a view 'let's play some Gaelic.

KEY TEACHER #2

[T]his programme has been phenomenal. There's kids coming back saying 'I was chatting to Conor' or 'I was talking to Aoife' – they're words and language that you do not use around our school on a daily basis.

LET TEACHER # 7

I remember a group coming back and they were out playing at lunch time and suddenly it went from soccer to a little bit of GAA...that's big. The kids just can't wait to meet each other again and for our community that's a massive step forward.

LET TEACHER # 7

Formal classes and outdoor activities on the KEY and LET programmes provide a neutral vehicle for engagement. From the very start of their time on the programme the children get to work together as a team on a classroom activity or to experience an outdoor activity. This means the children are too busy and focused on the task in hand to dwell on 'where are you from' thereby creating a bond before moving onto the detail of their backgrounds.

Yeah, moving from your School and being put into a place where nobody knows what community you're from – so they're all chatting to each other. So yeah, the residential is a massive part of it because they're talking to each other, they're planning businesses, planning products and they're now saying 'who are you, what's your background'? They're just focused on what they're meant to be doing.

KEY TEACHER #1

Jumping off a cliff is a great equaliser.

KEY TEACHER #2

Within in a 24 hour period you have children eating together and it's not 'this school, that school' by the second residential, it's all mixed, they're choosing and they're getting ready for the Gala night 'can I borrow your hair straightener' 'will you do my hair for me' and that's when you really see the friendships blossoming plus the fact that they put the children into their teams and those teams are broken into different groupings for the enterprise training so they're getting different opportunities to mix all the day.

LET TEACHER # 1

I think all shared projects are important because what you're sowing is a little seed that in the future you'll think twice about making a judgment about someone you don't know, when you're not sure who they are. But the benefit of the LET programme is you're with people for 24 hours for three, four days, that is intensified, they're not going back to their own enclave after a day on the programme, they're actually having to go and do evening activities, next day, breakfast. They may not think about it now.

LET TEACHER # 2

No issues with Catholic and Protestant but there was a guy from [x] who was a traveller and my kids were like 'what's a traveller?' and he was like 'this is where I live' even just to educate them, that was, great. From a multicultural perspective, brilliant.

LET TEACHER # 5

External involvement was also seen to be key to development and all teachers felt that the relationships built up with KEY trainers and outdoor activity trainers was an important element of the programmes' success. The external trainers walk the line between nurturing and disciplining, they are informal but professional. Experiencing a relationship with supportive adults outside of the school environment was identified as being an important part of their development on and beyond the programme.

Yes, definitely and the fact that they're thrown in, their teachers just step back and let them get on with it so they can't...they have to get out of their comfort zone and go for it, they can't be clinging on to you, they've got to put themselves forward.

KEY TEACHER #4

Family pressures, peer pressures...you're taking kids out of a culture and suddenly they're dropped in a different situation, there's nobody looking over their shoulders saying 'we don't say that' 'we don't do that' and they're free.

LET TEACHER # 7

I think the outdoor pursuits aspect is a very important aspect of the LET programme because it doesn't matter which side of the fence you come from, from which school you come from, like that child – they're standing on the edge of a cliff and there's just equality there, you're afraid and everybody had that fear factor and they build on each other's strength, you know they hold each other's hands and they spur each other on and that is what the programme is about.

LET TEACHER # 1

The KEY and LET model was compared very favourably against the Shared Education model which many schools also had experience of.

Sure if you organise something for a day, go to another school or they come to you, sure they're only going to be in for a couple of hours. They're not really getting talking, they're still standing in their own wee groups, you can split them up but they're just going to walk over to their original group. With LET and KEY they're doing all this team building, building trust and breaking down what they have in their minds. I don't think you can beat that.

KEY TEACHER #1

I know in our school we're involved in Shared Education and I think it did work well, again they're brought in small groups, it's not like loads of kids and they were brought bowling or to play cross community sports something like that. But I don't think it really facilitated friendships being made.

KEY TEACHER #4

We're very heavily involved as well in Shared Education which offers short stints, it has no way got the same effect as what we've seen with LET, the lasting effect.

LET TEACHER #7

I would like to agree on one of those points, we have quite a lot of money injected into Shared Education and you're going off on day trips with pupils from the other school, to take photographs in the local area. It doesn't have the same impact as the LET programme. It's the multi-dimensional approach and the fact that there are so many aspects, it just merges together and works. And the fact that they're so merged together, they're staying together, they're in groups together, the residential element, it's new ground for them. Whereas we go off on a day trip to say, do Home Economics and there's a camp here, then a camp there and that's it.

LET TEACHER # 6

The uniform defines you. You're ticking the box of shared education and they don't mix whereas that common ground of you're away from home, it's a new experience, it's completely new, it just works. It automatically works, there is no forced aspect to it whereas the Shared Education, you're forcing them together, the kids are very aware 'we're being forced together' whereas with the LET programme, it's so natural, it just seems to work.

LET TEACHER # 6

We did a cross community project with a school from X and it definitely did not work as well and it's being going on for years but it did not work. Although they didn't go in their uniform, they didn't get the opportunity to mix; they only were away for a day. There wasn't the same amount of time for them to interact, short sessions with long gaps in between and during it all, it was still 'my group' 'your group'. They communicated a bit but there wasn't any lasting friendships.

LET TEACHER # 3

You're going on those [Shared Education days] but WE take them, WE run the day whereas on the LET you hand them over to people who are completely independent from the whole situation, they don't recognise where they come from and WE step back, the teachers. And that, I think, lowers barriers for the kids, there not looking to see how we're reacting, they're just getting on with it themselves. It's that change, they're away from the community, away from the classroom, away from our rules; it's the girls, the trainers.

LET TEACHER # 7

(b) Planning for the Future

Both programmes, but especially the KEY programme, try to get participants to think about the future they want for themselves and to connect that aspiration or dream with concrete choices or actions. Teachers identified a number of examples where individual participants had connected effort and results and improved attendance at school or attitude in class following participation on the KEY or LET programme.

They identified some evidence that some participants had expanded their horizons as a result of being on the programme and had chosen a new path.

What I've noticed, we've a couple of guys on the programme this year, and especially one last year, the attendance wasn't great. I think having gone through the KEY programme they've realised if you work at something, if you put your time into it, you get something out of it. Certainly two guys this year, definitely their attendance has improved and one guy last year. And that guy is actually back in our sixth form, applying to get back into sixth form.

KEY TEACHER # 5

I took a wee boy a couple of years ago, the same year we went with X school and he was...hanging around with the bad boys who were into drugs and all that sort of thing. He got his head down; once he was on KEY he saw what he could do with his life. He worked really hard, he's in sixth form now and I do accredit that to KEY, there's no doubt about it, he could easily have gone the other way.

KEY TEACHER # 4

There was ample evidence that the KEY programme had been successful in its efforts to equip participants with tangible skills to influence their future path and open more option. The interview skills delivered as part of the KEY programme were particularly successful in embedding valuable knowledge and skills for the future.

Even from a confidence point of view, we hold mock interviews for the whole year group, we stagger them through the day and those fourth years, they are nervous, even the ones who did it on KEY were nervous going in. I noticed on Friday, the guys who were on the KEY programme were trying to reassure some of the other year 11s 'cause they'd already been there. The rest of the year 11s had never experienced anything like that before. They [the KEY participants] had been there and you could see that they were a lot more confident standing up in front of...and it's not teachers it's people from the business sector, like KEY does coming in to do those interviews as well. Those lads sailed it on Friday.

KEY TEACHER # 5

The kids like, the ones we chose to go on it...they wouldn't have got the opportunity to go on it, like money wise, absolutely not, no way. Like they'd be dreaming if they thought they'd ever get the opportunity to go away on that. They see it as a massive reward...they knew if they were going to start messing or anything like that, that was it, they'd be told 'sorry we can't take you'. So the [good] behaviour stacked up and stayed like that. They're focused on their exams now and they've gained like target setting and everything from the KEY and the LET so that's great like for them.

KEY TEACHER # 1

The programmes provide a wonderful, once-off opportunity for some kids as very few would have the family income to experience the outdoor activities. However, for some children with particularly low family incomes, having three meals a day whilst on a residential is a special experience in and of itself. One child learned how to ride a bike whilst on the LET programme because it was his first opportunity to access a bike and have people encourage him to ride it. For these children, the programmes can provide a break from a difficult existence and a glimpse of what is possible in life. For children on the LET programme the residentials are often their first long period away from home. For some children this presents an opportunity to learn basic skills, such as washing dishes, which will be of use for the rest of their lives;

We'd a 13 year old boy who learned how to ride a bicycle and he'd never known how to ride a bicycle and the guys taught him. Never rode the bicycle before, mother never had the money for a bicycle.

