



Mississauga Youth Plan

Youth Engagement Report



Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
ENGAGEMENT OF YOUTH.....	8
ENGAGEMENT OF THE YOUTH CORE TEAM	8
MARKETING TO ALL YOUTH.....	9
SUSTAINING PROCESS	10
PHOTOVOICE	11
TRAINING, CAPACITY BUILDING AND DEVELOPMENT OF YOUTH	12
SURVEY: SUMMARY REVIEW OF RESULTS.....	15
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS	15
HIGHLIGHTS OF RESPONSES BY QUESTION	18
FACE-TO FACE PUBLIC MEETINGS: WARD CONSULTATIONS AND FORUMS	34
THE WARD CONSULTATIONS AND FORUMS: A REVIEW OF THE RESULTS.....	37
SAMPLE BRAINSTORMING OF PRIORITIES FOR THE PLAN.....	46
OPEN ADULT AND YOUTH FORUM.....	50
OLDER YOUTH FORUM.....	52
YOUTH CITY-WIDE FORUM	53
NEXT STEPS OF THE PROCESS	55
CHALLENGES FOR ENGAGEMENT	55
APPENDICES	58
WHAT DOES A YOUTH CENTRE LOOK LIKE?	58
WHAT IF WALL	59
DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS	65
HOW TO READ THE TABLES	68
TABLE 1: WHERE DO YOU HANG OUT WITH FRIENDS?	69
TABLE 2: WHICH PLACES ARE YOUTH FRIENDLY?	71
TABLE 3: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ...HOUSING	73
TABLE 4: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ...PUBLIC PARKS	74
TABLE 5: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... PUBLIC TRANSIT.....	75
TABLE 6: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... COMMUNITY CENTRES	76
TABLE 7: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... ENVIRONMENT IN GENERAL.....	77
TABLE 8: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... SHOPPING	78
TABLE 9: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... MULTICULTURAL/DIVERSE	79
TABLE 10: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... CITY COUNCIL	80
TABLE 11: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... DEBT-FREE CITY GOVERNMENT	81
TABLE 12: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... EDUCATION	82
TABLE 13: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... SPORTS ACTIVITIES	83

TABLE 14: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... ARTS/CULTURE ACTIVITIES	84
TABLE 15: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... OTHER ACTIVITIES AVAILABLE	85
TABLE 16: HOW PROUD OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... OTHER PLEASE SPECIFY	86
TABLE 17: PARTICIPATED IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES	87
TABLE 18: DO YOU THINK MISSISSAUGA HAD ENOUGH OF THE FOLLOWING (THOSE ANSWERING “NO”).....	90
TABLE 19: DO YOU THINK MISSISSAUGA SHOULD HAVE MORE OF THE FOLLOWING FOR YOUTH?	93
TABLE 20: WHERE LEARN ABOUT OPPORTUNITIES, ACTIVITIES OR RESOURCES AVAILABLE?	94
TABLE 21: DO YOU THINK THAT YOU ARE AWARE OF THE VARIOUS OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO YOUNG PEOPLE IN MISSISSAUGA?.....	96
TABLE 22: SHOULD THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA DO MORE TO MAKE YOUTH MORE AWARE OF THE DIFFERENT OPPORTUNITIES AVAILABLE TO THEM?	97
TABLE 23: HAVE ANY OF THE FOLLOWING POSSIBLE BARRIERS PREVENTED YOU FROM PARTICIPATING IN ACTIVITIES THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO YOUTH?.....	98
TABLE 24: WHAT IS LONGEST TIME WILLING TO TRAVEL TO PARTICIPATE IN PROGRAMS AND/OR ACTIVITIES? .	100
TABLE 25: DO YOU THINK THAT THE YOUTH HAVE A SAY IN THIS CITY?	101
TABLE 26: WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE MORE SAY IN HOW THIS CITY IS RUN?	102
TABLE 27: WHICH ARE/SHOULD BE A PRIORITY FOR SPENDING BY THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA, THE REGION OF PEEL AND/ OR COMMUNITY?.....	103
ANALYSIS BY NEIGHBOURHOOD	106
TABLE 28: HOW PROUD ARE YOU OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... HOUSING BY NEIGHBOURHOOD	107
TABLE 29: HOW PROUD ARE YOU OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... PUBLIC PARKS/CONSERVATION AREAS BY NEIGHBOURHOOD.....	108
TABLE 30: HOW PROUD ARE YOU OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... PUBLIC TRANSIT BY NEIGHBOURHOOD.....	109
TABLE 31: HOW PROUD ARE YOU OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... COMMUNITY CENTRES BY NEIGHBOURHOOD	110
TABLE 32: HOW PROUD ARE YOU OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... ENVIRONMENT IN GENERAL BY NEIGHBOURHOOD....	111
TABLE 33: HOW PROUD ARE YOU OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... SHOPPING BY NEIGHBOURHOOD.....	112
TABLE 35: HOW PROUD ARE YOU OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... CITY COUNCIL BY NEIGHBOURHOOD	114
TABLE 35: HOW PROUD ARE YOU OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... DEBT-FREE CITY BY NEIGHBOURHOOD.....	115
TABLE 36: HOW PROUD ARE YOU OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... EDUCATION BY NEIGHBOURHOOD.....	116
TABLE 37: HOW PROUD ARE YOU OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... SPORTS ACTIVITIES BY NEIGHBOURHOOD.....	117
TABLE 38: HOW PROUD ARE YOU OF MISSISSAUGA’S ... ARTS/CULTURE ACTIVITIES BY NEIGHBOURHOOD ..	118
TABLE 39: DO YOU THINK MISSISSAUGA HAD ENOUGH OF THE FOLLOWING (THOSE ANSWERING “NO”) BY NEIGHBOURHOOD.....	119
TABLE 40: DO YOU THINK MISSISSAUGA SHOULD HAVE MORE OF THE FOLLOWING? BY NEIGHBOURHOOD	121
TABLE 41: HAVE ANY OF THE POSSIBLE BARRIERS PREVENTED YOU FROM PARTICIPATING IN PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES?	122
TABLE 42: DO YOU THINK YOUTH HAVE A SAY IN HOW THE CITY IS RUN?	124
TABLE 43: WOULD YOU LIKE TO HAVE MORE OF A SAY IN HOW THE CITY IS RUN? BY NEIGHBOURHOOD.....	125
TABLE 44: WHICH AREAS SHOULD BE A PRIORITY FOR SPENDING? (BY NEIGHBOURHOOD)	126

Mississauga Youth Plan Youth Engagement Report

“Make youth feel welcome. Have great opportunities and support programs in place, and a campaign to get youth engaged.” — Youth respondent, 2008

Executive Summary

In 2007, the City of Mississauga initiated a process that would help develop an official Mississauga Youth Plan, working with a consultant The Students Commission, lead of The Centre of Excellence for Youth Engagement. It was the first time that the City has encouraged a public consultation specific to youth. Entrenched in the vision was the rationale that a meaningful, responsive and relevant plan for its youngest citizens would have to be developed with, and not for, young people. In fall 2007, work began on a strategy that would engage a diverse population of young people, so that when it was completed, the Mayor and Council, City of Mississauga staff, community agencies and young people themselves would have the confidence that this plan was born in partnership with all stakeholders. The work of the consultation and engagement of youth unfolded January to May of 2008.

