

Annex 1: Conditions in the four areas

Location	West City	East Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
Inner/Outer	Inner	Outer	Outer	Inner
Ethnically Mixed	Yes	Yes	Very little	Yes
Dominant Tenure	Council	Council	Council	Social renting
Housing Type	Estates – flats	Estates - mixed	Estate – houses; some flats	Mixed
Older Street Property	Yes	Yes, some	No	Yes – many Victorian terraces
Park(s)	Yes	Yes	Yes, but largely considered to be unusable / not 'family friendly'	Yes, but largely considered to be unusable / not 'family friendly'
General Appearance	Poor – small park improved. Some signs of gentrification	Poor – some new facilities and some new housing	Poor – some basic repair and minor improvements	Poor – small park improved
Housing changes	New Deal for Communities investment (slow start). Significant increase in luxury flat building.	6,500 new homes Private Finance Initiative for estates major demolition and investment	Arms Length Management Organisation housing management and investment – some demolition	Objective 1 (EU) New Deal for Communities Housing Market Renewal some demolition and investment
Type of Area	Increasing number of new luxury flats alongside mainly council estates (flats). Some older private streets.	Mainly council estates (flats and houses). Some new mixed tenure developments	Predominantly one large inter-war council estate (houses with some flats)	Mixed area – council, Housing Association, private (houses and flats)

Annex 2: Summary of area characteristics

	West City	East Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
Population (rounded)	31,000	23,000	18,000	14,000
Tenure-%				
Local Authority	49	40	56	34
Housing Association	12	11	4	8
Owner occupation	24	32	33	44
Private renting	12	13	2	11
<i>Owner occupier</i> <i>National = 69%</i>				
Ethnic Composition¹-%				
White	61	60	97	59
Black	26	27	0.4	12
Asian	6	7	1	23
Mixed	4	4	0.3	2
Main Regeneration Programmes²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NDC - Excellence in Cities - Sure Start 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EAZ - Excellence in Cities - Sure Start - SRB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Excellence in Cities - Sure Start - SRB 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NDC - EAZ - Excellence in Cities - Sure Start - SRB
Deprivation Rank (IMD 2000)	Within poorest 1%	Within poorest 1%	Within poorest 5%	Within poorest 1%
Crime statistics local authority recorded offences per 1000 pop. Jan-Mar 2004 <i>National = 28</i> (Home Office, 2010)	Significantly above England/Wales average, but fell 2% 2001-2004 46	Above England/Wales average, but stable 2001-2004 38	Above England/Wales average, but falling since 2003 40	Above England/Wales average, and rose 3% since 2003 30
School performance 2008/9 <i>Local authority: % of total pupils with 5 GCSEs (A*-C)</i> <i>National = 70</i> (DCSF, 2009)	Below England average 67	Below England average 64	Below England average 67	Below England average 65
Tenure change	Right To Buy, housing association conversions, private new build	Right To Buy, housing association properties and private new build flat shares	Right To Buy, small housing association developments, selected demolition	Right To Buy, housing association and gentrification
Transport/Roads	Good bus connections. Underground not nearby, very busy roads	Overground trains, good underground and bus connections, dissected by A13	Good bus service along busy main road, which divides the estate, many minor estate roads	Buses along busy main road, lots of smaller roads
Demolition	None	Large scale	Small scale	Moderate scale, but slow and piecemeal
Ethnic change	Rapid (far above average)	Rapid (far above average)	Slow (typical of outer Northern council estates)	Rapid (far above average)

¹**Ethnic definitions:** Interviewees were asked to self-identify using showcards which included the following categories: White, Black Caribbean, Black African, Black British, Other Black Groups; Indian; Pakistani; Bangladeshi; Chinese; Irish, Mixed; None of these (please describe)

²**Glossary:** NDC = New Deal for Communities; SRB = Single Regeneration Budget; EAZ = Employment Action Zone

³**Statistics** in this annex are drawn from census data except where otherwise specified

Annex 3: Methods

1. Tracking twelve disadvantaged areas

This book is part of a long term, wide ranging longitudinal of twelve highly disadvantaged areas and neighbourhoods, each covering between 14,000 and 31,000 residents. The areas were selected in 1998 based on close analysis of the 1991 census and the government's index of multiple deprivation.³

We used wards as a proxy for areas, though ward boundaries do not exactly coincide with the neighbourhoods we studied. We first identified the 5% of wards that were most work poor, meaning wards with the highest proportion of households where no-one was in work, studying or on a full time training programme. We then identified the 5% most "deprived" wards as revealed by the Government's index of multiple deprivation. A majority of the 5% identified as work-poor were also identified on the index of multiple deprivation. 3% of all Census wards were both 'work poor' and 'multiply deprived' by these two definitions, a total of 280 wards. Mapping these wards revealed that all except 41 of them were in 'poverty clusters', i.e. adjacent to other high poverty wards. The twelve areas were selected out of the 280 wards.

The high poverty wards were concentrated in six ONS categories of area types, with high deprivation. This included London, large cities, industrial areas, mining and port areas, inner city areas, and other. The twelve areas reflect regional and ethnic differences and cover a wide range of characteristics. The twelve areas represent the range of problems affecting disadvantaged areas and are frequently used in other research.⁴ The study tracks change over time and shows the impact of government policies on area change, in order to understand area trajectories.

2. The Families Study

Within the twelve areas, four areas were chosen as the focus for an in depth longitudinal study of 200 families, 50 in each area, to understand the impact of urban neighbourhood conditions on family life; and to learn how low-income families cope with the problems that surround them. The aim was to learn from families directly how area conditions affect families. Funding for the study was provided by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

Two adjacent East London areas were chosen, undergoing similar regeneration and change. Both areas had been hit hard by the decline of industrial and port activity. Two adjacent areas rather than a single area avoided the risk of a major initiative or intervention in a single area distorting the experiences of families in a particular direction, such as demolition causing a majority of the families to move, and one researcher could interview 50 families per area yearly in two adjacent areas.

With matched funding from the Nuffield Foundation, we mounted a parallel study of 100 families in the North, in two disadvantaged neighbourhoods in two Yorkshire cities (Leeds and Sheffield). They are accessible to each other, allowing a single researcher to interview 50 families in each; both are important regional cities; and both are areas of concentrated disadvantage, undergoing major regeneration and changes of function, due to de-industrialisation and the restructuring of Northern

³ Glennerster, H., Lupton, R., Noden, P. And Power, A. (1999) *Poverty, Social Exclusion and Neighbourhood: Studying the area bases of social exclusion* London: LSE CASEPaper 022

⁴ Lupton, R. (2003) 'Neighbourhood Effects': Can we measure them and does it matter? London: LSE CASEPaper 073; Paskell, C. and Power, A. (2005) *The future's changed': Local impacts of housing, environment and regeneration policy since 1997*. London: LSE CASereport 2

economies, not dissimilar from the East End. Renewed funding for both parts of the study lasted to 2006. The aim was to compare family experiences in two contrasting regions, the North and London.

3. Identifying the sample of families

We found 50 families per area through local routes. We needed to recruit families on the basis of willing participation, since the study involved repeat rounds of interviews. We talked to many local organisations before we contacted the families. We were advised not to recruit through random door-knocking since many households did not have children and there were risks in not knowing who we were approaching. Recruiting in places families visited in the course of their daily lives would encourage families to opt into the study. The aim was to recruit and retain families who wanted to participate voluntarily and share their experiences. We decided against purely random selection, since we wanted to reflect the makeup of the local population as closely as we could in terms of parent status, tenure, ethnic origin and work. With only 50 families per area, we recognised that a random sample might not achieve this.

We used a snowballing method for contacting parents in order to create a purposive sample of families that reflected local population characteristics. Some families were recruited via local support groups and advice organisations. Direct personal contact with families at local access points became a central activity; it included schools, doctors, surgeries, child care and Sure Start centres, post offices, community centres, cafes, shops. When our sample contained enough families with particular characteristics, we then recruited to match other characteristics. We recruited a broad cross section of families from these low income communities.