LET TEACHER # 2

I taught one of my boys how to put a duvet cover. I had to ask permission to come into the bedroom. The other two were laughing at him and he was saying 'miss can you help me because mummy always does this'.

LET TEACHER # 1

Even washing the dishes! They don't know how to set a table, some of them. One of them didn't know that you had to put pressure on the brush when you're sweeping the floor.

LET TEACHER # 3

Some of them didn't know that you can talk around the dinner table, they'd be so used to watching TV during mealtimes at home. And they're skills that you can't teach at school, they're skills that they're not learning from their parents for a variety of reasons.

LET TEACHER # 7

(c) Personal and Social

Most of the teachers had examples of the positive effect both programmes have on the confidence and communication skills of participants. This effect is most noticeable among shy participants and can surprise teachers and parents alike. The ripple effect of such shifts in confidence and skill for these children can be seen in school, both in terms of academic contribution in class and socially. Some teachers connected the outdoor activities component of the programme with this shift in confidence. They thought that overcoming fears to participate in some scary outdoor activities teaches the participants an important lesson about the rewards of doing challenging things.

The feeling of achievement associated with overcoming your fears coupled with discovering a new talent is a potent and rare feeling for some participants.

I'd a wee lassie there from 1st to 4th year I barely heard her talk, I mean just a quiet person like you know. You'd see her out in the yard; she'd be standing about on her own. On KEY, she was doing everything, jumping off waterfalls with another five lassies. And since then, you don't see her without them; she's friendly with lots of people in the school and has gone from a person standing around on her own. It's had a massive impact on her life.

KEY TEACHER # 1

We've a form teacher and ...there was one in the group and from year to year, I don't think I heard her speak, to me or to any other teacher. The change in her is unbelievable. Still quiet the first residential, the second residential she came out of herself a bit more. We were going cliff jumping and she was saying 'I can't do this, I can't do this' and she was the first one on the cliffs, the first one off. And before it all, she was saying 'my parents say there's no way I'm going to do this' and I said 'well prove them wrong' and she did it and did it about five times after that. So how much it's changed her is unbelievable.

LET TEACHER # 5

We send our year 11s out to the feeder primary schools to try and encourage them to come to the school...and I was just thinking back over the last three years and of the students that go out, two have been on the LET [the programme] just absolutely boosted their self confidence and that is not a coincidence, the children who go out to sell our school, two out of the three have been on the LET programme. Our head boy and our head girl were both on the LET too and to me that is a success story.

LET TEACHER # 1

We have very high special needs in our school...and it's a reward...and we've worked closely with the team here placing kids with very low self esteem where the parents themselves would be worried and the difference in those kids, doing a presentation, who would not speak! Confidently! On the banquet night you see those kids and you're wondering where the shy retiring kid is now.

LET TEACHER # 7

I think it pushes a lot of their own boundaries too, you've kids who go there and they might have a fear of heights, a fear of water they [the outdoor staff] aren't going to force anybody to do anything but they'll ask you to have a go and they just keep pushing those boundaries. It's good.

KEY TEACHER # 5

I think as well on LET, although it's intensive, you're not spending the rest of your life with the kids who are there so what have you got to lose really. Whereas at school, you've got everything to lose. I may never meet these people again. The relationship change among some kids who go away together is something we've noticed too. The power relationship can change and inside jokes bind them together and sometimes it's good to see the team leader in school sitting in corner out of it. And the video they get from LET with all of the pictures, they show that around, it's amazing, you don't get that on a one day.

LET TEACHER # 7

(d) Business and Entrepreneurship

There was widespread positive feedback from teachers on the highly applied aspect of the business and entrepreneurship aspect of the programmes. The process of conceiving a product or service, developing the business idea and finally selling directly to the public was lauded as an incredibly positive experience for most participants and a life enhancing experience for some. In addition to developing existing skills many participants discovered new talents in the business arena which surprised teachers and parents. Teachers thought that these highly positive experiences in business and enterprise could open up new career paths. Some teachers had specific examples of previous KEY and LET participants who had chosen to start-up businesses after their experiences on the programmes.

I think a lot of them would be afraid of entrepreneurship...they'd like the idea of a secure job and maybe be afraid to take that step and I know from talking to them that doing the trade fair is one of the things they enjoy doing the most and I'm always surprised by that because of the geeky element of it, you'd be thinking surfing or something would be their favourite but they really love the trade fair. [They like] making money I think and the pride in what they've made.

KEY TEACHER # 4

I think when you tell them in residential one that they're going to form a company, give everybody responsibilities within that company and go into a shopping centre and sell their product, they look at you! They don't believe it and think there's not a chance that's going to happen. But when you tell them at the end of residential four and they're working together...I've seen kids where their own company has finished their work and they go around to the other kids still working and help them out. They tell you after the trade fair 'I can't believe I did that' you see them at the start of it all, the first 20 minutes in the shopping centre, very introverted and afraid to approach the members of the public and then they sort of realise if I don't get into people's faces it's not going to sell and that's not on, we've taken four residential to make this product and now we've got to sell it.

KEY TEACHER # 5

They took some pride even in their appearance at the trade fair.

KEY TEACHER # 1

The parents travel to see the trade fair, the number of parents who travelled some long distances was amazing.

KEY TEACHER # 4

[I]n my rural area, lots of farmers, they came up with this slurry alarm because of all the deaths, and it detects the fumes and if they get to a certain level... and the guys from the LET programme thought it was fabulous. That's an idea that could sell, why has no one come up with this? They're definitely not too young [for enterprise].

LET TEACHER # 6

They're getting into the whole technology thing because this year the children were devising apps and I was going 'what'. So funny, they had the two judges. That was totally fresh and new from them.

LET TEACHER # 1

So they're out there selling their wares and it all culminates in the [trade fair] and I was absolutely shocked at the skill of the students I had brought thinking 'what monsters have I created'!

KEY TEACHER # 1

It was wonderful; the business has been a great focus for them from a teamwork perspective even apart from it being a great entrepreneurial thing to do because it got them in teams, public speaking, making presentations. This is more value add.

LET TEACHER # 2

Well we'd a fella two years ago and he was a keen gardener but he never thought 'what could I do with that' On KEY he learned a lot of skills and when he left school at 16, he started up his own gardening business and he's really built that up. I was talking to him recently and he said 'what I learned on the KEY programme gave me the push to go out '. Fair enough he had his Dad behind him but KEY gave him the push, he thought 'I can do this, I'm going to go and do something' and now he has a wee business.

KEY TEACHER # 2

One of the teachers participating in the focus group was a business studies teacher and he had some specific examples of the positive impact back in school of engaging with the business aspects of the programme.

[I]t so happens that I'm a business studies teacher so the year group would do business studies. The 12 that I bring away would always gain a grade C at least in their GCSEs whereas before that they'd be maybe predicted a D, E. So that extra tuition from the enterprise training, has really benefited them as well from an academic point of view the KEY programme has improved pupils.

KEY TEACHER # 2

For the kids who are doing business at school as well, the work ethic, they apply themselves and when you bring something up in class and they tell you we did that KEY, you know like doing your CV or finance for business and then they help out the kid beside them who maybe didn't go on KEY. So work ethic and even pride in their work like 'I did that, I know how to do that, I'm going to show you how'; that has definitely improved. From a selfish perspective as a business teacher.

KEY TEACHER # 2

4: FINDINGS FROM PARTICIPANT & CONTROL GROUPS - KEY PROGRAMME

The tables below show the valid percentage of respondents selecting each option on the questionnaires completed. The results from two groups are presented;

- Participants i.e. those who participated on the KEY programme
- A control group i.e. students drawn from the same schools as participants but who did not participate in the programme

A questionnaire was distributed to both groups at two different time points;

- a 'pre' questionnaire distributed just before the start of the programme
- a 'post' questionnaire distributed at the end of the programme

The commentary below considers the extent to which there has been any movement in the pre and post percentages among participants as well as the degree to which this movement is different between the participants and the control group.