In total, 1,130 people have given input; 810 young people filled out a survey and 320 people attended public meetings. There were 15 public meetings, one in each Ward for youth aged 12 to 18 and four city-wide meetings: one for youth aged 19-24, one for youth aged 12 -18, one open and one for youth agency personnel. At the public meetings, the City used for first time, electronic polling devices, so that youth at the meetings could both discuss issues and provide data through individual hand-held response devices.

In-depth and continuous youth engagement was achieved through the development of a Youth Team, which became part of the consultant’s team. Fifteen youth were recruited, trained and supported to help lead the process and became the core of the Mississauga Youth Team. These young people helped develop various tools to collect information, including an on-line and paper survey, instant polling of youth during the face-to-face ward consultations and city-wide forums, taking notes from discussions. Led by the Youth Team with the support of consultants and City staff, 810 young people filled out the survey and 320 people attended the public meetings in order to share their ideas, experiences and insights into how to build upon Mississauga’s strengths and become a more youth friendly city. The Youth Team also participated in the One Vision Visioning Symposium, February 1-2, held as part of the Conversation 21 consultation: Our Future Mississauga.

As the second report in a series of reports for the Youth Plan¹, the Youth Engagement Report describes how young people became engaged in the process and how their engagement was sustained. It summarizes the results of the survey, face-to-face consultations and forums

¹ The Environmental Scan Report was the first report; it summarizes key issues, trends and opportunities as identified by a review of effective practices in Canada and around the world and interviews of key informants including City Councillors and community agency leaders.

strategy, and highlights the city's use of new electronic public consulting technology for the first time. It sheds light on who participated and how they feel about Mississauga, what they celebrate as working and what they identify should be improved. It provides the voices of a diverse group of stakeholders who took the time and energy to match the commitment of the City of Mississauga and the City Councillors who attended the meetings in their wards to ensure that the Mississauga Youth Plan is shaped by the needs and ideas of its children and youth.

Engaging young people at the civic level can be challenging. This report highlights some of the barriers faced when working to consult in partnership with young people and the learning that arose. It illustrates how the capacity of both young people and the City has increased to work in partnership with each other in order to implement components of the Mississauga Youth Plan. It also recognizes the assets that helped ensure a very successful process and explores the next steps in the development of the Mississauga Youth Plan.

There are 3 major components to this Engagement Report

- Recruitment and Engagement of Core Youth Team as part of Consultants Team (15 youth)
- Results of the Survey (810 youth)
- Results of the Face-to-Face Public Meetings: 11 Ward Consultations and 4 city-wide Forums (320 youth and adults)

Across all three strategies for engagement, common issues, city strengths, and suggestions emerged. Of the youth consulted: 46% were 12-15, 47% were 16-19, and 7 % were 18-24. The diversity of Mississauga was represented, with varying academic track records, some in school, some out, varying economic needs and diverse ethnic backgrounds. Sixty-eight percent were born in Canada, and 72% had lived in Mississauga for more than 5 years, but 68% of their mothers and 71% of their fathers were not born in Canada. There were participants from all wards. Except for a few minor exceptions, noted in the detailed statistical tables, there was a consistency of viewpoints, ideas, and suggestions across the city. A key challenge is the drop-off in participation rates in the 16-19, and 19-24 categories, and particular challenges around the participation of girls in sports-related activities.

This youth consultation supports the results from the key informants' interviews for The Environmental Scan in identifying inadequate public transportation as the most commonly cited barrier to a child and youth friendly city. It's also the area that emerges as the top priority of youth for public spending. In the survey 45% said transportation was the top priority for spending and 71.6% cited locations too far away or lack of transportation (66.4%) as barriers to participation.

Shopping outranks all other activities and public spaces that young people participate in and are most proud of in the city. 80% are very proud or somewhat proud, giving shopping the highest rating over all other survey items, which included housing, diversity, community centres, and parks.

In terms of participation, this is what they said they are doing through the survey: 85.8% have gone to a library, 66.2% have volunteered in their community, 69.3% have participated in a drop-in activity at a community centre, 65.0% have done extra-curricular school-based sports,

64.8% have participated in extra-curricular school-based clubs, 55.2% have participated in organized sport through Recreation and Parks, 54.5% have participated in organized sport not through Recreation and Parks.

In terms of youth friendliness, 58.1% thought that schools/colleges/universities were youth-friendly places, 49.1% thought that shopping malls were youth friendly and 48.3% said movie theatres were youth-friendly. One-third or more of the respondents indicated community centres (36.1%) and public parks (34.7%) as youth-friendly places.

In general throughout the consultations, young people thought that there should be more opportunities and this belief increased with their age. Top of the list across all three age groups was a focus on employment and apprenticeship programs. In terms of general themes, the top request was for more informally structured programs and spaces. In terms of planning what opportunities and programs need to be created, the young people created a long and wide-ranging list: from extreme sports to cricket, to dance, music, video and arts.

However, marketing and educational needs may supersede specific program requests. Young people learn about opportunities and participate in them primarily through word-of-mouth (80.4% survey.). This was true of the consultation process as well, where 22.77 % of youth attended because of a word-of-mouth invitation from the Youth Team, 16.28% learned about the consultations from friends, and 18.60% heard about it from a community staff person. In the survey, 42% said that they were somewhat aware of opportunities and 65.6% said that they were not aware of programs and activities. What emerged was a lack of awareness of what programs, services and opportunities do exist, and/or a lack of interest in seeking information from the sources that City programs and community agencies traditionally use to communicate. . (These results re lack of awareness of existing programs align with a previous Recreations and Parks Consultation with youth at the 2006 Mississauga's Youth Summit, Things to Do workshop which reviewed in the Environmental Scan.)

It may well be that many young people need different approaches to learn about and be encouraged to attend what already exists, with youth-responsive adjustments and enhancements to programs, services and facilities that already exist.

Cost of programs joins transportation as a theme that emerges as a barrier to participation both in the face-to-face consultations and in the survey where 65.6% said the cost of programs was too much.

"The cost for the stuff, like the community activities and recreational things are a little too expensive for a family with a low budget. I really want to continue my strength for Volleyball. Even my teacher said that I should be on a team, but the price is expensive and it would be a waste of valuable money that my family needs to have food on our plates. It's not that they are poor. It's just that we don't have enough spare money for my family to use on my development of skills in volleyball. It would be a lot more easier if the prices for recreational and arts things would be a little cheaper."

For the future, 62% say that they want to have more of a say in the city's future and in making decisions about how the city runs. There were many suggestions about how to broaden the opportunities for young people to become and remain involved in decision-making, including strengthening opportunities to build the capacity of youth to lead and represent greater diversity. Racism and exclusion were sub-themes that surfaced throughout the consultation;

types of youth whether by race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, academic achievement, or interest tend to cluster in programs and activities to the exclusion of others.

It is important to note that the major themes, issues and ideas from youth in this consultation align both strategically and tactically with other major consultations already completed or in process for the city. These include Conversation 21: Our Future Mississauga and the Older Adult Report. Transit figures prominently in both consultations, as does valuing and promoting social diversity and inclusion. Pillar Two for Conversation 21 is Ensuring that Youth, Older Adults and New Immigrants thrive.

The next steps in the development of the Mississauga Youth Team is for the Youth Core Team working with the city staff and the consultant to develop a Framework and Action Plan that will address the themes, issues and opportunities raised through the youth engagement process.