A potential draw-back of this form of willing and purposive recruitment through channels where parents participate in local life is that it may bias the sample towards active, positive families and away from problematic, withdrawn families. In practice, we found that virtually all families with children were in contact with local services, no matter how serious their problems. Some bias against families who remain hidden with deep problems may be inevitable but our sample includes many families in serious difficulty, some experiencing startlingly severe problems.

We deliberately avoided recruiting families whose lives were overwhelmed with unmanageable difficulties on the grounds that our study would be an added and unfair intrusion on them; also our study was trying to understand through the families how neighbourhoods affect families, rather than how families with multiple problems survive there. This did not preclude our recruiting many highly disadvantaged families and several of the families we interviewed relied on social workers and other welfare assistance.

4. Documentation, anonymising and storing data

At the outset of the study, we created a data base of the 200 families, recording all important information about them. Each interviewee was assigned a code number. In this way, we kept track of all cases across all rounds. These codes were attached to all questions and to all extracted quotes. We kept in a special secure file the actual contact details of all interviewees. We protected families' anonymity in various ways: we recorded all interview material according to the family identifier with a letter for the area and a number for their position in recruitment; we gave each interviewee and other family members pseudonyms; we created broad age bands rather than specific ages for the children, for parents and for their time in the area. We changed certain features of each family, avoiding changing the meaning or significance of their story. In this way we ensured anonymity of individuals while retaining the integrity of the families' experience.

Our archives hold all typed interviews for all rounds, all tables, all quotes, qualitative analysis of open ended responses and observations. The data will be available to a restricted body of researchers, at the end of the project, in accordance with ESRC guidelines.

5. Attrition and turnover of families

In basing this study within highly disadvantaged areas of predominantly rented housing, we knew that we were likely to find families in precarious housing, work and personal circumstances. A large majority of the families we interviewed were on low incomes and in categories of employment and tenure where changes and instability were common. We also know from other longitudinal studies that holding onto and tracking families from low income backgrounds with low educational qualifications is extremely hard, even with resources to attempt this. These factors affected many of the families we identified. Over the 8 years of the study we expected to lose a number of families since on average families move every 11 years, every 14 years for social housing tenants. On this basis, half the families would have moved over seven years. We did not have resources to track more than a small number of families that moved out. By the end of our visits, we retained 60% of all families who stayed, more in the North.

We took steps to minimise the loss of participants by building up a close rapport with the families. 60% of our original families were still in the study at the end of eight years over seven repeat rounds of visits. Sending Christmas cards and short newsletters about the project at intervals; phoning families before visiting and fitting in around family schedules helped. We kept interviews to one hour whenever possible, to make it easier for families. But we gave interviewees maximum freedom to express their views and we therefore went on longer if they wanted.

We did not press parents for details when sensitive issues came up, unless volunteered by the families, and we made it clear to them that they did not need to answer questions where they felt awkward. We cut short interviews where family needs arose. A modest gift voucher was offered at the end of each interview as a thank you, without prior notice. Most families said they enjoyed our visits.

Researchers invested considerable efforts to locate and re-interview the families who had not moved. Working parents have very little time; children cause frequent and unexpected changes of plan; our interviews were never top priority, so cancellation or simply not being there made completing some interviews very time consuming. Around one third of the interviews had to be re-scheduled in each round; nonetheless wherever a family was willing to continue, we rearranged times as often as necessary. Where a family was hard to locate (e.g. didn't answer the phone or door) we developed different strategies such as leaving notes with contact numbers, calling and phoning at different times of the day. We wanted to avoid putting families under unnecessary pressure or interfering with their privacy; so we worked around the problems if they could not stay involved or were particularly busy.

Three life changes particularly affected parents' ability to continue, apart from moving which was the most common: breaking up with a partner or joining a new partner; having a baby; getting a new job or starting college; in addition health and personal events could make someone unwilling to carry on. Dramatic family change and particularly partnership break up may explain why some families simply disappeared. In spite of such organisational hurdles, we were surprised by the families' generosity, hospitality and enthusiasm for our work. The majority of families wanted to stay involved, were glad to be asked their views and hoped it would make a difference.

Where we could locate the families who had moved, we followed them. Some were no longer interested in a study of the neighbourhoods they had left; others simply proved untraceable. Some

schools were willing to forward letters to the next school where they knew it, but this indirect method was rarely fruitful. Council housing offices simply did not keep records of where families had moved to; this was the biggest obstacle. No public body was able to disclose follow-on addresses to us. Sometimes neighbours or relatives helped. Up to round 7, we continued to interview about 5 out-mover families in each area, twenty in total.

6. Replacing lost families

We decided to replace families we lost with other families recruited in the same way, through local contacts within the area, seeking as close a match as possible to the original sample.

The aim was to keep our total of families per area close to 50 in order to:

- a) keep the sample representative across the key indicators: ethnic origin; parent status; work status; tenure. These main variables could change significantly with smaller numbers.
- b) maintain as broad a picture as possible of area conditions by drawing on as representative a sample of views as we could.
- c) gain wider insights into changing conditions.

At each round, we asked the newly recruited families about key topics covered in previous rounds. We developed condensed interview schedules for this, omitting earlier questions that were repeated or that reflected changes between rounds of interviews. This enabled us to compare family views on generic subjects such as schools, crime, neighbours.

The attrition cases we recruited covered shorter time scales. But they reflected family experiences in these areas, against a background of the longitudinal perspective of the majority of the families we interviewed. The additional families lent considerable strength to the study by maintaining a broad spectrum of views on many local issues and also helped us to understand the dynamics of change in the areas by adding new perspectives to those of the majority.

We did not detect significant differences in attitude or experience between the parents who were in the study from the beginning and addition cases. The new cases were already resident in the area and they shared similar demographics and income characteristics with the other families. They provided all the information we required to fill in gaps in the study. We are confident that the findings reflect accurately the views of a cross section of local communities.

7. The female bias of the study

We decided to interview the main carer for the children, the 'most present parent', since our focus was on bringing up children in difficult areas. We expected that a majority of our interviewees would be mothers, given the family focus of the study and the dominant role of women in caring for children. In practice 98% of all interviews were with mothers although fathers were sometimes actively involved in the interviews. In two cases, interviewees were older women (over 50) who were grandparents as well as parents of teenagers at the outset of the study.

We decided that where possible we would interview people in their homes in order to create a relaxed environment, to minimise the inconvenience to families, to avoid child care problems and to enhance our understanding of family circumstances. In the Northern Estate we interviewed a few mothers in a local community centre; and in two East London cases we interviewed mothers in a local school. All our interviewers were female which helped win the confidence of families. This did not seem to impede access to fathers where they were involved in a carer role. The London study had three main interviewers, plus two part-time, short-term interviewers; the Northern study had two interviewers.

We set out in the introduction why we believe the female bias of the study provides a relevant and useful perspective on area conditions and family life. Women, and mothers particularly, offer unique insights into neighbourhood conditions and attachment to local communities because of their survival needs. Through them we are able to explore the small-scale at which most families operate in low income neighbourhoods. However, we maximise the use of fathers' perspectives and recognise that this deserves further study.

8. The use of questionnaires and quantitative analysis of the evidence

While the study relied mainly on qualitative methods of interviewing and observation, we devised semi-structured questionnaires for each round to allow us to analyse as many answers as possible from 200 responses to a particular question or topic. We tabulated about two thirds of the answers in all rounds using SPSS. In all this amounted to 84,000 responses from 200 families over seven rounds of interviews recorded in 1,400 questionnaires. This enabled us to show through tables what 200 families said about a large range of current issues, comparing findings across the four areas and between the North and East London. We use figures from these tables to support what families say. We also tabulated the family and area changes between the rounds, based on our repeat questions. We structured some questions on area conditions to make them comparable with wider studies so we were also able to compare the families' views on area problems with wider surveys.⁵

We also encouraged parents to explain what they thought about some issues in an open ended way by combining quantitative and qualitative questions: for example 'what school does your child attend?' (name, level, location, church, state etc) – a factual question where responses can be tabulated; 'how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your child's progress?' (satisfied / dissatisfied) can also produce tabulated responses; 'can you explain why?' (open-ended) requiring more qualitative analysis.