(a) Respondent Profile

Gender

The participant group size reduced slightly in size between the two questionnaire collection periods but gender composition is unchanged and is broadly equally divided between male and female. The control group size is reduced from 310 at the first questionnaire collection to 130 for the second questionnaire. This reduction in size of the control group has affected the gender composition a little but it is still broadly equally divided between male and female.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Male	47.2	47.2	52.3	48.5
Female	52.8	52.8	47.7	51.5
N=	597	547	310	130

Table 1: Gender of respondents

Age

Table 2 shows the natural ageing of the cohort over the period of time the questionnaire data was collected.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
14 years	70	23	64.2	23.8
15 years	29.6	74.8	34.2	74.6
16 years	0.3	2.2	1.6	1.5
N=	597	547	310	130

Table 2: Age of respondents

Home Location

We can see that participants and non participants are most likely to live in a small city or town. However, almost a quarter of the participant group come from a big city whereas between 4-10% of the non-participant group do (table 3).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A big city	22.1	24.1	9.4	4.6
The suburbs or outskirts of a big city	12.9	11.7	17.4	17.7
A small city or town	37.7	36.6	46.1	43.1
A country village	14.4	12.4	11.6	17.7
A farm or home in the country	12.9	15.2	15.5	16.9
N=	597	547	310	130

Table 3: Where respondents live

Membership of Minority Ethnic Community

A higher percentage of the participant group see themselves as members of a minority ethnic community and yet a similar percentage of both groups (c95%) identify as white (tables 4-5). Section (b) below outlines some concerns about respondents' understanding of the concept of minority ethnic community.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	17.1	15.5	10.6	9.2
No	51.6	57.4	60	58.5
Don't know	31.3	27.1	29.4	32.3
N=	597	547	310	130

Table 4: Do you regard yourself as belonging to a minority ethnic community?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
White	94.5	93.2	94.8	96.9
N=	597	547	310	130

Table 5: To which of these ethnic groups do you belong – answer 'white'

Membership of a Religion

Although approximately one eighth of both participants and control group do not believe that they belong to any particular religion (table 6), there has been no significant shift in this stance over the duration of the programme. Of those that do see themselves belonging to a religion, almost 60% of participants identify as Catholic and 40% as Protestant. The drop in response rates for the control rate has affected the religious composition of the control group (table 7). Participants are marginally more likely to live in a mainly Catholic area (table 8) control group members are marginally more likely to live in a mainly Protestant area. Roughly one quarter of all respondents live in a mixed area.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	87.8	85.6	86.1	83.8
No	12.2	14.4	13.9	16.2
N=	596	543	310	130

Table 6: Do you regard yourself as belonging to any particular religion?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Catholic	58.1	59.6	53.7	48.6
Protestant	40.6	38.1	41.9	50.5
Christian	0.9	1.0	1.1	
Mormon	0.2		0.4	
Muslim	-	0.2	0.7	
Other	0.2	1.0	2.2	0.9
N=	535	480	270	111

Table 7: What religion do you belong to?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Mainly Catholic	38.4	36.3	30.6	28.5
Mainly Protestant	32	31.1	32.3	31.5
Mixed	22.1	25.8	28.4	27.7
Don't know	7.4	6.8	8.7	12.3
N=	596	543	310	130

Table 8: How would you describe your area (religion)?

(b) Community Relations

Interaction with People from Different Religions

Interestingly, KEY programme participants were more likely even at the start of the programme to say that they very often take part in common activities such as music or sport with people from different religious communities – 42% compared with 29% of the control group (table 9). This may indicate that participants who chose to apply for a cross community project like KEY are more likely to have cross community interaction in their lives anyway. However, there was no substantial increase in this percentage either among participants or control group.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very often	42.4	43.9	29.1	28.7
Sometimes	31.9	35.8	31.4	31
Rarely	17.1	14	23.3	25.6
Never	5.2	4.2	10.4	12.4
Don't know	3.4	2	5.8	2.3
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 9: How often do you take part in activities with people from a different religious community?

Interaction with Friends from Different Religions

However, there were some sizeable movements in participants' friendship groups. The number of participants who said they had more than 10 friends from a different religious community rose from 25% to 39% (table 10). The same figure dropped among control group members. The percentage of participants who said they had no friends at all from a different religious community dropped from 12% to 5%. The same figure rose slightly in the control group. This points to a very tangible effect of participation on the KEY programme – more friends from different religious backgrounds.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
None at all	11.9	5.4	12.9	16.3
One	7.9	3.3	6.5	10.1
Two to five	27.4	25.1	32	26.4
Six to ten	12.9	17.2	11	14
More than ten	25.4	39.1	19.7	15.5
Don't know	14.5	10	17.8	17.8
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 10: How many close friends do you have from a different religious community?

KEY participants were more likely after the programme to say they would visit the homes of these friends - 47% of participants compared with 37% of the control say they visit friends in their homes very often or sometimes (table 11). Participants were also more likely to have these friends calling to their home after the programme – 47% compared with 38% of the control group (table 12). However, it is notable how many participants and non- participants (c50%) rarely or never visit the homes of friends from different religious communities. In the case of KEY participants the uptake in the use of phone and text to keep contact with friends after the programme is significant – 77% of participants compared with 50% of the control group use these technologies to keep touch with friends (table 13). This may be due to the dispersed nature of the new friends made on the KEY programme; where new friends come from the other side of the province, phone and text is the best or indeed only way to stay in touch. However, being able to maintain friendships through this kind of contact allows the benefit of the KEY programme to persist, long past the end of the programme itself.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very often	11.9	14	11	10.9
Sometimes	27.9	32.8	24.6	25.6
Rarely	25.7	27.5	25.6	27.9
Never	26.1	18.8	26.2	27.1
Don't know	8.4	6.8	12.6	8.5
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 11: How often do you visit the home of friends from a different religious community?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very often	12.4	14.2	11.4	11.6
Sometimes	29.1	32.5	28.2	26.4
Rarely	26.2	24.9	22.3	26.4
Never	26.4	22.5	29.1	27.9
Don't know	5.9	5.9	9.7	7.8
N=	595		309	129

Table 12: How often do these friends visit your home?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very often	31.4	43.2	24.3	24.8
Sometimes	29.6	33.6	29.1	24.8
Rarely	15.1	13.5	20.7	20.9
Never	17	5.5	19.7	21.7
Don't know	6.9	4.2	6.1	7.8
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 13: How often do you phone or text friends who are from a different religious community?

Experience on Cross Community Projects

Before the programme started, both groups were asked to rate their experience mixing with people from different religious communities on their most recent cross community. Their views were broadly similar, with those going on the KEY programme a little more positive about prior experiences.

After the programme, the control group's rating of their most recent experience had not changed very much, 19% viewed the experience as very positive compared with 16% when asked before the programme. However, when participants were asked to rate the KEY programme in terms of their experience mixing with others from different communities, an amazing 80% of them rated the experience as very positive. This compared with 27% rating their previous cross community project experience as very positive (table 14).

This clear distinction points to the unique success of the KEY experience in terms of cross community interaction. This point was discussed at length during a focus group held with the teachers who participated on the KEY programme and is analysed at the end of this section.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very positive	26.6	79.9	15.5	18.6
Positive	45.2	17.5	42.7	43.4
Neither positive nor negative	10.1	1.5	16.5	12.4
Negative	0.8	-	1.9	4.7
Very negative	0.7	0.2	0.6	1.6
Don't know	16.6	0.9	22.7	19.4
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 14: On your most recent cross community project, how would you describe your interaction with people from different religious communities?

Future of Cross Community Relations

Approximately half of both groups think that religion will always make a difference to the way people feel about each other in Northern Ireland (table 15) but the KEY participants were much more optimistic about future relations between Catholics and Protestants – at the end of the programme, 42% of participants compared with 20% of the control group thought relations would be better in five years' time (table 16).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	47.1	53.3	51.1	54.3
No	32.3	31.2	26.2	24
Don't know	20.7	15.5	22.7	21.7
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 15: Do you think that religion will always make a difference to the way people feel about each other in Northern Ireland?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Better	36.1	41.5	27.8	20.2
Worse	8.9	9.2	9.7	17.8
About the same	40	35.4	48.5	48.1
Other	14.6	13.7	13.9	14
Don't know	.3	0.2	-	-
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 16: Do you think relations between Catholics and Protestants will be different in five years' time?

Preferences for Cross Community Interaction

There were differences too between the groups in personal preferences regarding interaction with people from different religions with the control group less open to these interactions both before and after the programme (table 17-19). The KEY programme appears to have succeeded in opening up participants' views even more. There was a small increase in the percentage of KEY participants who wanted to live in a mixed neighbourhood -65% after the programme compared with 57% before. The control group was marginally less willing to live in a mixed neighbourhood after the programme - 43% compared with 48% before (table 17). 59% of participants after the programme compared with 29% of the control group wanted to send their children to a mixed religion school (table 18). The percentage of participants who wanted to work in a mixed workplace rose from 74% to 82% while the corresponding percentage of control group members dropped slightly from 65% to 59% (table 19)

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Own religion neighbourhood	25.7	17.2	29.9	27.9
Mixed religion neighbourhood	57.1	64.9	47.7	43.4
Other	15.1	14.9	19.5	24
Other -Don't mind/don't care	2	3	2.9	4.7
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 17: What type of neighbourhood would you prefer to live in?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Own religion school	38	28.6	43.7	46.5
Mixed religion school	48.9	59.4	40.1	28.7
Other	11.6	10.7	14.2	20.9
Don't know	.2	-		-
Other -Don't mind/don't care	.8	1.3	1.9	3.9
Other – Irish School	.5	-		-
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 18: What type of school would you prefer to send your children to?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Own religion only	10.3	4.6	14.2	10.9
Mixed religion	74.1	81.9	64.7	58.9
Other	12.8	10.1	17.8	24
Other -Don't mind/don't care	2.9	3.3	3.2	6.2
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 19: If you were looking for a job, what type of workplace would you prefer to work in?