The Framework and Action Plan, after its review by city staff, will then be supported by an Implementation Plan and submitted to the City, and ultimately to City Council in a presentation by members of the Youth Core Team.

The Youth Engagement Process and its results demonstrate the value of young people being actively involved in planning and executing plans for programs that are designed to impact them. The single finding that word-of-mouth is how they receive their information and what prompts them to get involved suggests the significance of continuing to engage young people throughout the development and implementation of the plan.

Mississauga Youth Plan Youth Engagement Report

“I think that we should be able to voice our opinion and argue our side in city matters. We are the future, so we should be allowed to help make decisions. Also, we should be allowed to propose certain programs and events.”– Youth Respondent; 2008

Engagement of Youth

Young people were engaged in the development of the Mississauga Youth Plan in various capacities: as Youth Core Team Members, as members of the PhotoVoice team, as survey participants and in face-to-face consultations through the 11 public ward meetings and the four city-wide public forums. In total, 1,130 people have given input; 810 young people filled out a survey and 320 people attended public meetings.

This report describes both the process of the engagement and the results: what did young people across the city tell say about what they wanted to see in a Mississauga Youth Plan

Engagement of the Youth Core Team

Those most involved were Mississauga Youth Plan Core Youth Team (the Youth Team): a group of dedicated young people, ranging in ages between 15 and 26, with diverse life experiences, backgrounds and expertise. This group included recognized school and community leaders, young parents, youth out of school and work, young people in conflict with the law and young entrepreneurs. The backgrounds and life experiences of the Youth Team members were as diverse as their viewpoints, interests and capacity.

The Youth Team was recruited throughout the project, and continually developed in size and capacity as the process evolved. During the key informant interviews, for the Environmental Scan, community organizations were approached and informed about the next step of the project, (the Engagement Process) and the desire to engage a wide range of youth in leadership roles. Each contact was followed up with a phone call and email with further information as to how youth could become more engaged in the process.

Throughout the research for the Environmental Scan, various effective community based organizations were identified. In meetings conducted by the consultant, agencies were invited to identify youth to join the team. Staff from the Square One Youth Centre, (SOYC; a program of Nexus Youth Services), were quick to introduce the consultant to several young people who identified interest in the development of a plan for Mississauga youth.

From these initial discussions came a series of meetings held at SOYC where it was evident that the young people had strong relationships, connections and support from the staff at SOYC and these staff also supported the project strongly. This laid the groundwork for the launch of the initial youth to be involved in the Youth Plan. Being able to work closely with SOYC allowed for a local space where young people could connect, develop relationships, receive information and be contacted.

Recruitment for the Youth Team also took place using the City of Mississauga's website, and information circulated to coordinators and staff at municipal services, (libraries, community centres etc), as well as through City Councillors and their networks. This was complemented with the Students Commission existing network of youth in Mississauga.

As the project developed, members of the Youth Team were trained and its members began leading Ward Consultations and City-wide Forums. At each event, young people were recruited. Young people who started as participants became core Youth Team members and provided great leadership throughout the process. It was watching their peers lead the Consultation in which they were a participant that helped them decide to become further involved. Youth Team members were treated as part of the Consultants team and were paid for specific completed tasks, such as finishing a poster, facilitating a discussion, doing marketing for the survey in malls.

The Youth Team recruitment approach utilized several strategies, using both adult-to-youth and youth-to-youth invitations, print, electronic and personal face-to-face marketing tools. Although, interest was generated through print and electronic recruitment tools, overall the participation of youth whose engagement in the core team was the fullest was generated through personal invitation through a community agency meeting or through their volunteering at a public consultation event, after hearing the Youth Team issue the invitation. Mobilizing the Youth Team to be 'recruiters' allowed for young people to see that they could play a larger meaningful role in the process after the consultation, while the adults involved allowed young people to recognize the benefits of their involvement. This mechanism may point the way to on-going marketing strategies, which could become part of the Implementation plan to encourage greater participation of youth in all types of programs.

This approach of initiating engagement allowed for several factors to be addressed, as identified in the Centre of Excellence for Youth Engagement's Framework for engagement. The young people were asked to participate in activities related to the development of the plan, which they were interested in, and curious about, where there were incentives for participation, (payment, transit, meals) and sequenced activities that were regarded as fun, fulfilling and meaningful. They were able to develop new skills, while enhancing and having their existing strengths and assets recognized as making a meaningful contribution to the larger community. They were recognized as having meaningful roles, with opportunities to contribute and make decisions.

Marketing to all youth

Engagement was not limited to the Youth Team members. They in fact became part of the marketing process for the many other young residents of Mississauga who also became part of this process.

Prior to each public meeting, members of the youth team, set up displays and approached youth at the various sites: shopping malls, theatres, community centres, schools. Youth at large were informed of the incentives for participating, (door prizes, snacks and dinner) and the Youth Team stressed to their peers the importance of participating in the project: to have their voice heard and experiences shared to help shape the Mississauga Youth Plan.

Young people were recruited to participate in the online survey, the face-to-face ward consultations and the city-wide forums. Adults were recruited to participate in the adult and service provider Forums and to encourage youth they knew to participate in the various consultation activities.

Recruitment of youth to for the survey and public meetings included the City of Mississauga website, continual information sharing by City staff with their peers and service providers, advertising in city facilities, local media press releases and side-of-street signage and the youth-led word-of-mouth campaign described above. Both City staff and the Youth Team developed Facebook groups (an online social networking website) to promote the activities of the Engagement Process, with an updated calendar of events, pictures and e-mail alerts to members of these groups. There were three Mississauga Youth Plan spaces on Facebook, with 212 members: 158 youth participated in the MYP youth-led Facebook group, 43 became members of the MYP city-run page, and 11 fans of the city run page.

The Youth Team and staff of the City who were participating and organizing the individual Youth Consultations proved to be highly effective, with 22.77% of the participants in the consultations identified that they had heard about the event through the youth team, 16.28% learned about the consultations from friends, and 18.60% heard about it from a community staff person — 57.65% hearing through word-of-mouth sources.

Adults were invited to participate in several of the Forums, (an all ages Forum and a community service forum) through the existing network City staff has developed as well as through the City of Mississauga website and local media. Youth Team members and consultants also encouraged adults in their networks to attend.

Sustaining Process

Given the diversity and broad range of capacity of the Youth Team as it grew, it became increasingly critical to sustain their engagement by directly supporting their ongoing skill development in the direct application of their tasks, as they undertook to become paid members of the consultant's team. It was also important to develop a strong group of youth leaders, who could overcome the challenges and barriers they faced in communicating with each other because of their diversity. This was achieved by ensuring that a consultant team member was available in Mississauga on a daily basis during the public engagement phase to support the youth day-to-day, to provide ongoing training and assistance and to encourage the Youth Team member's participation in other ongoing activities, programs and projects. It was equally important to support the development of the relationship between City staff and the Youth Team and encourage and support the ongoing dialogue and interactions between the two.

The Youth Team was also continually challenged to use their developing skills in the Ward Consultations and Forums. With each passing consultation and forum, the youth members took on a stronger leadership role. This experience allowed the Youth Team to develop increased ownership of the project and pride in the outcomes. As the numbers of participants grew, each Ward Consultation became more challenging

There were several focused objectives of the youth team during their sustained involvement throughout the consultation phases. Primarily, it was to encourage youth who were participating in one of the areas of the Engagement Strategy (the online survey, a Youth Consultation or Forum) to participate in others as well. The objective was to have the youth share their ideas and experiences using various mediums and continually provide further opportunities for youth to contribute meaningfully.