With open ended questions such as "What helps you most as a parent?", we analyse responses on the basis of recurring themes which parents themselves identify e.g. open spaces; play areas; friendly neighbours; community activities; family. We then group parents' responses under these broad themes, thus helping us to identify the patterns of dominant concern across a wide range of families in relation to particular issues. By using some quantitative tools of analysis alongside our large volume of qualitative material we are able to handle the scale of material and draw some broad-based findings from this large and complex study.

9. Selection and use of quotations

After completing the analysis of the questionnaires using SPSS and qualitative analysis in each round, we identified quotations, family by family for each open-ended or explanatory response on each topic. These quotations, each carrying the family identifier, were documented under each topic, by area, for each round. Over seven rounds, we built up a large stock of quotations covering the main topics shown in Annexe 4. Relevant quotes on any of the issues we discussed with parents we saved under each topic for each round. We selected the quotes that captured a salient point in relation to every important theme: schools, race, community, parenting, regeneration etc. This way of managing quotes from 1,400 questionnaires covering seven rounds and 21 main themes proved invaluable in identifying representative quotations to illustrate different perspectives. Our systematic documentation of quotes, for each topic and each round allowed us to select relevant quotes from a wide range of families on that topic or theme. It forced us to select carefully on the basis of all quotes that are relevant. Using a systematic method of extracting quotes, question by

⁵ Mumford, K (1998) *Talking to Families in East London: A report on the first stage of the research* London: CASereport 09; Bowman, H. (1999) *Talking to Families in Leeds and Sheffield: A report on the first stage of the research*. London: CASereport 1

question, reduced interviewer bias and created a data base of qualitative feedback that as nearly as possible reflected what the families said across the board.

Different parents articulate very different views on particular topics. Some families offer a minimal response; some elaborate more fully on most subjects. This means that useful and revealing quotes tend to come from a more limited range of parents than direct answers to questions which come from everyone. We feel that the combined methods of tabulating all answers, and systematically extracting revealing quotes to illustrate themes from different viewpoints, provides an overview of what these families experience and their experiences on different issues. The quotations are used as recorded, except where a word is needed to make the meaning clear. We use as much of what parents say as is necessary to convey the full meaning.

10. Observation in the areas

Interviewers spent a lot of their time in the areas, and observed many aspects of local life, simply by virtue of being there. Open spaces, shops, schools, doctors' surgeries, community facilities, cafes, children's centres, housing offices, streets, parks, blocks, parking areas were all places interviewers passed their time in between interviews. It is how they found out what was going on. Since the interviewers were actively engaged in what was happening in the areas through their repeated contact with families, it was useful to record their impressions over time systematically. Observations were recorded at the time of each interview on the front sheet of each interview schedule, including what they encountered in the approach to an interviewee's home and once inside. This gives valuable context to the interviews, documenting over time the interviewers' and the interviewees' changing perceptions. It provides a ready way of refreshing memories, grounding the interviews in observed conditions.

These recorded observations provide valuable additional information on neighbourhood conditions and social relations; they also record at each family's interview the evolving context that surrounds each family and is often quite specific to them. This was particularly useful for the stories in *City Survivors*, where incidental information, recorded as a by-product of the interviews, often revealed back-up evidence of what the family described. During the interviews, interviewers filled in responses in note form on the questionnaires, recording verbatim as far as possible parents' answers. Questionnaires were then typed up as soon as possible after the interviews. We taped interviews in at least ten cases per area in each round, and typed in to the interview schedule for these cases the much longer answers.

11. The emerging themes of the study

The early themes for investigation emerged from the original aims of the study and from pilot interviews, to find out how poor area conditions and area change affected families. Further themes emerged round by round from the families themselves as shown in Annex 6. For example in round one, so many families commented on the changing ethnic composition of the areas in relation to community that in round two we asked about it directly, building on the families' willingness to feed information into our study over time. But we avoided questions of a personal and sensitive nature, e.g. divorce, separation, domestic violence, child rearing problems, legal status, and money matters, until parents brought them up. We felt that intruding into their personal lives would not directly shed light on neighbourhood conditions, but in practice they told us a great deal about the interaction of their personal circumstances and the wider environment.

The relationship of confidence and trust that we built up over time allowed us cumulatively to learn about family lives, offering insights over time that would not have been obvious in a single visit. This applied to the newer attrition cases as well as the original families since they were aware that they were part of an established study involving many other families in their area. Local support for the

study was strong, and we did not start from scratch with each new attrition family each time as there was much common ground between new and original families. In this book, a qualitative approach is adopted, only occasionally using quantitative evidence directly.

12. Ethical issues

The study raised a number of ethical considerations. We followed the ethical guidelines set out by ESRC. We also satisfied the medical research ethical guidelines and gained approval of local medical ethics committees to access families via doctors' surgeries. Similar rules applied to schools. Rules on complete confidentiality, accurate and responsible use of research findings, clear consent, careful storage of information, accurate recording of evidence and anonymity were all followed carefully. Throughout the study, we looked on the families as willing partners and accepted throughout that they had the right to withhold information or end their participation. Occasionally interviewers decided not to record what interviewees said because it seemed too sensitive an issue and too private to them.

The safety of interviewers in areas regarded as risky places for strangers was a concern. We agreed with all interviewers some basic precautions. They let the office know where and when they were going to interview and rang in before and after each interview. They carried a mobile phone; they dressed inconspicuously; and they made sure they knew in advance where they were going. Being clear about the route to take added to their confidence and this increased their acceptance in the areas.

Interviewers did not go into a home without seeing someone they knew or the interviewee at the door. Interviewers did not go along routes where they felt uneasy to reach a house. Obstacles included: a lift that appeared 'threatening'; a deserted street; an empty, poorly lit underpass; a dark, wet evening with no-one about. The main worries were on the street during long, dark evenings and we encouraged interviewers to arrange mini cabs to pick them up directly from the address as they left in winter. The precautions we took gave confidence to the interviewers. Once they became familiar with the areas and knew their way around, they generally felt safe. We had only one potentially serious incident where a group of youths driving recklessly mounted the pavement where an interviewer was walking, seriously frightening her, but then driving off without doing more.

Without exception, families gave a warm welcome and made the interviewers feel comfortable. The fact that contact was in the home, put the interviewer-interviewee relationship on a friendly and accepting basis. The co-operative and long run nature of the study ensured a positive experience.

13. The cumulative value and relevance of the study

Family Futures is the third book since the study began. There have also been four CASE reports, two on our initial findings, two near the end on sport and on social capital⁶. This study draws on all our previous work, occasionally using incidents and quotes that have previously appeared. However, the findings of this final book are totally new, as are the themes and the vast majority of the actual evidence. Earlier works are listed in the bibliography.

14. Limitations of the study

⁶ Mumford, K (1998) *Talking to Families in East London: A report on the first stage of the research* London: CASereport 09; Bowman, H. (1999) *Talking to Families in Leeds and Sheffield: A report on the first stage of the research*. London: CASereport 1; Davidson, R & Power, A (2007) *Families' and children's experience of sport and informal activity in Olympic areas of the East End*. London: LSE CASereport 35; Power, A & Willmot, H (2007) *Social Capital within the Neighbourhood*. London: LSE CASereport 38

There are many potential biases in such a study: we have already discussed the dominance of mothers and female interviewers in the sample. The study reflects the 'female' perspectives of the participating interviewers as well as interviewees. Female interviewers clearly had success interviewing women about family matters whereas a male interviewer may have had more problems in some areas the study uncovered. Gender overrode other factors in this female oriented study.

We screened interviewers for suitability asking them to carry out a dummy interview with a local mother from near one of the areas who was willing to work as a 'guinea pig' under the observation of a senior researcher. This helped to screen out off-putting or inadaptible interviewers and select sensitive, careful and adaptable ones. Empathy, listening skills and an interest in children were all extremely important. Alongside this, interviewers needed to be systematic in getting through the questions, accurate and quick in recording responses and motivated to persist in tracking down elusive families. Empathy and listening skills led families to report satisfaction at the chance to talk about their children, the neighbourhood and their direct experiences. Their desire to communicate generally overrode inhibitions and sensitivities. For example, some white families were willing to express sometimes hostile or fearful views about minority neighbours to minority interviewers, while some minority families often openly explained to white interviewers the bitterness they felt.