Other Cultures and Traditions

The KEY programme appears to have increased participant's understanding of both Catholic and Protestant culture and traditions (tables 20 and 21). However, most noticeably, participants' respect for Catholic culture and traditions has increased over the life of the programme while the control group's respect has decreased (table 22). Both groups have seen an increase in respect for Protestant culture and traditions (table 23).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A lot	29.9	37.5	26.2	24.8
A little	40.5	45.2	47.9	45.7
Hardly anything	18.5	10.5	17.2	18.6
Nothing at all	3.9	3.3	2.3	6.2
Don't know	7.2	3.5	6.5	4.7
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 20: How much do you understand the Catholic community's culture and traditions?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A lot	30.6	32.1	25.2	31.8
A little	39.3	40.2	40.5	38.8
Hardly anything	21.2	18.6	22.7	20.9
Nothing at all	3.7	5.4	5.2	3.9
Don't know	5.2	3.7	6.5	4.7
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 21: How much do you understand about the Protestant community's culture and traditions?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A lot	57.3	63.5	54.4	41.9
A little	29.1	24.7	24.9	28.7
Hardly anything	3.4	4.6	6.8	9.3
Nothing at all	0.7	0.9	1.9	5.4
Don't know	9.6	6.3	12	14.7
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 22: How much do you respect the Catholic community's culture and traditions?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A lot	51.9	58.1	45.6	51.9
A little	26.4	24.7	29.1	19.4
Hardly anything	8.1	7.9	9.1	10.1
Nothing at all	3.9	2.6	3.6	7
Don't know	9.7	6.6	12.6	11.6
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 23: How much do you respect the Protestant community's culture and traditions?

Views of Flag Flying

The control group's view on the importance of flag flying has not changed over the interval between questionnaire collections – 35% think it is an important expression of cultural identity. This was the same percentage of participants who thought it was important at the start of the programme; however this dropped to 27% by the end of the programme (table 24). Some KEY participants seem to have become more aware of the impact of flag flying on others – 62% after the programme compared with 50% before, think flag flying intimidates people (table 25). By the end of the programme, 63% of participants think more should be done to control flag flying compared with 48% at the start. An increased number of the control group also agree that more control is needed – 46% compared with 39%. This may perhaps show that the KEY programme helped some participants acquire a sensitivity towards the impact of these kinds of displays on other communities and increased their openness towards appropriate societal responses.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	34.1	27.1	35	35.7
No	25.9	31.2	19.7	24.8
Sometimes	31.4	35.6	34.6	27.9
Don't know	8.6	6.1	10.7	11.6
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 24: Do you think it is important for communities to fly flags as an expression of cultural identity?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	50.4	62.4	47.9	42.6
No	8.1	8.1	9.7	17.8
Sometimes	29.2	24.4	30.7	26.4
Don't know	12.3	5.2	11.7	13.2
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 25: Do you think that people are intimidated by flag flying?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	47.7	62.7	38.5	45.7
No	19.2	15.5	29.4	30.2
Don't know	33.1	21.8	32	24
N=	595	542	309	129

Table 26: Do you think more should be done to control flag flying in Northern Ireland?

Views regarding Minority Ethnic Communities

The questionnaires included some questions on interaction with people from minority ethnic communities and views on discrimination they might encounter. However, from some of the responses it seems that there was not a clear and shared understanding of the concept of minority ethnic communities. Respondents seemed to interpret this to mean 'people who were born outside of Northern Ireland' and people born in England, America and the Republic of Ireland were among those groups categorised as ethnic minorities. Thus, it is difficult to rely on the results generated under this topic presented below in tables 27-30.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
	N=	N=	N=	N=
Black (African, Caribbean)	272	277	106	38
Chinese	166	166	79	23
South Asian (Indian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi)	120	131	64	25
Irish Traveller	148	141	53	26
Polish	228	261	115	34
Filipino	116	145	53	10

Table 27: Number of respondents with friends in specific ethnic minority communities

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A lot	32.8	37.6	33	19.4
A little	56.1	54.1	55.3	61.2
Hardly any	11.1	8.3	11.7	19.4
N=	594	542	309	129

Table 28: Do you think that there is discrimination in Northern Ireland against people from minority ethnic communities?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
More	11.6	13.3	11.3	10.9
Less	29.8	40.6	33	31.8
About the same	39.1	33.8	41.1	38.8
Other	1.2	0.7	.3	0.8
Don't know	18.4	11.6	14.2	17.8
N=	594	542	309	129

Table 29: Do you think there will be more or less of this discrimination in 5 years' time?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Prefer company from same ethnic background	17	12.5	22.3	24
Prefer company different ethnic background	9.3	15.9	10.4	6.2
No preference	55.1	56.5	51.8	45
I don't know anyone from a different ethnic background	2.2	2.8	2.6	3.9
Other	0.2	1.1	1	0.8
Don't know	16.3	11.3	12	20.2
N=	594	542	309	129

Table 30: How do you feel about mixing with people from a different ethnic background?

(c) Planning for the Future

Education, Training, Exams and Qualifications

Both the participant and non-participant groups displayed a high level of awareness regarding the importance of a school education to their future. They were well disposed to taking exams in the near future and c.25% of both groups thought that they would attain a third level qualification. Over 80% of both groups thought that they would do some form of education and training after school. These measures remained high over the duration of the programme with no real difference between the two groups (tables 31-34).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	95.3	95.4	97.7	92.2
No	2	2.4	1	4.7
Don't know	2.7	2.2	1.3	3.1
N=	593	541	309	129

Table 31: Do you think that a school education is important to your future?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
No	0.3	0.9	-	1.6
A Level	38.4	35.9	36.6	29.5
GCSE	51.8	56	53.1	53.5
AS Level	2.9	3	1.6	3.1
GNVQ	-		0.3	
NVQ	0.3	1.3	1	0.8
Other	6.2	3	7.4	11.9
N=	593	541	309	129

Table 32: Do you intent to do any of these exams in the next five years?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A Level	36.4	39	30.4	26.4
GCSE	21.6	21.3	26.5	25.6
AS Level	3.9	3.1	3.9	1.6
GNVQ	0.3	0.4	0.6	-
NVQ	1.5	2	1.0	6.2
Third Level Qualification e.g. a degree or masters or HND etc.	22.6	25.7	20.1	22.5
Other	13	8.3	17.5	15.5
Don't Know	0.5	0.2	-	2.3
N=	593	541	309	129

Table 33: What do you think will be the highest level of qualification you will ever get?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	79.1	83.5	79.6	82.9
No	3.9	3.3	5.8	3.9
Don't know	17	13.1	14.6	13.2
N=	593	541	309	129

Table 34: When you leave school, do you think you will do any further education or training?

Careers and Planning

Respondents were asked to imagine what they would be doing in five years time and although there were some small differences between the two groups, both thought it was most likely that they would be studying in college or university (60% of participants compared with 54% of the control group) or working in a full-time job (table 35).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Studying in college or university	63.9	60.4	61.2	53.5
On an apprenticeship or training programme	4.4	6.7	5.2	2.3
Working in a full-time job	15.7	17.9	19.1	17.8
Working in the home	0.2	0.2	0.3	-
Working in a part-time job	3.7	5.7	3.6	7.8
Self employed	2.5	1.5	2.6	3.1
On the dole	0.7	0.4	1.3	1.6
Don't know	8.9	7.2	6.8	14
N=	593	541	309	129

Table 35: What do you think you will be doing in five years' time?

Both groups made use of school supports to discuss their future. Careers teachers and other teachers were more likely to be called on for support than the careers office in school. KEY participants' usage of these school career supports increased over the duration of the programme whereas control group usage remained roughly the same (table 36). Both groups drew more heavily on family and friends to discuss their future. KEY participants were fortunate to have access to KEY staff to discuss their future and over half of participants had taken this opportunity.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Someone from the careers office at school	19.3	28.3	12.9	14
A careers teacher at school	38.5	49.7	34.3	38.8
Another teacher at school	31.4	37.9	27.5	31.8
Someone in your family	76.5	76.3	81.2	77.5
Friends	58.2	63.4	59.9	64.3
Someone from the KEY programme	N/A	52	N/A	N/A
N=	595	541	309	129

Table 36: Have you discussed your future with any of the following people?