PhotoVoice

In order to help sustain the involvement of youth who participated in Ward Consultations and Forums the consultants also supported the Youth Team to look at alternative mediums for youth to share their experiences and stories of living in Mississauga. Researchers from Youth Voices, Youth Engagement Unit of the Centre for Health Promotion, University of Toronto volunteered their time to teach the Youth Team a participatory action research approach used internationally, called PhotoVoice.

The objectives were to utilize this strategy to conduct a story telling, using photographs, of Mississauga through the lens of youth as well as to help sustain the engagement of youth in a community-based research effort.

The PhotoVoice component had three goals:

- To enable young people in Mississauga to record and reflect their community's strengths and problems
- To promote dialogue about important issues for Mississauga youth
- To support the communication between youth and decision-makers

The PhotoVoice project was designed to give young people a voice by engaging them in the process of defining and discussing the issues that affect their community through photography. Researchers from the University of Toronto donated their time to train members of the youth team in the technique and a member of the youth team took charge of the project. 15 youth were provided disposable cameras after various ward consultations in order to help tell their story and that of their peers in Mississauga. The PhotoVoice component did impart new skills and knowledge to the Youth Team, but was not as successful as hoped in terms of participation outside of the Youth Team. The Youth Team member in charge of the project could not get young people to return his calls for the debriefing meeting with the photos and only two sets of photos were returned, which was a frustrating learning experience for him. However, the photos that were returned were insightful, including a comparison of community centres and what makes a centre inviting.

An important strategy in sustaining youth's participation was the continued communication between the Youth Team, City staff and consultants with the young people involved and interested in the Mississauga Youth Plan. One of the tools used were the two Facebook groups where 212 individuals, predominantly Mississauga youth, registered between the two groups. Email alerts were sent to members, updates on the group's homepages were posted and each upcoming event was advertised. One of these groups was managed by a City staff and the second by a Youth Team member.

Training, Capacity Building and Development of Youth

One of the goals with the development of the Mississauga Youth Team was to develop diverse and strong youth leaders in Mississauga who could remain involved in helping with the implementation of the plan.

An important objective was to involve youth who are not normally engaged or participation-oriented in order to ensure that the voices and issues of those who are least likely to participate in youth activities were clearly captured in the development of the action.

To do this, the consultant focused on the training, capacity building and development of the Youth Team members as they joined the engagement process, and rather than adults doing the work, they focused on preparing youth to do the work wherever possible and supporting them from the sidelines or back of the room. This process began from the very first activities when they presented themselves to Council and described their motivations for being involved. City staff were excellent in adjusting to allowing for mistakes and learning and adjusting the pace of the project and the expectations in order to allow for youth to learn as they went.

The basis for the approach is described in the Environmental Scan, using the Youth Engagement Framework of the Centre of Excellence for Youth Engagement and the key elements of effective practices in positive youth development approaches. It combined creating a safe, warm and caring team (heart) with youth and adults from the city and consultant working together, with new knowledge and skills (head) and the meaningfulness that comes from knowing that they were contributing to the bigger community. The final element of the definition of youth engagement for the Centre is outcome of new behaviours with positive results (feet). Former deficits for these youth (bad life experiences, teenage pregnancies, trouble with the law) were viewed as strengths (strength-based approach) and helped make them experts in leading discussions on the issues. Various incentives and rewards, including increased responsibilities and challenges, were used to initiate involvement in the team and then to sustain it.

There were four training sessions provided specifically for Youth Team members and at each Ward Consultation and city-wide Forum there was a very clear process of skill sharing and capacity building. Some of the skills developed by the team included:

- Survey and research development
- Group facilitation
- Basic Interviewing
- Communication skills
- PhotoVoice research training
- Team Building exercises
- Data analysis
- Proposal development
- Presentation skills

The learning was shared in both informal and formal processes. Informal training took place throughout the time period that the ward consultations and city-wide forums were being organized and conducted. Youth Team members were challenged (and supported) at each

session to take on larger roles with their growing experience. Following each session the team met for debriefing and a review of the process, experience and were provided feedback and guidance for upcoming Consultations.

As one of the objectives of the consultants was the development of the Youth Team as leaders it was important to provide the Youth Team the opportunity to officially debrief and share their experiences being involved with the Mississauga Youth Plan. Mid-way through the process the Youth Team had an opportunity to provide feedback on the process and evaluate project to date. This session, led by one of the Consultants researchers, provided insights into the dynamics between Youth Team members, the challenges that they faced and the degree to which personal life experiences continued to need addressing in order to support their involvement in the process. The diversity of the team (good in school, not in school), young moms and dads with little time and money, highly involved volunteers and extra-curricular enthusiasts with few monetary concerns provided challenging dynamics and excellent insights into the needs of a variety of youth.

It was also an indicator to the Youth Team that their voices were being heard, not only for the final overall plan but also within the process of developing it. This led to individual work and dialogue between the consultants and young people that allowed for further personal development for the Youth Team members.

As a number of the young people involved faced risks and challenges in their day-to-day lives much of the support provided to the Team supported their personal development, as well as their civic engagement which hopefully will help them continue in leadership roles within the City and other local service providers. This type of approach is supported by the literature as an effective practice.

Engagement in Environmental Scan

Members of the Youth Team assisted senior interviewers with the consultants in interviewing key informants. Their direct and honest questions to the City Councillors were well received by Councillors and, in turn, the participating Youth Team members provided meaningful feedback during the interview process and afterwards as the interviews were analyzed in Youth Team Meetings. This process helped establish a sense of ownership of the project to them. This experience also helped solidify relationships between City staff, Councillors and individual Youth Team members.

Several Youth Team members helped shape the Environmental Scan following the collection of information and data. They read, reviewed and provided feedback and edited various stages of the document.

Engagement in the Youth Engagement Report

Throughout the process of gathering information and consulting youth throughout Mississauga, different strengths, interests and assets of the individuals on the youth team, and they were encouraged to participate and take on the tasks that related to their strengths. Some members took on the job of entering the data gathered from the paper surveys, other wrote out notes from the flip charts at each meeting, and others helped code the qualitative data from the

surveys working the consultant's adult researchers. The adult consultant team pulled together the survey data, the Turning Point results, and the notes, and then during several evening sessions the whole youth team reviewed the results to generate summaries of the major themes, looking ahead to collaboratively with City Staff develop the Framework for the Action Plan.

Survey: Summary Review of Results

The survey that was used was developed in partnership between City staff, the consultants, programmers and researchers and members of the Youth Team. This process provided proof for the Youth Team members that they did play a very large and important role in the execution of the project and expanded their understanding that it was not only their opinions and life experiences that counted, but their ability to ensure broad representation from all types of youth in the city.

The survey was initially to be an online tool to gather information and engage youth but with feedback from the Youth Team it was decided that a paper version was very important, specifically for young people who did not have Internet access. This proved to be a correct assessment from the Youth Team, as the survey became an excellent tool to use in the Ward Consultations and city-wide Forums, where the youth participants were encouraged to fill out the survey in person after the discussions. The Youth Team were responsible for entering the data from the surveys into the online system allowing them to become more familiar and aware of the ideas, issues and wishes of the youth survey respondents.