Another potential bias is our reliance on parent perspectives on family experiences. Some researchers question the legitimacy of reflecting family experience almost exclusively through the eyes of an adult. We occasionally include comments by children as they were sometimes present and contributed their views. But we did not set out to interview children or to interview more than one parent, even though in a number of families, both parents did participate. This limitation does not reduce the validity of the views of those we did interview and we believe that the perspective of the most present parents on bringing up children in disadvantaged areas is relevant and timely.

There is a potential bias in the ethnic and class background of our interviewers. Over the course of the study we employed seven interviewers, two in the North, five in London, including two temporary, part time interviewers. Two of the London interviewers were from a minority background, one Afro- Caribbean and one South Asian. They both felt that their backgrounds helped in creating a relaxed and trusting atmosphere for talking to families from different backgrounds. Inter ethnic tensions, between people of African and Afro-Caribbean origin, Sikhs and Muslims and mixed race and others limited this advantage somewhat. One interviewer felt that the more prejudiced white families might be more reluctant to open to a black interviewer, while the other thought she blended in and encountered no problems with any racial group. One minority interviewer thought that class background made a bigger difference than race.

White interviewers did not have difficulty recruiting or retaining families of different minority backgrounds and a few of these families said spontaneously they felt free talking with a white interviewer. But it is likely that some of the views expressed by ethnic minority families to white interviewers were tempered by considerations of courtesy and sensitivity and vice versa. Language barriers sometimes occurred, particularly with Turkish families in West City and Somali families in the Valley. Where older children were able to translate and parents wanted this, we accepted this. When we used interpreters, we relied on personal contacts or local social centres.

Different responses might have been elicited with ethnically matched interviewers; in comparable US studies, it is common to match interviewers and interviewees by race.⁷ We could not do this given the variety within each area. In spite of potential barriers, the issue of race relations was raised spontaneously by virtually all families of all races in the three areas with large minority ethnic

⁷ Wilson, W.J. and Taub, R (2006) *There goes the neighborhood : racial, ethnic, and class tensions in four Chicago neighborhoods and their meaning for America*. New York : Knopf

populations and fast changing populations, regardless of the interviewers' background. We are therefore confident that we captured with reasonable accuracy people's views on delicate subjects. All the interviewers were selected for their neutral, adaptable, and reassuring style, so this did not seem to apply.

The fact that we ended most family visits by autumn 2006, means that families report on conditions as they were four years before Family Futures was finished. However, the research group responsible for the study stayed in touch with the four areas and some families; the changes under way between 1998-2006 continued through to 2009. Since then economic and political change has accelerated, though to date no major local programmes have been cancelled or withdrawn by sudden shifts. Therefore, what is documented here reflects as accurately as we could establish the direction of change seen by families, alongside the content and impact of programmes and interventions.

15. Continuity of researchers

The long term role of the lead researcher provided continuity and consistency of approach from 1998 to date and has lent stability and continuity to the overall framework of study with one person responsible for the families' research and for the wider areas study throughout. This helped each new interviewer to fit in quickly, providing scope to check on any uncertainties, to clarify problems and to ensure systematic records.

Our documentation methods and storage systems allow interviewers to access the accumulated records of each family at each round. In an ideal world a single researcher would complete all rounds of the study and would record and analyse consistently all information. Even though this was not possible, we managed to retain the confidence of the families and local organisations and to retain the continuity and consistency of the research method, by following carefully laid down rules and methods, as outlined here.

Annex 4: Summary information about the families

4a: Interviewees in West City (Inner East London)

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages ⁸	No. of resident children	Occupation ⁹	Length of residence in area ¹⁰
Adeola	Married Mum	Black African	20s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	1 year
Alice	Married Mum	White UK	30s	School-age	2	Childminder	11 years
Andaiye	Single Mum	Black African	40s	School-age	2	School assistant	14 years
Ariana	Married Mum	White Irish	40s	School-age	3	P/T Writer	14 years
Beth	Single Mum	White	40s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	30 years
Carrie	Married Mum	White UK	30s	Pre-school & post-school	4	Home-worker	25 years
Charlene	Married Mum		20s		3	F/T Customer Services Administrator	4 years
Charley	Mum in couple	White UK, mixed race child	20s	Pre-school & school-age	2	Not in paid work	3 years
Charlotte	Married Mum	White	30s	8 years	1	P/T Tattooist	3 years
Cynthia	Married Mum	Black African	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	Cleaning	13 years
Debra and Alan	Married couple	White UK, mixed race & white children	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	Not in paid work	8 years
Delilah	Mum in couple	Black African	30s	Pre-school & school-age	4	Occasional social care work	9 years
Destiny	Married Mum	White	40s	School-age	2	F/T Childminder	15 years
Ece & Onur	Married couple	Turkish	30s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	6 years
Ellie	Married Mum	White UK	50s	Post-school	1	Foster-carer	29 years
Emily	Mum in couple	White Jewish	20s	Pre-school	1	Casual sales work	3 years
Eve	Mum in couple	Black African	30s	Pre-school & school-age	2	Care work	5 years
Faye	Single Mum	Black Caribbean	30s	Pre-school & school-age	3	Occasional shop work	Whole life

⁸ We define 'pre-school' as under 5 at the outset. We define children as those aged 18 and under.

⁹ We have described occupations in general terms to anonymise family identity.

¹⁰ At time of first interview (1998-9). All other information in the table relates to the interviewee's circumstances at the time of the second interview, if they took part in the second round.

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	No. of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Felicity	Married Mum	White UK	30s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	3 years
Felicity	Single Mum	Black African	30s	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	5 years
Gina	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	P/T Bar Maid	14 years
Helat & Aziz	Married couple	Kurdish	30s	School-age	1	Own their own business	7 years
Hulya	Married Mum	Turkish	20s	Pre-school & school-age	2	Not in paid work	5 years
Jane	Married Mum	White UK	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	11 years
Jasmine	Married Mum	White	30s	Pres-school	3	P/T Reporter	6 years
Jess	Single Mum	White UK	20s	Pre-school & school-age	2	Not in paid work	20 years
Jessica	Mum in couple	White UK	20s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	Whole life
Joan	Single Mum	White UK	40s	School-age	1	Foster-carer	19 years
Joanne	Married Mum	White UK	30s	School-age & pre-school	4	Editor	9 years
Justine	Single Mum	White UK	30s	School-age	1	Sales assistant	Whole life
Karli	Married Mum	Turkish	30s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	12 years
Kathleen	Married Mum	White other	40s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	13 years
Kebire	Married Mum	Turkish	30s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	4 years
Kerim	Married Mum	Kurdish	20s	Pre-school & school age	3	Not in paid work	Less than 1 year
Kezban & Mustafa	Married couple	Kurdish	20s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	5 years
Leah	Single Mum	White	40s	School-age	3	F/T Freelance Marketing	13 years
Linda	Mum in couple	White UK	20s	Pre-school	2	Occasional hairdressing	2 years
Liz	Single Mum	White UK	30s	School-age	2	School assistant	Whole life
Lola	Single Mum	Black French	40s	Pre-school	1	F/T Catering Supervisor	4 years
Marilyn	Married Mum	White UK	30s	School-age	3	Secretarial	Whole life
Megan	Single Mum	White UK	20s	Pre-school	1	Childminder	2 years
Millie	Married Mum	Black Caribbean	30s	School-age	2	Childminder	17 years
Mina	Married Mum	Asian	20s	School-age	6	Not in paid work	Less than 1 year