Job Search

One of the clearest benefits of participating on KEY programme is the improvement in job search skills. The percentage of participants and control group rating their skills as high in this area was very similar before the programme but very different after the programme – 46% of KEY participants would rate their CV preparation skills as high compared with 9% of the control group, 44% of participants would rate their interview preparation skills as high compared with 15% of the control group (table 37). There is also a general increase in awareness among KEY participants of the various places to look for a job e.g. online, newspapers etc (table 38). Recognition of the importance of qualifications and work experience in finding a job was higher among KEY participants both at the start and after the programme (tables 39 & 40).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Searching for job opportunities	19.9	25.3	16.6	15.5
Preparing a CV	11.3	46.2	11.4	9.4
Filling out an application form	22.8	38.7	25.2	21.9
Preparing for an interview	14.1	43.8	15.7	14.8
Sitting an interview	12.3	40.1	15	14.1
N=	592	541	306	129

Table 37: I would rate my skill as high.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Family and friends	65.9	71.5	62.1	66.6
Newspaper	48.7	60.4	51.8	62
Online	73.8	85.8	79.9	79.8
Recruitment agency	50.1	49.5	41.1	40.3
N=	595	541	309	129

Table 38: Where would you look to find a job, tick as many as apply.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very important	63.1	64	55.7	45.7
Important	30.5	32.2	36.9	43.4
Not that important	2.0	2	3.2	7
Not important at all	0.2	0.2	0.3	-
Don't know	4.2	1.7541	3.9	3.9
N=	593		309	129

Table 39: How important do you think relevant work experience is in getting a job?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very important	75.4	79.1	69.3	55
Important	19.6	17.6	25.2	34.9
Not that important	1	1.3	1.3	6.2
Not important at all	-	-	0.3	
Don't know	4	2	3.9	3.9
N=	593	541	309	129

Table 40: How important do you think relevant qualifications are in getting a job?

(d) Personal and Social

Linchpin Skills

The KEY programme aims to improve skills across a range of areas but there three linchpin skills incorporated into all aspects of the programme; communication skills, team working skills and goal setting skills. Both groups were asked to rate their own skill level in these areas. These are self ratings so it is possible that the actual skill level has not changed however the difference in self perception between the two groups is noticeable. The percentage of control group respondents who would rate their skill level as 'high' in these areas has barely changed. However, the KEY participants' skill ratings in all three linchpin skills have increased. By the end of the programme 71% of KEY participants compared with 48% at the start would rate their team working skills level as high. In terms of communication skills, 63% would rate themselves as 'high' compared with 46% at the start. Finally, 49% of KEY participants rate their goal setting skills as high compared with 32% at the beginning (table 41).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Communicating with others	46	62.8	51.6	48.8
Working as part of a team	47.7	70.9	50.6	51.9
Setting goals for yourself	32	49	29.6	31.5
N=	587	541	307	129

Table 41: I would rate my ability as high

Confidence, Self Worth and Control

In addition to concrete knowledge and skill acquisition the KEY programme aims to improve participants' attitudes about themselves focusing on feelings of confidence, self-worth, and control over their own lives. To measure shifts in these attitudes, participants are asked to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree with a range of statements. Although both groups showed very similar results for these attitudes, after the KEY programme, those who had participated scored higher than the control group in every one of these measures (table 42).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
I feel good about myself	76	83.9	74.5	71.1
I feel confident most of the time	68.4	79.3	66.5	66.7
I make good decisions	67.8	79.4	70.8	73.4
I enjoy taking responsibility	68.6	80.6	66.3	62.8
I am good at coming up with ideas	71.5	81.5	69.2	72.9
I think you have to take risks to get what you want	79.2	91.1	79.5	85.3
I am good at adapting to new situations	71.6	86.4	69.2	72.9
I think you have to work hard to get what you want	91.2	98.3	92.5	93
I believe I can achieve what I put my mind to	88.3	95.9	88.8	91.4
N=	588	541	305	129

Table 42: Strongly agree or agree with statements about self-efficacy.

Communication Skills

The same is true in relation to communication skills. Both groups started with similar ratings in relation to their communication skills in various settings but after the programme the participant group scored higher than the control group across each one of these skills (table 43). These are self-perceived skill levels so again, it is important to say that it is possible the underlying skill has not changed. Nonetheless, even if these improvements in self-perception are just that, they demonstrate and increased confidence about skill level among participants which is useful in improving confidence and shaping future actions.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
I would be happy standing up and talking in front of a group of people	43.2	64	43.8	43.4
I would be happy to talk in a group of people my own age	65.2	85.1	68.8	72.9
I would be happy speaking out in a class	58.8	79.2	60.7	57.4
I feel confident talking to people I haven't met before	55.4	74.1	57.4	52.7
I would be happy writing my ideas on paper	74.9	83.7	76.5	69.8
N=	592	541	306	129

Table 43: Strongly agree or agree with statements about communication skills.

(e) Entrepreneurship and Business

Business Awareness and Skills

Both groups had quite a high level of awareness of the things that are important in business and this did not change much for either group over the duration of the programme (table 44).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Communication skills	99.3	99.4	99	99.2
Knowing people in the community	76.7	74	78	80.9
Developing a good product and service	96.4	98.5	97	94.6
Money management	98.3	99.1	98.4	96.9
Managing your employees	98	99.1	99	96.9
Planning	96.1	98.1	98	93
Leadership	92.9	97.9	95.4	94.5
Meeting customer needs	94.2	98.1	95.7	97.7
N=	580	541	304	129

Table 44: I believe that this is important when running your own business.

However, when it came to the skills of actually working in business the percentage of KEY participants who believed their skill was at a high level had increased in each of five key business skills whereas the control group had decreased in three. For example the percentage of KEY participants who would rate their skill level is high in relation to selling products more than doubled over the duration of the programme from 20% to 44% (table 45). This seems directly attributable to the KEY exercise of developing and selling a product at a local market which is a clear highpoint of the programme according to the teacher's focus group.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Budgeting money	22.5	36.2	20.9	27.1
Saving money	31.1	37.4	30.6	37.2
Managing money	25.4	42.1	28.6	27.1
Setting up a business	12.7	28.4	15.1	14.1
Selling products to customers	19.6	43.5	19.5	18.8
N=	580	541	304	129

Table 45: Rating of business skills as high

Perhaps because of this positive experience of actually working in a business, KEY participants were much more likely to see themselves working in a business – 68% compared with 50% of the control group (table 46).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	59.9	68.1	53.4	49.6
No	11	8.2	13.1	14
Don't know	29	23.7	33.4	36.4
N=	589	536	305	129

Table 46: Can you see yourself working in business in the future?

Entrepreneurship

KEY participants entered the programme more likely than the control group to be personally interested in entrepreneurship. Over a third of KEY participants compared with one quarter of the control group could see themselves starting their own business (table 47). There was no real shift in this propensity among either group over the duration of the programme. However, by the end of the KEY programme, participants were more likely to feel they might enjoy this particular life choice – 47% of participants compared with 35% of the control group said they would 'love' starting their own business (table 48).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	34.1	35.7	24.8	24.8
No	23.1	22.4	33	36.8
Don't know	42.8	41.9	42.2	38.8
N=	593	540	306	129

Table 47: Can you see yourself starting your own business in the future?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
I'd love doing it	38.8	47	34.6	34.9
I'd enjoy it a bit	33.1	35.6	32.4	29.5
I wouldn't enjoy it that much	6.6	6.1	9.2	7.8
I'd hate doing it	1.9	2.0	6.5	9.3
I don't know	19.7	9.3	17.3	18.6
N=	593	540	306	129

Table 48: How much would you enjoy starting a business in the future?

5: FINDINGS FROM PARTICIPANT & CONTROL GROUPS - LET PROGRAMME

The tables below show the valid percentage of respondents selecting each option on the questionnaires completed. The results from two groups are presented;

- Participants i.e. those who participated on the LET programme
- A control group i.e. students drawn from the same schools as participants but who did not participate in the programme

A questionnaire was distributed to both groups at two different time points;

- a 'pre' questionnaire distributed just before the start of the programme
- a 'post' questionnaire distributed at the end of the programme

The commentary below considers the extent to which there has been any movement in the pre and post percentages among participants as well as the degree to which this movement is different between the participants and the control group.

(a) Respondent Profile

Gender

The participant group size reduced slightly in size from 416 to 392 between the two questionnaire collection periods but gender composition is unchanged and roughly evenly divided. The control group size reduced from 353 at the first questionnaire collection to 259 for the second questionnaire. However, this reduction in size of the control group has not significantly affected the gender composition which is broadly equally divided.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Male	49.3	48	49.3	51
Female	50.7	52	50.7	49
N=	416	392	353	259

Table 49: Gender of respondents

Age

Table 50 shows the natural ageing of the cohort over the period of time the questionnaire data was collected.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
12 years old	70.2	26.8	64.9	24.7
13 years old	29.8	73.2	35.1	75.3
N=	416	392	353	259

Table 50: Age of respondents

Home Location

As with the KEY programme, both participants and non-participants on the LET programme are most likely to live in a small city or town (table 51) with over one third identifying this as the location of their home.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A big city	15.1	21.7	11.6	10
The suburbs or outskirts of a big city	5.5	4.3	6.5	8.9
A small city or town	38.2	35.5	39.9	39
A country village	19.7	17.6	23.2	23.6
Or, a farm or home in the country?	21.4	20.9	18.7	18.5
N=	416	392	353	259

Table 51: Where respondents live

Membership of a Minority Ethnic Community

A higher percentage of the control group are unsure about whether they are members of a minority ethnic community and yet a similar percentage of both groups (c95%) identify as white (table 52-53). Section (b) below outlines some concerns about respondents' understanding of the concept of minority ethnic community.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
White	92.3	93.1	92.4	95.4
N=	416	392	353	259

Table 52: To which of these ethnic groups do you belong – answer 'white'

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	9.6	5.5	13.9	8.9
No	53.8	65.1	49.9	55.2
Don't know	36.5	29.3	36.3	35.9
N=	416	392	353	259

Table 53: Do you regard yourself as belonging to a minority ethnic community?