810 young people completed the survey, either online or on paper. Below is a summary review of the highlights of each survey question, starting with the full demographic profile of participants. For the complete results for each question, consult the Tables in the appendix where summary totals for all answers are presented, together with age-grouped breakouts. There are also tables breaking out answers based on neighborhoods.

In addition to the quantitative, number-based questions on the survey, there were a number of qualitative questions asked at various points in the survey which allowed the participants to expand their responses and share their ideas, experiences and thoughts in words. These qualitative comments have been coded and integrated after the quantitative data is presented in the relevant sections. So for instance, the question “Where do youth hang out?” will have both quantitative and qualitative answers. The number of responses given for a particular code is recorded, rather than percentages, as the majority of respondents chose not to give a text-answer each time there was an opportunity.

Demographic Profile of Survey Participants

Demographic Profile of Survey Participants

Total # of Surveys Completed:

First time completers: 87.9%
(n=767)

Completed survey before: 7.2%
(n=63)

Information was missing for
4.9% (n=43)

Those that answered that they had completed the survey before were EXCLUDED from the analyses performed, including the demographic information presented below.

Age:

12-15: 46.5% (n=377)
 16-19: 40.7% (n=330)
 20-24: 7.0% (n=57)

Information was missing for 5.7% (n=46).

Gender:

Male: 38.4% (n=311)
 Female: 54.2% (n=439)
 Transgender: 1.4% (n=11)

Information was missing for 6.0% (n=49)

Please note: because of the extremely small sample size for the transgender youth, these youth were excluded from the gender crosstabs completed and reported on later in this document.

Respondent Born in Canada?

Yes: 68.0% (n=551)
 No: 25.8% (n=209)
 Information missing for 6.2% (n=50)

Mother Born in Canada?

Yes: 24.4% (n=198)
 No: 68.6% (n=556)
 Information missing for 6.9% (n=56)

Father Born in Canada?

Yes: 21.1% (n=171)
 No: 71.6% (n=580)
 Information missing for 7.3% (n=59)

Cultural/Ethnic Identity:

Identification of cultural identity was based upon several questions asked – all open-ended – and included the languages spoken in the home and the person’s own self-described ethnicity. Therefore, there were a variety of answers. The youth team, along with a member of the research team, went through all the responses and developed cultural codes. The most common cultural codes were:

East Asian: 10.0% (n=81)
 South Asian: 9.7% (n=78)
 European: 8.8% (n=71)
 Mixed: 5.4% (n=44)
 Caucasian: 4.8% (n=39)
 Canadian: 4.7% (n=38)
 Canadian & European: 3.5% (n=28)

More than one-third of the responses (n=321, 39.7%) were missing or could not be coded (i.e., information given did not answer the question or it was impossible to determine a cultural “code”).

With whom do you live?

With my parents: 87.7% (n=710)
 With extended family: 5.8% (n=47)
 With a guardian/foster parent: 1.7% (n=14)
 In my own place: 4.1% (n=33)

In a group home:	1.4% (n=11)
With a friend:	1.9% (n=15)
I am homeless:	1.6% (n=13)
Other:	1.7% (n=14)

Where in Mississauga do you live?

Cawthra	1.9% (n=14)
Churchill Meadows	2.7% (n=20)
Clarkson	1.9% (n=14)
Cooksville	7.8% (n=57)
Courtney Park	5.3% (n=39)
Dixie	4.4% (n=32)
Erindale/South Common	7.3% (n=53)
Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills	4.4% (n=32)
Lorne Park	13.0% (n=95)
Malton	10.8% (n=79)
Meadowvale	1.8% (n=13)
Meadowvale Village	8.3% (n=61)
Mississauga Valley	1.8% (n=13)
Port Credit	5.1% (n=37)
River Grove	4.2% (n=31)
Streetsville	9.4% (n=69)
Hurontario	1.8% (n=13)
Other	6.2% (n=45)
Outside of Mississauga	1.9% (n=19)

Information was missing for 9.8% (n=79).

How long have you lived in Mississauga?

Less than 1 year	4.4% (n=36)
1-2 years	5.6% (n=45)
3-4 years	10.2% (n=83)
5+ years	72.5% (n=587)

Information was missing for 7.3% (n=59).

Schooling

In elementary school	22.0% (n=178)
In high school	60.5% (n=490)
In college	1.2% (n=10)
In university	6.3% (n=51)
Not in school anymore	2.6% (n=21)
Other	0.9% (n=7)

Information was missing for 6.5% (n=53).

Job Status

No	66.2% (n=273)		Have job or not? → Information was missing for 0.1% (n=1)
Yes	33.7% (n=273)	Full-time: 10.0% (n=25)	Job type? → Information was missing for 8.4% (n=23)
		Part-time: 74.8% (n=187)	
		Occasional: 8.8% (n=22)	
		Summer only: 6.4% (n=16)	

Have enough money?²

To meet basic needs?

Yes: 41.6% (n=337)
 Mostly: 20.2% (n=164)
 Sometimes: 18.4% (n=149)
 Hardly ever: 6.3% (n=51)

Information was missing 8.1% (n=66)

To do fun things?

Yes: 29.4% (n=238)
 Mostly: 23.3% (n=89)
 Sometimes: 21.2% (n=172)
 Hardly ever: 11.0% (n=89)

Information was missing for 8.5% (n=69)

Involved in Justice System?

Juvenile Justice System

Yes: 6.4% (n=52)
 No: 87.0% (n=705)

Information was missing 6.5% (n=53)

Adult Justice System:

Yes: 3.5% (n=28)
 No: 89.4% (n=724)

Information was missing for 7.2% (n=58)

Highlights of Responses by Question

The following section presents each question, with its significant results, followed by a brief description of the most relevant findings from the quantitative survey data, and finally a summary of the qualitative responses if there were any for the question.

Where do you hang out with friends?

70.0% Shopping Malls
 69.1% Schools, Colleges, Universities
 65.7% Community Centres

From those surveyed, 70.0% of young people said they hung out at shopping malls, 69.1% said schools/colleges and 65.7% said community centres (65.7%). Youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the other 12-15 year-olds or 20-24 year-olds to hang out at community centres. In the older age group, young men indicated they were more likely to hang out at the community centres than young women. Some caution may be warranted with these numbers

² Although income range was asked it was not completed by almost three-quarters of the participants (70.7%): they either left it blank (9.5%), answered “don’t know” (46.2%), or responded “choose not to answer” (15.1%). Therefore, income is not presented here.

as many people filled out the surveys at community centres where consultations were held, or were recruited to do the survey through community centres.

- Youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the other two age groups to hang out in shopping malls. As well, in the 2 younger age groups, girls were more likely than boys to hang out at shopping malls.
- Female youth in the older 2 age categories were less likely than male youth to indicate they hung out at the YMCA or other sport organizations.
- Youth aged 12-15 were more likely than the older 2 age groups to hang out with friends at religious institutions.

Qualitative Comments:

Many people responded “other “ to the question about where they hang out with their friends. The majority (approximately 210) said they hung out at either their house or their friend’s houses. Other responses that were mentioned more than once included: private establishments such as coffee shops or restaurants (22 responses); outside or on the street (16 responses); clubs/bars (10 responses); parties (7 responses); basketballs courts (6 responses); library (4 responses); hockey rinks or arenas (3 responses); pool halls (2 responses); soccer field (2 responses).