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	No. of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Narin	Married Mum	Kurdish	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	4 years
Natalie	Single Mum	Mixed race	20s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	Whole life
Niamh	Married Mum	Irish	40s	School-age	1	Childminder	18 years
Peter	Single Dad	White	50s	-	-	F/T Flower Stall	All life
Rebecca	Mum in couple	White	30s	Pre-school	1	F/T Childminder	All life
Renata	Married Mum	Brazilian	20s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	1 year
Rosemary	Married Mum	White UK	20s	School-age	1	School assistant	Whole life
Sarah	Mum in couple	White UK	20s	School-age & pre-school	4	Play worker	5 years
Selda	Single Mum	Turkish	30s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	20 years
Shushan	Married Mum	Black African	30s	Pre-school	1	Financial sector	2 years
Sinead	Single Mum	Irish	30s	School-age	1	Teacher	12 years
Snejana	Married Mum	Kosovan	20s	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	1 year
Sola	Married Mum	Black Caribbean	40s	Post-school	1	Care-worker	19 years
Sophie	Single Mum	Black British	20s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	19 years
Theresa	Mum in couple	White UK	20s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	Whole life
Tina	Mum in couple	White UK	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	Sports instructor	Whole life
Tracy	Married Mum	White	30s	-	-	F/T Cashier	25 years
Trudy	Single Mum	White	50s	-	-	Florist	All life
Yetunda	Single Mum	Black Caribbean	40s	School-age	1	Financial sector	20 years
Yonca	Married Mum	Turkish	40s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	9 years
Zena	Single Mum	Asian	30s	Pre-school & school-age	4	Not in paid work	7 years
Zoe	Single Mum	Mixed race	30s	School-age	1	Not in paid work	10 years

4b: Interviewees in East Docks (Outer East London)

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	No. of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Alexa	Single Mum	White	40s	Post-school & school-age	2	Not in paid work	1 year
Aliya & Said	Married couple	Other	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	Husband occasional computer engineer, wife not in paid work	5 years
Amber	Single Mum	Black Caribbean	20s	School-age	1	F/T Nursery Nurse	5 years
Aminia	Married Mum	Black African	30s	Pre-school & school-age	2	Not in paid work	3 years
Andrea	Mum in couple	White UK	40s	School-age	1	Teacher	Whole life
Annie	Married Mum	Black British, mixed race children	30s	Pre-school & school-age	3	School assistant	Whole life
Audrey	Single Mum	Black African	30s	Pre-school	1	Nurse	1 year
Barbara	Married Mum	White UK, mixed race children	40s	School-age & post-school	3	Administrative assistant	20 years
Becca	Single Mum	Black African	30s	Pre-school & school-age	4	Not in paid work	4 years
Belinda	Single Mum	Black African	30s	Pre-school & school-age	4	Not in paid work	10 years
Carmen	Married Mum	Black Caribbean	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	Not in paid work	10 years
Caroline	Single Mum	White	20s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	18 years
Chanika	Married Mum	Black African	-	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	4 years
Chantel	Married Mum	Black African	40s	Pre-school & school-age	5	Home-working	11 years
Clare	Single Mum	White UK, mixed race children	20s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	7 years
Clarissa	Single Mum	Black Caribbean	40s	School-age	1	Not in paid work	30+ years
Constance & Grace	Grandmother / Granddaughter	Black Caribbean	60s / teen	School-age	1	Retired	29 years / whole life
Desiree	Single Mum	Black African	40s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	2 years
Diane	Married Mum	White UK	40s	Post-school	1	School assistant	Whole life
Dionne	Married Mum	Irish	30s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	15 years

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	No. of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Dominique	Mum in couple	Black African	30s	School-age	1	Domestic work	6 years
Elaine	Single Mum	White	20s	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	3 years
Erin	Married Mum	White	40s	School-age & pre-school	4	Not in paid work	6 years
Flowella	Single Mum	Black Caribbean	20s	School-age	1	Occasional childcare assistant	Whole life
Fran	Single Mum	White UK	20s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	Whole life
Frances	Single Mum	Black African	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	Support worker	5 years
Gabrielle	Single Mum	Black British	50s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	1 years
Gillian	Mum in couple	White UK	40s	School-age	1	School assistant	Whole life
Gloria	Single Mum	Black African	30s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	9 years
Hailey	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	3 years
Hannah	Single Mum	Black African	40s	School-age	4	Public service officer	8 years
Jackie	Single Mum	White UK	30s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	Whole life
James	Father	White UK	30s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	2 years
Janet	Single Mum	Black African	40s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	1 year
Jelka	Married Mum	Kosovan	20s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	1 year
Josephine	Single Mum	Black African	30s	School-age & pre-school	4	F/T Nurse	
Joyce	Single Mum	White UK	40s	School-age	2	Administrator	9 years
Julie	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	All life
Kate	Mum in couple	White UK	20s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	5 years
Katja	Single Mum	Eastern European	20s	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	3 years
Kayla	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	4	Not in paid work	3 years
Kerry	Single Mum	White	20s	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	7 years
Kessie	Single Mum	Black British	30s	School-age & pre-school	4	Not in paid work	4 years
Kim	Single Mum & Daughter	White UK	Teen	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	14 years
Lesley	Mum in couple	White UK	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	Not in paid work	Whole life

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	No. of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Lilian	Mum in couple	Black British	20s	School-age & pre-school	3	P/T Cashier	17 years
Louise	Married Mum	Black Caribbean	30s	Post, pre and school-age	5	Supervisor, cleaning services	20 years
Luiza	Mum in couple	Mixed Brazilian	20s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	1 year
Madeleine	Married Mum	White UK	30s	School-age	1	Nursery nurse	7 years
Marie	Single Mum	White with mixed race children	50s	School-age	1	Not in paid work	6 years
Michelle	Mum in couple	White	20s	School-age	1	Not in paid work	20 years
Miriam	Married Mum	Black	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	Nurse	4 years
Nadia	Married Mum	White with mixed race children	30s	School-age	2	Teacher	3 years
Naomi	Mum in couple	Black African	30s	School-age	2	Cleaning services	6 years
Natasha	Single Mum	White UK	30s	School-age	1	Not in paid work	5 years
Neema	Single Mum	Black Caribbean	20s	School-age	1	Not in paid work	All life
Nicola	Single Mum	White UK with mixed race children	30s	School-age	2	Childcare	Whole life
Nora	Single Mum	Black Caribbean	30s	School-age & post-school	5	School assistant	21 years
Oni	Single Mum	Black African	20s	Pre-school	1	Within legal profession	3 years
Peggy	Single Mum & Grandmother	White UK	50s	Pre-school	1	School assistant	Whole life
Rachel	Mum in couple	White UK	30s	School-age	3	School assistant	14 years
Refika	Daughter & Sister	Turkish	Teen	School-age	2	Youth work	Whole life
Rose	Married Mum	White UK	30s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	15 years
Sade	Single Mum	Black African	20s	Pre-school & school-age	2	Not in paid work	6 years
Sasha	Single Mum	Black African	30s	School-age	3	Child care worker	8 years
Sonia	Single Mum	White UK	30s	School-age	2	School assistant	Whole life
Tamara	Married Mum	Turkish	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	13 years

Tessa	Single Mum	White UK	30s	School-age & post-school	3	School assistant	17 years
Yinka	Single Mum	Black African	40s	Post-school	1	Not in paid work	8 years

4c: Interviewees in Kirkside East (North: Outer Estate)

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	Number of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Adel	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	Not In Paid Work	22 years
Adrienne	Married Mum	White	40s	Post-school & school-age	4	Not In Paid Work	11-20 years
Alice	Single Mum	White	20s	Pre-school	1	Not In Paid Work	All life
Amanda	Married Mum	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	2	P/T Legal Secretary	2-10 years
Amy	Single Mum	White	20s	Pre-school	1	Not In Paid Work	21-30 years
Angela	Married Mum	White	20s	School-age	5	Not In Paid Work	21-30 years
Angie	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	Clerical Assistant	21-30 years
Anita	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	Not In Paid Work	11-20 years
Audrey	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	P/T Nurse	31-40 years
Becky	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	Not In Paid Work	under 2 years
Bess	Mum in couple	White	50s	School-age	1	F/T Cleaner	21-30 years
Carla	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age	2	Not In Paid Work	2-10 years
Carol	Single Mum	White	40s	Post-school	1	F/T Temping	21-30 years
Carol	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	Not In Paid Work	10 years
Carrie	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not In Paid Work	2-10 years
Cath	Mum in couple	White	20s	School-age	3	P/T Sure Start	2-10 years
Charlotte	Single Mum	White	40s	School-age	4	P/T Nurse	11-20 years
Charlotte	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not In Paid Work	Whole life
Chloe	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	P/T Bank Clerk	21-30 years
Cynthia	Mum in couple	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	3	Not In Paid Work	2-10 years
Danielle	Single Mum	White	Teen	Pre-school	2	Not In Paid Work	11-20 years
Denise	Married Mum	White	30s	Pre-school	1	Office Manager	2-10 years
Enid	Grandmother	White	40s	School-age	2	P/T Lgi	31-40 years
Erica	Single Mum	Black British	40s	Post-school & school-age	3	P/T Cleaner & Bar Staff	18 months