Membership of a Religion

The overwhelming majority (over 85%) of both groups see themselves as belonging to a religion and this does not change over the duration of the programme (table 54). 55% of participants identify as Catholic and 43% as Protestant. The drop in response rates for the control rate has affected the religious composition of the control group and the breakdown varies a little between the pre and post questionnaires. (table 55). A third of participants compared with one half of the control group live in a mainly Catholic area (table 56). Roughly one quarter of all respondents, both participants and control group, live in a mixed area.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	90.5	88.9	85.6	86.3
No	9.5	11.1	14.4	13.7
N=	412	386	353	256

Table 54: Do you belong to a religion?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Catholic	55.3	54.8	51.9	58.7
Protestant	43.6	42.9	45	39.6
Other	1.1	2.3	3.1	1.7
N=	385	354	318	235

Table 55: Personal Religion

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Mainly Catholic	31.8	33.9	33.1	44.9
Mainly Protestant	25.5	30.8	28.6	23.8
Or mixed?	31.8	27.7	27.2	24.2
Don't know	10.9	7.5	11	7
	412	386	353	256

Table 56: How would you describe your area (religion)?

(b) Community Relations

Interaction with People from Different Religions

There is no significant change over the duration of the programme in the frequency of interaction between respondents and those from a different religious community and no significant difference between the participant and control groups (table 57).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very often	40.3	35.4	36.4	34.3
Sometimes	39.6	40.6	38.4	35.4
Rarely	14.1	16.7	15.3	18.1
Never	2.5	1.8	5.5	8.3
Don't know	3.5	5.5	4.3	3.9
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 57: How often do you take part in activities with people from a different religious community?

Interaction with Friends from Different Religions

In terms of interaction with friends from different religions there is more interaction among the participant group after the programme and some small comparisons between the two groups worth noting. The LET participant group has halved the percentage who say they have no friends at all from a different religion and increased the percentage with more than 10 such friends from 20% to 32%. The reverse of these shifts can be observed among the control group (table 58). This points to a very tangible effect of participation on the LET programme – more friends from different religious backgrounds.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
None at all	12.1	5.7	8.4	11.8
One	8.4	4.7	7.8	9.8
Two to five	27	27.3	25.7	32.3
Six to ten	14.4	18.5	14.7	13.8
More than ten	20.3	31.5	26	15.7
Don't know	17.8	12.2	17.3	16.5
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 58: How many close friends do you have from a different religious community?

There has been no noticeable change in the frequency with which either group visits friends at home or has the friends to visit their own home. Roughly one quarter of all respondents never visit their friends from other religions at home or have these friends to visit them (table 59-60).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very often	10.9	13	12.1	8.7
Sometimes	30.4	27.6	28.6	28.3
Rarely	21.5	25.8	23.4	28.3
Never	24.8	21.9	24.6	25.2
Don't know	12.4	11.7	11.3	9.4
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 59: How often do you visit the home of friends from a different religious community?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very often	9.7	13.3	14.5	9.4
Sometimes	31.2	27.9	32.4	29.1
Rarely	23.5	25.8	16.5	28.3
Never	26	23.4	26.3	22.4
Don't know	9.7	9.6	10.4	10.6
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 60: How often do these friends visit your home?

However, LET participants are more likely after the programme to keep contact using phone or text than they were before - 67% use these methods very often or sometimes compared with 53% before. This may be due to the geographic dispersion of the friends made on the LET programme.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very often	23.3	31.5	26	20.1
Sometimes	30	35.2	27.2	33.5
Rarely	13.4	14.1	19.9	16.1
Never	23.3	9.6	18.5	21.7
Don't know	10.1	9.6	8.4	8.7
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 61: How often do you phone or text friends who are from a different religious community?

Experience on Cross Community Projects

Before the programme started, both groups were asked to rate their experience mixing with people from different religious communities on their most recent cross community project. Their views were broadly similar. After the programme, the control group's rating of their most recent experience had not changed very much, 20% viewed the experience as very positive compared with 17% when asked before the programme. However, when participants were asked to rate the LET programme in terms of their experience mixing with others from different communities, an astonishing 79% rated the experience as very positive. This compared with a 21% very positive rating for other cross community projects before they undertook the LET programme (table 62).

As with the KEY programme, this clear distinction highlights a very successful methodology in terms of cross community interaction. This point was discussed at length during a focus group held with the teachers who participated on the LET programme and is analysed at the end of this section.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Very positive	21	78.6	16.8	19.7
Positive	41.1	17.2	40.2	32.7
Neither positive nor negative	7.2	1.8	11	15
Negative	1.7	-	2.6	2.8
Very negative	0.7	0.3	2	4.3
Don't know	28.2	2.1	27.5	25.6
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 62: On your most recent cross community project, how would you describe your interaction with people from different religious communities?

Future of Cross Community Relations

At the time of the second questionnaire collection point 55% of the control group compared with 36% of the participant group believe that religion will always make a difference to the way people feel about each other in Northern Ireland (table 63). However, the groups are almost identical in their beliefs about the nature of this future with approximately one quarter thinking relations would be better in five years' time (table 64).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	31.4	35.7	46	54.7
No	41.1	34.6	34.4	22.8
Don't know	27.5	29.7	19.7	22.4
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 63: Do you think that religion will always make a difference to the way people feel about each other in Northern Ireland?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Better	34.7	28.9	30.5	26
Worse	8.4	12	14.8	16.9
About the same	39.6	40.4	38.4	42.9
Other	17.3	18.8	16.3	14.2
N=	404	384	344	254

Table 64: Do you think relations between Catholics and Protestants will be different in five years' time?

Preferences for Cross Community Interaction

There were differences too between the groups in personal preferences regarding interaction with people from different religions with the participant group more open to these interactions after the programme. There was an increase in the percentage of LET participants who wanted to live in a mixed neighbourhood -62% after the programme compared with 52% before. The control group was marginally less willing to live in a mixed neighbourhood after the programme - 44% compared with 49% before (table 65). 53% of participants after the programme compared with 37% of the control group wanted to send their children to a mixed religion school (table 66). The majority of both groups would prefer to work in a mixed workplace but this percentage did not show any movement for either group over the duration of the programme (table 67).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Own religion only	26.7	21.4	28.1	34.6
Mixed religion neighbourhood	52.2	61.5	49	44.1
Other	18.1	15.6	20.9	19.7
Other -Don't mind/don't care	3	1.6	2	1.6
N=	404	384	345	254

Table 65: What type of neighbourhood would you prefer to live in?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Own religion only	44.6	32	39.4	46.5
Mixed religion school	39.4	52.6	45.5	37
Other	14.1	14.9	14.8	14.6
Other -Don't mind/don't care	2	0.5	0.3	2
N=	404	384	345	254

Table 66: What type of school would you prefer to send your children to?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Own religion only	10.6	10.7	15.4	14.6
Mixed religion workplace	70.5	69.8	63.5	62.2
Other (Please write in)	14.4	16.7	18.3	17.7
Other -Don't mind/don't care	4.5	2.9	2.0	5.5
N=	404	384	345	254

Table 67: If you were looking for a job, what type of workplace would you prefer to work in?

Other Cultures and Traditions

Understanding of and respect for the culture and traditions of the two main communities in Northern Ireland was examined. There were small increases in understanding of Catholic traditions among both groups (table 68) and an increase in understanding of Protestant traditions in the LET participant group (table 69).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
...a lot,	22.8	30.5	26.3	31.9
a little,	50	43.8	42.2	42.5
hardly anything,	18.6	15.1	17.6	15.7
or nothing at all?	3.0	3.6	6.6	3.5
Don't know	5.7	7	7.2	6.3
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 68: How much do you understand the Catholic community's culture and traditions?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
...a lot,	26.2	34.1	27.5	25.6
a little,	36.4	34.4	30.9	37.4
hardly anything,	23	21.1	24.3	25.2
or nothing at all?	6.4	5.7	9.2	6.3
Don't know	7.9	4.7	8.1	5.5
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 69: How much do you understand about the Protestant community's culture and traditions?