“At home or on the street because there is nothing to do.”

“Cold dark alleys where I smoke away my boredom and wished I lived somewhere else.”

Which places are youth friendly?

58.1%	Schools, colleges/universities
49.1%	Shopping Malls
48.3%	Movie Theatres
36.1%	Community Centres
34.7%	Public Parks

Only one of the items – schools/colleges/universities – had more than one-half of the youth (58.1%) responding that these were youth-friendly places. Just less than one-half of the youth thought that shopping malls (49.1%) and movie theatres (48.3%) were youth-friendly. One-third or more of the respondents also indicated community centres (36.1%) and public parks (34.7%) as youth-friendly places.

- Youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the other 2 age groups to indicate shopping malls as youth friendly places. Younger youth aged 12-15, and to a lesser extent youth aged 16-19 were more likely than older youth to indicate that public parks are youth friendly.
- Female youth aged 20-24 were less likely than male youth to think that community centres were youth friendly.

Qualitative Comments:

When asked what places they hang out at that are youth friendly, many youth responded “other”. Of these responses, the most common was at their house or their friends’ houses (approximately 140). Other responses that were mentioned more than once included: private establishments such as coffee shops or restaurants (9 responses); youth or student centres (7 responses); streets or outside (5 responses); parties (5 responses); basketball courts (4 responses); nowhere/none (4 responses); neighbourhood (3 responses); hockey (2 responses); and library (2 responses).

In the survey, there was a series of questions asking the youth about the pride they felt in various aspects of Mississauga. Here is a snapshot of what young people were and were not proud of.

How Proud of Mississauga’s ...Housing

49.2% Somewhat proud
26.7% Very proud

With respect to Mississauga’s housing, 49.2% are “somewhat proud” and 26.7% “very proud.” Younger youth (ages 12-15 and 16-19) were more likely than younger youth to answer this way and older youth were more likely than the other two age groups to answer “neutral/not sure” or “not proud”.

How Proud of Mississauga’s ...Public Parks

44.6% Somewhat proud
20.8% Very proud

With respect to Mississauga’s public parks, again most youth answered “somewhat proud” (44.6%) and similar proportions answered “very proud” (20.8%) and “neutral/not sure” (21.2%). Less than 15% were “not proud” or “not at all proud”.

How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Public Transit

29.1% Somewhat proud
15.1% Very proud
25.9% Neutral/not sure
18.6% Not proud
10.5% Not at all proud

Of all the items on which youth were queried with respect to feeling proud, public transit was given the lowest rating – 29.1% answered either “not proud” (18.6%) or “not at all proud” (10.5%). A fair proportion also answered “neutral/not sure” (25.9%). Nonetheless the largest proportion (29.9%) answered “somewhat proud”.

Older youth were more likely to answer negatively than the younger two age groups – 39.3% answered either “not proud” or “not at all proud”. Younger youth aged 12-15 had more positive

rating of public transit than the other two age groups; boys in this age range were less likely than the girls to give a negative rating (18.1% vs. 29.1%).

How Proud of Mississauga's ... Community Centres

43.9% Somewhat proud
28.2% Very proud

For community centres, most respondents answered "somewhat proud" (43.9%) or "very proud" (28.2%). Less than 10% of respondents gave a negative response. Male youth aged 12-15 were more likely than the girls that age to answer "very proud" (37.5% vs. 23.9%).

Proud of Mississauga's ... Environment in General

42.5% Somewhat proud
21.3% Very proud
20.2% Not sure
11.6% Not proud
4.4% Not at all proud

Most youth felt "somewhat proud" of Mississauga's environment (42.5%); approximately 15% gave this item a negative rating.

How Proud of Mississauga's ... Shopping

40.1% Somewhat proud
39.8% Very proud

This item was the most positively rated item by the youth that completed the survey. In total, approximately 80% of the respondents answered either "very proud" (39.8%) or "somewhat proud" (40.1%) to this item. Very few respondents (7.8%) answered negatively.

How Proud of Mississauga's ... Multicultural/diverse

42.4% Very proud
32.5% Somewhat proud

Youth also rated the city's multicultural and diverse nature very positively; in fact, this item had the highest proportion of youth reporting that they were "very proud" (42.4%). Added together, 74.9% of the youth answered either "somewhat proud" or "very proud". Very few youth (6.8%) answered "not proud" or "not at all proud".

How Proud of Mississauga's ... City Council

34.0% Neutral
30.0% Somewhat proud
27.6% Very proud

The largest proportion of youth answered "neutral/not sure" for this item (34.1%). Slightly smaller proportions answered "somewhat proud" (30.0%) or "very proud" (27.6%). Older youth

aged 20-24 were more likely to answer “very proud” (38.2%) than their younger counterparts; however, they were also more likely to answer “not proud” than the other 2 groups (12.7%).

How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Debt-free city government

36.6% Neutral
31.1% Very proud
24.3% Somewhat proud

Youth were also most likely to answer “neutral/not sure” (36.6%) on how proud they were that they had a debt-free city government. Again, however, the majority answered at least “somewhat proud” (55.4%). Less than 10% of the respondents (7.3%) answered “not proud” or “not at all proud”.

How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Education

45.8% Somewhat proud
32.4% Very proud

This item also received a very high rating by the youth; 78.2% of the youth answered at least “somewhat proud”. Younger youth (ages 12-15) were more likely than the other 2 groups to answer “very proud”; and boys in that age range were more likely than girls to answer in this way (46.5% vs. 32.7%).

How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Sports Activities

37.8% Very proud
36.3% Somewhat proud

Similar proportions of youth answered this item either “very proud” (37.8%) or “somewhat proud” (36.3%). About 10% answered either “not proud” or “not at all proud”.

- Younger youth (aged 12-15) were more likely than youth in the other 2 age groups to answer “very proud”. Older youth (aged 20-24) were more likely than the younger youth in both groups to answer “not proud”.
- Female youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the male youth in that age group to answer “neutral/not sure” and were a little less likely to answer “very proud” or “somewhat proud”.

How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Arts/culture activities

36.5% Somewhat proud
29.3% Very proud

The largest majority of respondents felt “somewhat proud” (36.5%) of the city’s arts/culture activities; a further 29.3% were “very proud”. Almost one-quarter (23.0%) were “neutral/not sure”.

How Proud of Mississauga's ... Other activities available

- 38.7% Very proud
- 37.2% Somewhat proud

Youth were also given the opportunity to rate how proud they were of Mississauga's "other" activities – and were given some examples (e.g., Playdium, RibFest, events/activities at the International Centre). Almost equal proportions answered "very proud" (38.7%) or "somewhat proud" (37.2%). Less than 10% answered "not proud" or "not at all proud". Younger youth aged 12-15 were more likely than the other two age groups to answer "very proud"; older youth aged 20-24 were more likely to answer "somewhat proud", "neutral/not sure" or "not proud".

Qualitative Comments re Proud Questions Series:

Youth provided comments on additional things that they were, or were not, proud of in Mississauga, in addition to the pre-selected list that was provided. All responses were made about things that they were not proud of. Responses that were mentioned more than once included: crime and violence (4 responses); transportation (4 responses); no cricket teams (2 responses); libraries not designed for youth (2 responses); and police intolerance towards youth (2 responses).