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	No. of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Fiona	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	Not In Paid Work	21-30 years
Heather	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	Not In Paid Work	2-10 years
Holly	Married Mum	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	3	P/T Sure Start	2-10 years
Holly	Single Mum	White	30s	Pre-school	1	Not In Paid Work	19 years
Jacqui	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	Not In Paid Work	11-20 years
Jasmin	Mum in couple	White	20s	Pre-school	2	Not In Paid Work	Whole life
Julie	Older Sister	White	20s	School-age	2	P/T Nursery Nurse	11-20 years
Kathleen	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	F/T Hospital Worker – Nights	31-40 years
Katie	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	Home Care Assistant	2-10 years
Kelly	Single Mum	White	30s	Pre-school	1	Not In Paid Work	6 years
Kevin	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	Not In Paid Work	11-20 years
Kirsten	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	P/T Care Assistant	under 2 years
Helen	Married Mum		30s	School-age & pre-school	4	Not In Paid Work	21-30 years
Tony	Mum in couple	White	20s	Pre-school	1	Not In Paid Work	11-20 years
Harriet	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	4	Not In Paid Work	11-20 years
Tracie	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	3		2-10 years
Sharon	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	Not In Paid Work	21-30 years
Nina	Single Mum	White	20s	Pre-school	1	Not In Paid Work	21-30 years
Lara	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	P/T Cleaner	whole life
Laura	Single Mum	White	20s	Pre-school	1	Not In Paid Work	2-10 years
Lauren	Single Mum	White	30s	Pre-school	1	Not In Paid Work	21-30 years
Laverne	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	5	Not In Paid Work	21-30 years
Lindsey	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	P/T Sure Start	2-10 years
Lisa	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	P/T Special Needs Assistant	2-10 years
Liza	Single Mum	White	Teen	School-age & pre-school	2	Not In Paid Work	under 2 years

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	No. of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Louise	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	3	Not In Paid Work	11-20 years
Lucy	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	1	Not In Paid Work	under 2 years
Mandy	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	4	P/T Shop Assistant	2-10 years
Margaret	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	Not In Paid Work	11-20 years
Nellie	Married Mum	Mixed Race	40s	School-age	2	F/T Carer	whole life
Olivia	Married Mum	White	20s	School-age	1	F/T Fast Food Restaurant	2-10 years
Patricia	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age	1	Not In Paid Work	2-10 years
Patsy	Single Mum	White	Teen	School-age	1	Not In Paid Work	11-20 years
Peter	Married Mum	White	40s	School-age	2	P/T Telecom Worker	2-10 years
Pippa	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age	1	Not In Paid Work	2 years
Poonam	Married Mum	Indian	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not In Paid Work	2-10 years
Rita	Single Mum		?	Post-school	2	Not In Paid Work	
Rosie	Single Mum	White	Teen	Pre-school	1	Not In Paid Work	under 2 years
Sadie	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	P/T Crèche Worker	whole life
Samantha	Married Mum	White	20s	School-age	1	P/T Sales Assistant	under 2 years
Sara	Mum in couple	White	20s	School-age	1	P/T Cleaner	11-20 years
Sheila	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	P/T Cleaner	21-30 years
Shirley	Mum in couple	White	30s	School-age	2	Not In Paid Work	2-10 years
Sonia	Married Mum	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not In Paid Work	2-10 years
Suzie	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not In Paid Work	2-10 years
Tanya	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age	1	F/T Sales Assistant	whole life
Tina	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	P/T Care Assistant	11-20 years

4d: Interviewees in The Valley (North: Inner City)

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	No. of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Abraham	Married Dad	Pakistani	50s	School-age	5	F/T Sales & Marketing comm. Office	11-20 years
Adam	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Adele	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Gillian	Single Mum	White	20s	Pre-school	1	P/T Co-ord comm. Facs	2-10 years
Amreen	Single Mum	Pakistani	30s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Avril	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Ellen	Married Mum	White	40s	Pre-school	1	P/T Researcher	under 2 years
Chandra	Married Mum	Pakistani	30s	School-age	4	P/T	11-20 years
Chia	Married Mum	Pakistani	30s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Clarissa	Single Mum	White	20s	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	under 2 years
Angie	Married Mum	White	20s	School-age	1	P/T Artist	2-10 years
Cynthia	Mum in couple	African Caribbean	40s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	under 2 years
Daniel	Married Mum	Black African	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	P/T support Worker	under 2 years
Fatima	Married Mum	Pakistani	20s	School-age	2	P/T Nursery Nurse	11-20 years
Fiona	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Francesca	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	4	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Gillian	Mum in couple	White	30s	Pre-school	1	F/T University Administrator	2-10 years
Gloria	Single Mum	Black British	30s	School-age	6	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Imogene	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age	1	Not in paid work	21-30 years
Jade	Married Mum	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	2	F/T classroom support assistant	whole life
Jane	Single Mum	White	40s	School-age	1	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Janet	Mum in couple	White	20s	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Janice	Single Mum	African Caribbean	20s	School-age	1	Not in paid work	21-30 years
Janice	Married Mum	White	30s	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	under 2 years
Jenny	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	1	Not in paid work	under 2 years

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	No. of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Jessica	Mum in couple	White	30s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Judith	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	P/T play worker & toy library worker	11-20 years
Justine	Mum in couple	White	20s	School-age	1	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Kali	Single Mum	Somali	30s	School-age	9	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Kamal	Married Mum	Kashmiri	40s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	31-40 years
Kelly	Mum in couple	White	50s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Kerry	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Laura	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Lesley	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Liz	Mum in couple	White	30s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	21-30 years
Louise	Mum in couple	White	30s	School-age	2	P/T Drugs Worker	2-10 years
Maggie	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	2	Sick leave	2-10 years
Marilyn	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	4	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Marissa	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	under 2 years
Maya	Married Mum	Irish	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	P/T Housing Officer	2-10 years
Meg	Mum in couple	White	20s	Pre-school	1	P/T Secretary	2-10 years
Melissa	Single Mum	Mixed Race	30s	School-age & pre-school	4	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Michelle	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	2	P/T cleaner	under 2 years
Millie	Single Mum	Black British	20s	School-age & pre-school	2	P/T Youth Worker	21-30 years
Nancy	Married Mum	White	20s	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Naomi	Married Mum	White	30s	School age	2	Not in paid work	whole life
Natalie	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	F/T Civil Servant	2-10 years

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	No. of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Neesha	Single Mum	Pakistani	30s	School-age & pre-school	4	Not in paid work	21-30 years
Nina	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	Not in paid work	21-30 years
Nita	Single Mum	White	40s	School-age & pre-school	6	P/T Sure Start	2-10 years
Paulo	Mum in couple	Mixed Race	20s	School-age	1	P/T information Officer	2-10 years
Peggy	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age	1	P/T Nursery Nurse	21-30 years
Petra	Single Mum	Black Caribbean	20s	School-age	2	P/T Youth Worker	11-20 years
Philippa	Married Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	P/T Housing Adviser	31-40 years
Phoebe	Single Mum	White	40s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Polly	Mum in couple	White	30s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Poonam	Mum in couple	Pakistani	20s	School-age & pre-school	3	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Rachel	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Rani	Married Mum	Pakistani	30s	School-age	3	F/T Attendant Officer	21-30 years
Rebecca	Single Mum	Mixed Race	20s	School-age	3	Not in paid work	whole life
Rosemary	Mum in couple	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	2	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Ruth	Single Mum	White	20s	School-age	2	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Abigail	Mum in couple	White	20s	School-age & pre-school	3	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Caitlin	Single Mum	White	20s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Faryal	Single Mum	Pakistani	20s	Pre-school	3	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Tricia	Single Mum	Black / African Caribbean	30s	Post-school, school-age & pre-school	3	Not in paid work	11-20 years
Doreen	Single Mum	White	30s	School-age & pre-school	3	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Dawn	Single Mum	White	Teen	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Wendy	Single Mum	Mixed Race	30s	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Lesley	Single Mum	White	40s	School-age	4	Not in paid work	under 2 years