By the end of the programme 64% of LET participants felt they respected the Catholic community's culture and traditions a lot compared with 51% before and 58% respected the Protestant community's culture and traditions at the end of the programme compared with 43% at the start. The control group's respect for Catholic traditions declined over the same period and respect for Protestant traditions increased (table 70-71).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
...a lot,	51.2	63.5	50	41.9
a little,	28.5	24.7	24.6	28.7
hardly any,	5.9	4.6	5.8	9.3
or none at all?	1.5	0.9	4.9	5.4
Don't know	12.0	6.3	14.7	14.7
N=	404	542	346	129

Table 70: How much do you respect the Catholic community's culture and traditions?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
...a lot,	43.1	58.1	43.4	59.1
a little,	32.4	24.5	28.3	24.4
hardly any,	6.4	4.7	7.8	6.7
or none at all?	2.2	0.5	5.2	2
Don't know	15.8	12.2	15.3	7.9
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 71: How much do you respect the Protestant community's culture and traditions?

Views of Flag Flying

By the end of the programme there was practically no difference in views between the participant and control groups in relation to fly flying. One third of both groups thought it was important for communities to fly flags as an expression of cultural identity but over 50% agreed that people were intimidated by flag flying and c57% believe that more should be done to control it (table 72-75).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	25.2	33.3	32.9	32.7
No	27	18	28.6	25.6
Sometimes	34.2	38.8	26.3	33.1
Don't know	13.6	9.9	12.1	8.7
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 72: Do you think it is important for communities to fly flags as an expression of cultural identity?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	39.1	54.7	45.1	50.4
No	11.4	6.2	10.7	10.6
Sometimes	30.9	24.7	28.3	26
Don't know	18.6	14.3	15.9	13
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 73: Do you think that people are intimidated by flag flying?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	40.8	57	41.3	56.3
No	20	14.8	26.9	19.3
Don't know	39.1	28.1	31.8	24.4
N=	404	384	346	254

Table 74: Do you think more should be done to control flag flying in Northern Ireland?

Views regarding Minority Ethnic Communities

The questionnaires included some questions on interaction with people from minority ethnic communities and views on discrimination they might encounter. However, from some of the responses it seems that there was not a clear and shared understanding of the concept of minority ethnic communities. Respondents seemed to interpret this to mean 'people who were born outside of Northern Ireland' and people born in England, America and the Republic of Ireland were among those groups categorised as ethnic minorities. Thus, it is difficult to rely on the results generated under this topic presented below in tables 75-78.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Black (African, Caribbean)	29.2	18	25.8	19.7
Chinese	17.1	18	16	12.2
South Asian (Indian, Pakistani or Bangladeshi)	10.6	13.8	11.9	15.4
Irish Traveller	20.3	20.3	15.3	17.7
Polish	36.9	40.1	37.4	31.1
N=	404	384	345	254

Table 75: Number of respondents with friends in specific ethnic minority communities

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A lot	23.9	33.3	28.5	29.2
A little	59.7	54.9	56.1	57.7
Hardly any	16.4	11.7	15.4	13
N=	402	384	344	253

Table 76: Do you think that there is discrimination in Northern Ireland against people from minority ethnic communities?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
More in 5 years	11.7	13.8	18.3	18.2
Less	23.4	22.9	23.3	24.5
About the same	40.8	35.9	39.5	39.1
Other	0.2	0.8	0.9	0.8
Don't know	23.9	26.6	18	17.4
N=	402	384	344	253

Table 77: Do you think there will be more or less of this discrimination in 5 years' time?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
I prefer the company of people from the same ethnic background as the one that I was brought up in	17.7	11.5	21.2	23.3
I prefer the company of people from a different ethnic background to the one that I was brought up in	11.7	11.5	10.5	7.1
I have no preference	41.5	51	38.1	45.5
I don't know anyone of a different ethnic background	2.7	1.0	6.1	4.7
Other	0.5	22.4	1.7	1.2
Don't know	25.9	0	22.4	18.2
N=	402	384	344	253

Table 78: How do you feel about mixing with people from a different ethnic background?

(c) Planning for the Future

Education, Training, Exams and Qualifications

Both the participant and control groups displayed a high level of agreement, over 90%, regarding the importance of a school education to their future. They were well disposed to taking exams in the near future with slightly more interest in A levels among both groups by the end of the programme period. c.13% of both groups thought that they would attain a third level qualification. c.70% of both groups thought that they would do some form of education and training after school. These measures remained high over the duration of the programme with no major differences between the two groups (tables 79-82).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	95	95.8	95.3	92.4
No	1	0.8	2.6	2.4
I don't know	4	3.4	2.1	5.2
N=	401	384	341	251

Table 79: Do you think that a school education is important to your future?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
No	1.2	0.5	1.2	2.4
Yes, A Level	31.7	37.8	34	40.2
Yes, GCSE	54.9	52.1	51.9	41.4
Yes, AS Level	4.5	3.1	1.8	3.2
Yes, GNVQ	0.2		-	1.2
Yes, NVQ	-	0.5	1.2	0.4
Yes, Irish Leaving Certificate	-		0.3	
Yes, Irish Leaving Certificate Applied	-		0.6	0.4
Other	7.5	6	9.1	10.4
Don't Know	401	384	341	251

Table 80: Do you intent to do any of these exams in the next five years?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
A Level	35.2	33.9	26.1	36.7
GCSE	36.4	29.2	34.6	25.5
AS Level	3.2	4.2	5	4.8
GNVQ	1.7	1.3	1.5	0.4
NVQ	1	1.3	1.5	0.8
Irish Junior Certificate	-		0.9	0.4
Irish Leaving Certificate	0.5		-	0.4
Irish Leaving Certificate Applied	0.2		-	
Third Level Qualification e.g. a degree or masters or HND etc.	6.2	14.1	10	12.7
Other	15.5	15.1	20.2	17.1
Don't Know	-	1	0.3	1.2
N=	401	384	341	251

Table 81: What do you think will be the highest level of qualification you will ever get?

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	72.3	73.7	72.1	69.3
No	6	3.4	7.6	6.8
Don't know	21.7	22.9	20.2	23.9
N=	401	384	341	251

Table 82: When you leave school, do you think you will do any further education or training?

Careers and Planning

When respondents were asked to imagine what they would be doing in five years' time there was a great deal of similarity in the responses from both groups at both time points, pre and post. Both groups thought it was most likely that they would be studying in college or university or working in a full-time job (table 35).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Studying in college or university	56.4	60.9	54.8	58.2
On an apprenticeship or training programme	6	3.6	5	3.2
Working in a full-time job	14	14.3	15	13.1
Working in the home	1.2	0.3	0.3	0.4
Working in a part-time job	8	8.3	7.9	6.8
Self employed	2.2	2.1	4.1	2.4
On the dole	0.7	0.3		1.2
Don't know	11.5	10.2	12.9	14.7
N=	401	384	341	251

Table 83: What do you think you will be doing in five years' time?

Both groups made limited use of school supports to discuss their future and were far more like to talk to family and friends about their future. LET participants' usage of all career discussion outlets increased over the duration of the programme whereas control group usage remained roughly the same (table 84). LET participants were fortunate to have access to LET staff to discuss their future and a quarter of participants had taken this opportunity.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Someone from the careers office at school	6	5.7	5.8	6.7
A careers teacher at school	11.4	15.1	15	14.7
Another teacher at school	10.6	24.7	11.1	13.5
Someone in your family	71.8	77.6	65.2	73.3
Friends	53.2	63.3	57.7	58.6
Someone from the LET programme	N/A	24.5	N/A	N/A
N=	404	384	345	251

Table 84: Have you discussed your future with any of the following people?

(d) Personal and Social

Linchpin Skills

The LET programme aims to improve skills across a range of areas but there three linchpin skills incorporated into all aspects of the programme; communication skills, team working skills and goal setting skills. Both groups were asked to rate their own skill level in these areas. The LET programme does not appear to have been particularly successful in this regard in 2012/13 as there was relatively little movement over the duration of the programme in participants' rating of their proficiency in these skills (table 85).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Communicating with others	44.7 N= 396	52 N=383	50.6 N= 332	49.6 N=248
Working as part of a team	55.2 N=395	53.9 N=382	52.1 N= 326	48.6 N=247
Setting goals for yourself	40.2 N=391	42.6 N=382	34.8 N=325	31.7 N=246

Table 85: I would rate my skill as high.