"The cost for the stuff, like the community activities and recreational things are a little too expensive for a family with a low budget. I really want to continue my strength for Volleyball. Even my teacher said that I should be on a team, but the price is expensive and it would be a waste of valuable money that my family needs to have food on our plates. It's not that they are poor; it's just that we don't have enough spare money for my family to use on my development of skills in volleyball. It would be a lot more easier if the prices for recreational and arts things would be a little cheaper."

"I am not proud of the amount of drug abuse, violence, and bullying. It is not good for children to be involved in these areas because it will scar them forever..."

"I am not proud of the amount of violence and bullying that goes on in certain schools. Also, I believe cultural diversity is fine, as long as it does not interfere with other people's lives. I don't think religion should endanger anyone or give people power over others. I also think there should be more youth groups, where teenagers who don't know each other can get together and talk about their problems and struggles through life. Teens are growing farther away from society and tend to rebel more. It's not fair that they are given such a bad image, when it's this part of their life when they need the most guidance."

"The overall atmosphere is not youth friendly. It is difficult to transport oneself in this city. Not everyone drives and the bus system is not adequate to accommodate the needs of various individuals".

"Our libraries -- there are no good reading programs for children (I used to live in Toronto, and the summer reading programs there were fantastic! I actually fell in love with reading all thanks to it. The charges are extremely high, so high that I have almost stopped using the system completely now, and there are not enough in-library community activities."

“It feels like there is too little to do in Mississauga in general. Most of the action is downtown Toronto, and even if one were to go downtown using public transportation to say a bar or club, one would need to worry about the early departure times. There needs to be more transportation options available late at night to major public transit terminals. Also, there is no gay scene for younger people in Mississauga. I think it would be a great thing to bring gay culture to this part of town.”

The following question provided a list of activities and the respondents were asked if they had participated in any of them.

Participated in any of the following programs or activities

- 85.8% Gone to a library
- 69.3% Participated in a drop-in activity at a community centre
- 66.2% Volunteered in their community
- 65.0% Extra-curricular school-based sports
- 64.8% Extra-curricular school-based clubs
- 55.2% Organized sport through Recreation and Parks
- 55.2% Organized sport not through Recreation and Parks

In terms of participation, this is what they said they are doing through the survey: 85.8% have gone to a library, 69.3% have participated in a drop-in activity at a community centre, 66.2% have volunteered in their community, 65.0% have done extra-curricular school-based sports, 64.8% have participated in extra-curricular school-based clubs, 55.2% participated in organized sport through Recreation and Parks, 54.5% participated in organized sport not through Recreation and Parks.

- There were some age differences in participation levels: younger youth aged 12-15 and 16-19 were more likely than older youth to have participating in organized sport either through Recreation and Parks, or outside of Recreation and Parks.
- Boys were more likely than girls, in both ages 12-15 and 16-19, to have participated in organized sport – either through Recreation and Parks, or outside of Recreation and Parks.
- Younger youth aged 12-15, and to a lesser extent those aged 16-19, were more likely than older youth to have participated in arts programs through Recreation and Parks. Girls were more likely than boys in both the younger age groups to have participated in these activities. Female youth were also more likely than male youth in both older age groups (16-19 and 20-24) to have participated in arts activities outside of Recreation and Parks.
- Young women aged 20-24 were more likely than their male counterparts to have participated in a drop-in activity outside of Recreation and Parks.
- Female youth aged 12-15 and 16-19 were more likely than male youth to have participated in school-based clubs and to have gone to a library.
- Male youth aged 16-19 were more likely than female youth in that same age range to have participated in environmental programs.

- Young women aged 20-24 were more likely than their male counterparts to have volunteered in their community or to have participated in cultural or religious-based programs or activities.
- Boys aged 12-15 were more likely than girls in that same age range to have participated in other community based programs or activities.

Qualitative Comments:

Survey respondents were asked to state why they did not participate in activities or opportunities. The most frequent responses included: lack of time (17 responses); not interested (16 responses); lack of information or unaware of programs (13 responses); and cost (11 responses). Other responses included: accessibility or getting to activities is a problem (4 responses); just moved to Mississauga (3 responses); not allowed to participate (2 responses); age restrictions (2 responses); don't feel comfortable (2 responses); and there are no cricket teams (2 responses).

"Many times I do not get informed of these activities. I think it would help if there were more flyers around other than just the City Hall area. However, I enjoyed the Yoga Program VERY MUCH! Please do it again this summer.

"I'd really like to, but the problem is, I was never made aware that there are things out there for youth. Never was there a flyer or some other form of advertisement that told me of these things. However, whenever I find a sheet with all the info, I'll be sure to join."

The following question provided a list of activities and programs and the respondents were asked if they felt Mississauga had enough of them.

Do you think Mississauga had enough of the following (those answering "no")?

- 59.8% Not enough extreme sport parks/locations
- 53.5% Not enough outdoor skating rinks
- 46.7% Not enough skateboard parks
- 46.2% Not enough outdoor swimming pools
- 41.4% Not enough teen youth centres or drop-ins
- 39.8% Not enough public parks/conservation areas
- 35.6% Not enough volunteer activities
- 34.6% Not enough advisory, planning or decision-making activities
- 34.5% Not enough basketball courts

- One-half or more of the youth responding to the survey felt that Mississauga did not have enough extreme sport parks/locations (59.8%) or outdoor skating rinks (53.5%).
- One-third or more of the youth felt that there were not enough skateboard parks (46.7%), outdoor swimming pools (46.2%), teen youth centres or drop-ins (41.4%), public parks/conservation areas (39.8%), indoor ice skating rinks or ice time (37.7%), volunteer opportunities (35.6%), advisory, planning or decision-making activities or opportunities (34.6%), and basketball courts (34.5%).
- Older youth were more likely than the other two age groups to answer "not sure" with respect to indoor swimming pools.

- Older youth aged 20-24, and to a lesser extent those aged 16-19, were more likely than the youngest youth to think the city did not have enough youth activities at community centres. Older youth (aged 20-24) were also more likely than the younger youth (aged 16-19 and 12-15) to think that the city did not have enough basketball courts, volunteer opportunities, or advisory, planning or decision-making activities or opportunities.
- Female youth aged 12-15 and those aged 16-19 were also more likely than the male youth in those age ranges to think that the city did not have enough youth centres or drop-ins. Girls aged 12-15 were more likely than boys in that same age range to think that there were not enough youth activities at community centres.
- Male youth aged 16-19 were more likely than female youth that same age to report that the city did not have enough basketball courts.
- Young women aged 20-24 reported more frequently than young men that age that the city did not have enough volunteer opportunities.

Qualitative Comments:

Respondents were asked to describe other places and opportunities they would like to see for youth in Mississauga. A large number of responses centred around increased opportunities or venues for sports, including basketball (14 responses); soccer (6 responses); hockey (3 responses); cricket (2 responses); and badminton (2 responses). At least 13 respondents said that they wanted more youth centres or places for youth to hang out. Numerous responses focused on increased opportunities for music and art (at least 9 responses), including more opportunities for young artists and more music venues.

"I would like to see more activities based for teens (preferably aged 15+) so that we do not have to be stuck with the pre-teens, or children. Most of us don't go out for most events because the age group is way too broad (youngest age being around 6 oldest age being around 18)."

"I have found that a lot of the youth in this city are extremely interested in Arts, Media, Music and Entertainment....There are not enough community organizations focused on Arts and Entertainment that are affordable if not free, for us to participate, get networks and develop skills to make great contacts and engage others with our talents."