'Name'	Family Relationship	Ethnicity	Age	Resident children's ages	No. of resident children	Occupation	Length of residence in area
Shahla	Married Mum	Pakistani	50s	Post-school & school-age	3	Not in paid work	21-30 years
Sahra	Single Mum	Somali	30s	School-age	3	F/T Care Assistant	under 2 years
Aneeka	Single Mum	Pakistani	20s	Pre-school	1	Not in paid work	under 2 years
Deirdre	Single Mum	White	30s	Pre-school	1	N/r	under 2 years
Alex	Mum in couple	White	40s	School-age	2	P/T	11-20 years
Adele	Mum in couple	White	30s	Pre-school	2	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Sandre	Married Mum	White	40s	School-age	2	N/r	2-10 years
Simone	Single Mum	Mixed Race	30s	School-age	1	Not in paid work	2-10 years
Sunita	Married Mum	Pakistani	20s	Pre-school	1	P/T Science Teacher	Whole life

Annex 5: Major government initiatives affecting families in disadvantaged areas between 1998 and 2006

1. Community Involvement and Sure Start

- 1997 Sure Start
- 1998 'Communities at the HELM'
 - announced in NDC programme
 - followed in all neighbourhood programmes
- 2001 Neighbourhood Renewal Community Chests (small grants, up to £5000)
 - Community Empowerment Fund (larger grants, outreach and support for community participation)
- 1998 NDC Programme (until 2010/11)
- 2000 Practice and Neighbourhood Warden Team Programme
- 2001 Neighbourhood Regeneration Fund
- 2001 Neighbourhood Management Pathfinders Programme (until 2011/2012)

2. Education

- 1998 Literacy and Numeracy Hours
 - Introduction of teaching assistants and assistants for special needs
- 2000 Fresh Start Schools
- 1999 Education Action Zones
- 1999 Schools for the Future Building Programme
- 2000 Expansion of nursery education and lowering age for starting school
- 2002 Children's Fund
- 2003 Neighbourhood Nurseries Programme
- 2004 Children's Centres
- 2004 Aimhigher Programme (until 2011)

3. Young People's Provision, Play Space, Parks, Sports

- 1998 Stopped sale of playgrounds
- 2000 Amalgamation of many youth services into Connexions to help access to jobs and training
- 2000 Action teams
- 2000 Rebuilding of local swimming pools into 'Leisure Centres' (ongoing)
- 2003 Introduction of green flag scheme for parks – 2003
- 2005 Reduced funding for after-school clubs
- 2006 Free swimming for all children
- 2006 Winning the Olympic bid
- 2000 Reintroduction of park keepers

4. Crime Prevention

- 2000 Drug Tsars and Drug teams
- 2000 Youth Offending Teams
- 2002 Anti-Social Behaviour Orders
- 2003 Community Police Support Officers
- 2004 Prolific and Other Priority Offenders (PPO) Scheme
- 2005 Area based street policing (London)
- 2005 Safer and Stronger Communities Programme
- 2005 Drug Intervention Programme

5. Health

- 1998 Health Action Zones

- 1998 Alternative health care and counselling (through Sure Start)
- 1998 Vaccination campaigns (through Sure Start)
- 1998 Child assessments and support for special needs (health education services in schools, Sure Start nurseries) (ongoing)
- 1999 Healthy Living Centres (ongoing)
- 1999 Primary Care Trusts (ongoing)

6. Work, Tax Credits, Training, Child Care

- 1997 Widening access to higher education (ongoing)
- 1998 New Deal for Lone Parents
- 1999 National Minimum Wage introduced
- 1999 New deal for Work (linked to training)
- 1999 Introduction of Working Families Tax Credits
- 2000 Connections
- 2003 Introduction of Child Tax Credits
- 2003 Introduction of Working Tax Credit
 - Payments for approved child care through tax credits and subsidies for all approved nursery places from 3 years old
- 2006 Childcare Act (including Children's Centres, Neighbourhood Nurseries, Extended Schools)

7. Housing and Regeneration

- 1997 Continued expansion of transfer of council housing to Housing Associations (ongoing)
- 1998 New Deal for Communities
- 1998 Public-Private regeneration partnerships (ongoing)
- 1999 Tenant Compacts and tenant representation (ongoing)
- 2000 Introduction of Arm's Length Management Companies
- 2000 Neighbourhood Renewal programme
- 2000 Home Zone Fund
- 2001 Decent Homes Programmes
- 2001 Neighbourhood Management and neighbourhood wardens
- 2001 Private Finance Initiative for regeneration
- 2003 Mixed Communities Initiative

Annex 6: Development of themes by round of visits

	1 (1999-2000)	2 (2000-1)	3 (2001-2)	4 (2002)	5 (2003-4)	6 (2004-5)	7 (2006)
1	Family Ethnic Housing	Update on household	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
2	Area-change, Like/dislike Time in area	✓	✓ Plan to move/stay	✓ Area better/worse	✓ Local environment. Gentrification Moving	✓ Most sig. change? Better/worse/same? Plan to move/stay? Safe for children? Risks for children? What would make it better?	✓ Plan to move / stay Area better/same/ worse than at start of study? What still needs to be done/sorted out?
3	Schools	Schools and children's' activities	Same/better/worse Secondary	Secondary school – work preparation. Difference – primary/ secondary	Same schools Secondary		Children's progress Any school failures/ successes
4			Health – disability/ medicine/ smoke/ health services		When last used? Who/what for/how often? Better/same/worse	Disability? Depression? Support with it?	Special needs – experience of help/ support
5	Local links/ community	Ethnicity Links with community Belong to groups	Relatives and friends	Community relations Barriers/ Divisions Bringing people together Who to count on		Family locally? Get on help? Friends locally? Help?	How race relations are going
6	Image of area	Assets of area problems				Outsiders' view and Own view of area?	
7	Income/ benefits	Work history Qualifications		Unofficial work – cash in hand	Changes in income/benefits Bank accounts Credit cards Who handles money? Family budget	Changes in income/benefits? New child / family benefits? Do they help? Jobs via ND? Tax credits influence	H'hold income: Source / tax credits -Do these help?

					Partner-employment? Children's work	on work?	
8		Update work, study	✓	✓	✓ Partners work	✓ What courses / funding / value	✓ Work update. Study
9		Voluntary roles	Trust, security, mutual aid, influence	Political engagement, voluntary roles			Voluntary roles
10	Future hopes, worries in area				Pressures within area		
11		Crime and drugs			Police Wardens Community safety		Any safer/ less crime?
12		Local services					
13		Parks and open spaces			Parks renovation		
14	Housing	✓	Regeneration programmes	Housing changes / demolition	Regeneration NDC/ parks/ projects		Use of NDC Housing satisfaction Decent Homes
15					Transport		
16					RTB / 00		
17				Parenting enjoyment Parenting problems Time/enjoy Pressures Gangs/ Bullying What Helps? What safer Let out	Helping look after children Sure Start	Getting child/ren to behave? Reward? Different from own childhood? Bullying? How advise child/ren? Hyperactive problems? Support – on own / with partner? Dads' role? Other male figure?	Overall family coping Sure Start

18					Social exclusion		
19					Use of time		Mapping activities
21						Problems in family worsened by area? why?	Area impact on family life

Annex 7: Families' sense of belonging

Existence of community spirit – 1998-99 (%)

	West City	East Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
yes	54	48	48	50
no	30	34	40	34
can't say	12	14	12	16

Whether community spirit matters – 2000-01 (%)

	West City	East Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
Yes	87	89	86	86
No	4	2	6	14
don't know	2	2	4	-
a bit	2	7	4	-

Relatives in area – 1998-99 (%)

	West City	East Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
Yes	52	50	78	48
No	46	50	22	52

How families get on with local relatives – 2004-05 (%)

	West City	East Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
Well	69	78	88	76
Not well	2	2	0	10
Varies	17	19	12	14

Whether support is given by local relatives – 2004-05 (%)

	West City	East Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
Yes	64	85	79	73
No	36	15	21	27