Confidence, Self-Worth and Control

In addition to concrete knowledge and skill acquisition the LET programme aims to improve participants' attitudes about themselves focusing on feelings of confidence, self-worth, and control over their own lives. Both groups showed very similar results across these attitudes at the beginning of the programme. The LET programme does not appear to have been particularly successful in this regard in 2012/13 as the participant group showed slight declines in most of these attitudinal measures over the duration of the programme (table 86).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
I feel good about myself	87.7	83.3	85.2	79.5
I feel confident most of the time	79.5	74.9	77	79.6
I make good decisions	80.5	73.3	78.3	72.7
I enjoy taking responsibility	76.3	73.1	75.6	75.1
I am good at coming up with ideas	78.8	77	74	78.1
I think you have to take risks to get what you want	77.9	85.3	76.5	78.8
I am good at adapting to new situations	79.3	81.2	71.5	73.9
I think you have to work hard to get what you want	95.6	95.1	90.8	90.2
I believe I can achieve what I put my mind to	91.2	93.4	89.5	89.2
N=	389	381	323	241

Table 86: Strongly agree or agree with statements about self-efficacy

Communication Skills

Both groups started with similar ratings in relation to their communication skills in various settings but after the programme the participant group scored higher than the control group across in relation to specific communication setting. For example 69% of participants compared with 53% of the control group would be happy standing up and talking in front of a group of people. 91% of participants compared with 77% of the control would be happy to talk in a group of people their own age (table 87). These are self-perceived skill levels so again, it is important to say that it is possible the underlying skill has not changed. Nonetheless, even if these improvements in self-perception are just that, they demonstrate and increased confidence about skill level among participants which is useful in improving confidence and shaping future actions.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
I would be happy standing up and talking in front of a group of people	55.3	69.2	55.5	52.9
I would be happy to talk in a group of people my own age	83.3	90.9	83.1	76.5
I would be happy speaking out in a class	72.5	75.4	67	64
I feel confident talking to people I haven't met before	70.4	71	67.7	63.9
I would be happy writing my ideas on paper	80.9	83.3	83.4	82.7
N=	392	382	324	243

Table 87: Strongly agree or agree with statements about communication skills.

(e) Entrepreneurship and Business

Business Awareness and Skills

Both groups had quite a high level of awareness of the things that are important in business and this did not change much for either group over the duration of the programme (table 88).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Communication skills	98.5	98.2	97.5	97.6
Knowing people in the community	79.7	85.1	82.6	77.1
Developing a good product and service	96.4	96.3	95.3	95.4
Money management	96.7	98.7	95.6	94.3
Managing your employees	96.2	94.7	97.2	96.2
Planning	96.4	95.8	95.6	92.6
Having a good social life	74.7	61.1	74.3	60.9
Leadership	91.3	91.8	90.4	86
Meeting customer needs	96.2	93.3	95.9	93.3
Having a lot of friends	53.7	40.9	48.9	43.8
Having good holidays	36.9	22.8	44	37.3
N=	382	369	316	233

Table 88: I believe that this is important when running your own business.

However, when it came to the skills of actually working in business the percentage of LET participants who believed their skill was at a high level had increased in each of four key business skills whereas the control group had decreased in all four. For example the percentage of KEY participants who would rate their skill level is high in relation to budgeting increased from 32% to 43% over the duration of the programme (table 89). These differences in skill did not impact on the respondents' ability to see themselves working in business in the future, c60% of both group could envisage opting for this career choice (table 90).

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Budgeting money	31.9 N= 395	42.7 N= 382	33.1 N= 323	31.2 N= 247
Saving money	46.6 N= 397	48.6 N= 383	44.5 N= 328	35.9 N= 245
Managing money	42.5 N= 393	46 N= 383	44 N= 323	38.8 N= 245
Setting up a business	26.6 N=395	32.5 N=381	31.2 N=321	20 N=245

Table 89: Rating of business skills as high

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	64.5	61.1	62.6	58.7
No	8	5.7	9.7	10.5
I don't know	27.5	33.2	27.7	30.8
N=	400	383	329	247

Table 90: Can you see yourself working in business in the future?

Entrepreneurship

LET participants entered the programme marginally more likely than the control group to be personally interested in entrepreneurship. However, over the duration of the programme this percentage dropped among LET participants perhaps because they had received a realistic preview of business start-up from the LET programme (table 91). By the end of the programme, LET participants were slightly more likely to feel they might enjoy this particular life choice – 51% of participants compared with 43% of the control group said they would 'love' starting their own business (table 92) although this had not changed much over the duration of the programme.

	Participants		Control Group	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Yes	41.2	33.7	37.1	31.6
No	20.8	20.4	23.4	25.9
I don't know	38	46	39.5	42.5
N=	400	383	329	247

Table 91: Can you see yourself starting your own business in the future?

	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
I'd love doing it	52.2	50.7	50.2	42.5
I'd enjoy it a bit	32	29	28.9	30.8
I wouldn't enjoy it that much	5	7	7.3	9.3
I'd hate doing it	1.2	2.1	1.8	2.4
I don't know	9.5	11.2	11.9	15
N=	400	383	329	247

Table 92: How much would you enjoy starting a business in the future?

6: CONCLUSION

This evaluation focused on shifts in certain key attitudes among participants on the KEY and LET programmes delivered in 2012/13 which were developed by Young Enterprise Northern Ireland and Junior Achievement Ireland. Participants from schools, primarily in interface areas in Northern Ireland, were included in the evaluation along with control groups and teachers from these schools. The findings from the evaluation have been presented in the previous sections and are summarised here with reference to four key areas of the programmes; community relations, planning for the future, personal and social skills, business and entrepreneurship.

In terms of community relations, it is clear that the KEY and LET model of classroom and outdoor activities combined in a residential setting with external facilitator and teacher support is both unique and successful. The programmes are generating immediate and tangible effects such as an increased number of friends from other communities and backgrounds. However, they are also impacting positively on attitudes to future interactions with those from other backgrounds and contributing to a sense of optimism about cross-community relations in general. The programmes don't just impact on their participants. Firstly, though network effects, young people who have not participated on the programme are part of cross-community friendship groups whose contact with each other is initiated on the programmes. Secondly, the programmes are also contributing to communities' structural capital by helping to build links between schools and teachers as well as the students themselves.

Both programmes, but especially the KEY programme, get participants to think about planning the future they want for themselves and to connect their dreams with concrete choices or actions. This requires tangible shifts in skills as well as a greater interest in making plans. Both KEY and LET participants have made greater use of career discussion supports offered by family and friends and at school. There was ample evidence that the KEY programme has been successful in its efforts to equip participants with a more confident attitude about their skills in this area, particularly in relation to CV and interview preparation skills. There was also a general increase in awareness among KEY participants of the various places to look for a job and a greater recognition of the importance of qualifications and work experience in finding a job. Teachers felt that the programme environment was far more effective in delivering these outcomes due to the involvement of external tutors such as business people and because of the intensive but safe environment provided by the programmes.

With regard to personal and social skills, this evaluation focused on linchpin skills of communication, team working and goal setting as well as personal feelings of confidence, self-worth and control. The focus on linchpin skills has been shown to be very successful, particularly on the KEY programme where participants' self-ratings of skills in all three linchpin skills increased. Participants' ratings of their communication skills in a variety of settings were much improved on both the KEY and LET programmes compared with those in the control group. Teachers provided individual examples of these effects which are particularly noticeable among shy participants and can prove to be surprising for teachers and parents alike. Teachers observed that for some participants overcoming their fears to participate in some daunting outdoor activities taught an important lesson about the rewards of

doing challenging things. The feeling of achievement associated with overcoming your fears coupled with discovering a new talent was a potent and rare feeling for some participants.

Finally, with regard to the business and entrepreneurship in terms of the actual skills of working in a business both KEY and LET participants rated their skills levels as higher after their participation on the programme. There was widespread positive feedback from teachers on the highly applied entrepreneurship aspect in particular. The process of conceiving a product or service, developing the business idea and finally selling directly to the public was lauded as an incredibly positive experience for most participants and a life enhancing experience for some. In addition to developing existing skills many participants discovered new talents in the business arena which surprised teachers and parents. These improvements in self-perceived skill however did not make it more likely that participants could see themselves working in business in the future or starting their own business. However, this may be related to the difficulty of predicting your future at a young age and teachers thought that these highly positive experiences in business and enterprise could open up new career paths. Some teachers gave specific examples of previous KEY and LET participants who had chosen to start-up businesses after their experiences on the programmes.

The KEY and LET programmes are unique and successful. They offer a high quality learning experience and comparisons with control groups show the effects on young people as a result of participating on the programmes. These effects can be linked to the distinctive aspects of the KEY and LET model namely the residential experience, combination of classroom and outdoor activities and use of external tutors and facilitators. The evaluation has shown that the KEY and LET model is particularly successful in relation to community relations and may provide a blueprint for the design and delivery of interventions in this regard. Although Northern Ireland is much changed in the years since the first KEY programme was launched, the need for interventions of this type has not gone away. It is important that the lessons learned from pioneering programmes such as KEY and LET are distilled and used to guide future interventions.