Friendliness – how friendly do you find people in the area? – 2000-01 (%)

	West City	East Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
friendly	75	73	72	56
not friendly	6	2	8	10
some are, some aren't	17	22	20	32

How many people in the area do you feel you can trust – 2001-02 (%)

	West City	East Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
Some	77	66	54	72
none or almost none	16	13	12	22

How many people are there that you exchange favours with – 2001 (%)

	West City	East Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
None	9	11	26	28
1-4	58	64	52	48
more than 4	21	14	18	20

Is there anyone who you can really count on to help you out in a crisis – 2002-03 (%)

	West City	East Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
Yes	78	96	92	93
no	10	-	8	7

Number of parents taking on a significant voluntary role

Role	West-City	East-Docks	Kirkside East	The Valley
School governor/parent representative on school council or board	7	2	2	
Committee member of local group for children	3	2		
Church council member / other formal voluntary work at church	1	3		
Committee member of other local group (e.g. neighbourhood watch)	3			
Committee member of tenants association	3			
Volunteer with small children (sure start, crèche, nursery, etc)	3		4	4
Committee member of group for single parents		1		
Voluntary sports coach		1		
Volunteer with local ethnic organisation		1		1
Volunteer in hospital, voluntary classroom assistant ¹ or children's escort	1	1		
Member of Parent/Teacher Association	1			
Formal involvement in tenant compact				
Youth worker			2	4
Volunteer in credit union			2	2
Volunteer with local council			1	
Other volunteer in local community			1	2

Note: These figures include voluntary roles played by partners and other immediate family members.

Annex 8a: Primary School Statistics in the 4 Local Authority Areas

Local Authority Average	% SEN: With statements / supported at School Action Plus (2009)	% SEN: Supported at School Action (2009)	SATs results: Level 4 or above ¹¹						2009 Av point score
			1998 Maths	2009 Maths	1998 English	2009 English	1998 Science	2009 Science	
England (all schools)	10.8	13.8	57.9	80	64.1	79	68.6	86	27.8
Hackney	17	20	47.3	74	52.2	72	53.6	81	26.7
Newham	9.8	16.6	44.7	77	51	79	53.9	85	27.4
Leeds	9.2	14	60.9	79	65.8	77	72.3	86	27.6
Sheffield	16.6	13.3	53.4	76	57	76	62.3	86	27.5

Annex 8b: Secondary school statistics in the 4 Local Authority Areas

	Pupils achieving 5+ GCSEs grade A*-C in 1998 (%)	Pupils achieving 5+ GCSEs grade A*-C in 2009 (%)	Pupils achieving 1+ GCSEs grade A*-G in 1998 (%)	Pupils achieving 1+ GCSEs grade A*-G in 2009(%)	2009 % pupils with SEN with statement
England (all schools)	46.3	49.8	93.4	98.9	10
Hackney	26.5	52.2	93.1	98	12.5
Newham	34	47.1	96.8	98.8	10.6
Leeds	37.9	45.9	90.1	98.1	12.9
Sheffield	38	44.5	90.8	98.2	13.9

Notes

1. Receiving five or more A*-C grades, including English and Maths, is often a requirement for progressing to the next stage of education at age 16+ (A-levels in a school sixth form, at a sixth form college or at a further education college after leaving secondary school).
2. Local area statistics are available at individual school level. Almost without exception (2 schools) the schools our families attended show the same pattern of improvement in KS2 and GCSE results between 1998 and 2009 – with dramatic progress in some schools.

¹¹ The percentage of eligible pupils achieving Level 4 or above in the test - the level expected of 11 year olds. This percentage is based on all eligible pupils, including those who were absent or disapplied at the time of the test and did not therefore achieve a result.

Annex 9: Crime trends by Local Authority (offences per 1000 population)

LA Name	Offence Group	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09
National	Total offences	113.20	113.00	105.20	103.10	100.10	90.80	85.70
Hackney	BURGLARY	23.63	20.58	18.70	17.13	12.93	13.28	13.13
	CRIMINAL DAMAGE	23.19	20.17	19.61	15.93	15.12	14.66	11.47
	DRUG OFFENCES	6.17	7.87	10.10	10.26	11.87	21.81	22.27
	FRAUD AND FORGERY	8.99	8.13	7.98	4.90	3.78	4.31	4.02
	VEHICLE CRIME	36.73	33.69	26.52	26.55	21.05	19.77	17.72
	OTHER OFFENCES	1.62	1.75	1.50	1.70	1.64	1.97	2.01
	OTHER THEFT OFFENCES	45.08	45.77	44.33	43.49	39.22	37.17	32.99
	ROBBERY	12.12	11.61	9.24	8.96	8.11	6.32	5.26
	SEXUAL OFFENCES	2.03	2.14	2.18	2.24	1.85	1.79	2.01
	VIOLENT CRIME	33.48	33.97	34.98	36.08	34.41	33.84	30.84
	Total	193.04	185.68	175.14	167.24	149.98	154.92	141.72
Newham	BURGLARY	14.30	13.38	13.60	16.60	13.69	12.65	12.58
	CRIMINAL DAMAGE	23.34	22.52	17.75	17.30	17.02	16.22	15.81
	DRUG OFFENCES	4.66	4.96	4.52	8.14	6.73	9.88	10.77
	FRAUD AND FORGERY	13.17	11.69	12.51	9.84	9.80	7.64	6.82
	VEHICLE CRIME	35.64	30.41	24.26	29.01	26.65	28.37	25.61
	OTHER OFFENCES	1.58	1.65	1.47	1.35	1.70	1.72	1.88
	OTHER THEFT OFFENCES	31.89	32.10	29.98	29.62	26.52	24.67	23.90
	ROBBERY	8.80	8.83	7.74	10.10	10.23	9.50	6.83
	SEXUAL OFFENCES	1.94	2.02	1.80	1.57	1.45	1.33	1.31
	VIOLENT CRIME	33.14	32.32	31.82	34.00	30.78	31.04	28.70
	Total	168.46	159.88	145.45	157.53	144.57	143.02	134.21
Leeds	BURGLARY	39.87	34.34	24.48	21.13	20.02	19.43	20.52
	CRIMINAL DAMAGE	31.84	34.64	32.30	30.27	29.37	24.57	21.79
	DRUG OFFENCES	2.95	3.05	3.46	3.83	3.93	3.74	3.80
	FRAUD AND FORGERY	10.33	9.65	5.55	4.33	3.55	2.81	2.32
	VEHICLES CRIME	37.81	31.69	22.67	18.46	19.09	15.26	15.08
	OTHER OFFENCES	1.26	1.33	1.28	2.48	2.60	1.93	1.83
	OTHER THEFT OFFENCES	36.34	36.62	31.31	30.64	27.85	25.75	23.59
	ROBBERY	3.70	2.74	1.68	1.82	2.27	1.99	1.85
	SEXUAL OFFENCES	1.21	1.37	1.17	1.28	1.35	1.09	0.94
	VIOLENT CRIME	14.87	20.00	20.67	21.95	20.23	17.71	16.39
	Total	180.18	175.43	144.57	136.19	130.26	114.28	108.11
Sheffield	BURGLARY	25.87	20.14	17.64	17.20	17.56	16.54	15.86
	CRIMINAL DAMAGE	25.22	26.13	29.03	31.28	30.83	28.75	23.63
	DRUG OFFENCES	2.86	2.48	2.40	2.81	2.76	2.90	3.35
	FRAUD AND FORGERY	4.81	4.86	4.38	5.74	3.90	3.13	2.77
	VEHICLES CRIME	30.40	27.59	25.08	27.15	27.55	20.71	19.08
	OTHER OFFENCES	1.66	1.67	1.04	1.46	1.28	1.23	1.18
	OTHER THEFT OFFENCES	23.73	23.32	20.84	22.72	22.99	25.97	22.74
	ROBBERY	2.68	1.76	1.43	1.63	2.07	1.57	1.46
	SEXUAL OFFENCES	0.78	0.89	1.13	1.28	1.01	0.94	0.70
	VIOLENT CRIME	10.06	11.38	15.92	19.01	19.29	18.27	16.04
	Total	128.07	120.22	118.89	130.28	129.24	120.01	106.81