"There is a 'playground' structure in walking distance of most blocks but where are the places for young teens to go without being accused of being up to no good?"
The following question provided a list of programs and the respondents were asked if Mississauga should have more of them.

Do you think Mississauga should have more of the following for youth?

73.5%	Employment programs
67.5%	Apprenticeship programs
66.9%	Mentoring programs
64.4%	Leadership training
63.3%	Health programs
56.7%	Peer counseling programs
56.2%	Parenting programs
51.4%	Homework Clubs

More than 50% of the respondents reported thinking that more of all the possible programs listed on the survey were needed in Mississauga. Although there were differences in answers for the age categories, the largest proportions of youth in all three age groups felt that more Employment Programs were needed, followed by Apprenticeship Programs. All programs in the list, outside of one (homework clubs) were rated differently by the 3 age groups. In terms of age difference, the general pattern was that as age increased so did the proportions of the age group indicating that more programs were needed. That is, the youngest youth showed the smallest proportions wanting more of the program and the older youth showed the highest proportions.

- There was only one significant gender difference found: female youth aged 20-24 were more likely than male youth in that same age range to think that more Employment Programs were needed.

Qualitative Comments:

The survey asked respondents to state what additional support programs should be available for youth in Mississauga. The most common response was programs for tutoring or homework help (14 responses). Help for new immigrants was mentioned numerous times (9 responses). Programs to develop life skills (4); employment programs (3); and free programs or assistance for low-income youth with programs (4) were mentioned several times. Other responses included: mentoring programs (2) and providing a voice to youth (2)

“Young people in Mississauga should help the immigrant youths get used to the type of society in Mississauga. Introduce and open to other youths helpful programs available in Mississauga.”

Where you learn about opportunities, activities or resources available?

80.4%	Friends or word-of-mouth
74.6%	School, college or university
33.0%	Community Centres
31.9%	Local community newspaper
26.3%	Recreation and Parks Guide
20.5%	City of Mississauga website
15.1%	Community or cultural organization
13.7%	Other

By far, most youth learn about different opportunities, activities or resources available through their friends or word-of-mouth (80.4%) or through their schools/colleges/universities (74.6%).

- About one-third reported they also learn about different opportunities, activities or resources through the Community Centres (33.0%) or through the local community newspaper (31.9%).
- Older youth were less likely than the other 2 groups to learn about opportunities, activities or resources through schools/colleges/universities, and were more likely to use the City’s website.

- Female youth in the youngest 2 age groups were more likely than the male youth to learn through friends or word-of-mouth.
- Male youth in the youngest age group were more likely than the female youth to use the City's website.

Do you think that you are aware of the various opportunities available to young people in Mississauga?

42.2% Somewhat aware
36.6% A little bit aware

Most youth (42.2%) felt that they were “somewhat” aware of the various opportunities available to young people in Mississauga. A slightly smaller proportion (36.6%) felt they were “a little bit” aware. Less than 10% (9.1%) thought that were “not at all” aware.

Should the City of Mississauga do more to make youth more aware of the different opportunities available to them?

72.3% Yes
17.3% Not sure
10.5% No

72.3% felt that the City should do more to make youth more aware of the different opportunities available to them.

- Older youth (20-24) were more a little more likely to answer “yes” and younger youth were a little more likely to answer “not sure”.
- In both the 16-19 and 20-24 age ranges there were gender differences: in both groups the female youth were more likely than the male youth to answer “yes”.

Qualitative Comments:

Respondents were asked to suggest how the City could make youth more aware of different opportunities, active and resources available to them. A majority of respondents suggested that an effective way to reach youth and make inform them of activities is through the schools. Specific suggestions included through teachers, PA announcements and school bulletin boards. Many respondents suggested increased advertising using mediums that were popular with youth (websites, Facebook groups and television) and advertising through youth-friendly print (e.g. posters) in areas where one often finds youth (e.g. buses or bus terminals). Youth sections on the City websites, local newspapers and specifically the Mississauga News were also suggested quite often.

“Make youth feel welcome. Have great opportunities and support programs in place, and a campaign to get youth engaged. It's no good if only a small fraction of our youth are participating...a lot of the time these are the ones that don't need the programs the most.”

“I'd advise the city to keep schools informed of all of the different opportunities, activities and resources available to them by constantly advertising/speaking to students about these events. A lot of students won't know what's going on in their city unless they are informed of it!”

“Communicate to youth through schools. I learned about most of the things I do through things mentioned in school.”

Have any of the following possible barriers prevented you from participating in activities that are available to youth?

71.6%	Locations too far away
66.4%	Lack of transportation
65.6%	Not aware of programs
60.3%	Cost was too much
58.9%	Hours are not convenient
36.8%	Not feeling welcomed by other participants
34.7%	Not feeling welcomed by staff
35.9%	Not allowed to go
31.4%	Reputation of neighbourhood or facility
28.5%	Not feeling safe

More than one-half of the youth felt that the following barriers prevented them from participating: locations too far away (71.6%), lack of transportation (66.4%), not aware of programs/activities (65.6%), cost was too much (60.3%), and hours were not convenient (58.9%). Approximately one-third or more felt that not feeling welcomed by other participants (36.8%), not feeling welcomed by staff (34.7%), not being allowed to go (35.9%) and the reputation of the neighbourhood or facility were barriers as well. Less than one-third (28.5%) felt that not being safe was a barrier.

- Older youth were more likely than the younger 2 age groups to cite lack of transportation as a barrier. Younger youth were more likely to indicate that “not allowed to go” was a barrier and they were more likely to answer “not sure” about the reputation of the neighbourhood/facility as a barrier.
- There were gender differences found in some of the barriers listed. And in each case it was the females answering “yes” more frequently than the males. Locations too far away, lack of transportation, not feeling welcomed by other staff, hours not convenient, cost too prohibitive, and not being aware of programs or activities were all barriers where female youth were more likely than male youth to answer “yes”.

Qualitative Comments:

The survey asked participants to describe additional barriers (other than those listed) that they had faced in participating in programs or activities for youth. These comments are similar to the comments generated by the question asking why they did not participate in activities and provide additional evidence for the cluster of factors that restrict the participation of young people in various activities. The most common responses centre around transportation and location of activities, with approximately 15 responses. Numerous respondents also mentioned the following barriers: lack of time (11); friends are not interested in the activity (10); cost (7); lack of awareness of activities (7); age restrictions on the activity (4); bullying/intimidation by others at activity (3); lack of interest (3); weather (3), and police harassment (3).

“I have no time! There is way too much schoolwork. In order to keep my grades high, I must spend loads of time studying. I am too busy to attend these programs even though I would absolutely love to enroll in them.”

“The age limit and for instance in the gym where I live I have to go with an adult but if they wanted to invite more youth they could have put supervisors their and the police in my community center in Malton thinks all the kids which are 12 and higher are mischief makers and so the other day I went and was roaming around in the center with my friend and the police man comes and says angrily what are you doing and we are saying nothing but his face was telling us 'hey kids I hate you get out' and we went out.”

“Lack of transit sometimes. Specially during Saturday and Sundays. Also the community centres are not open those days. We get free time on Saturday and Sunday and those days they are open for few hours.”

What is longest time you are willing to travel to participate in programs / activities?

39.5%	15-30 minutes
31.9%	15 minutes or less
15.0%	45 minutes or more
13.6%	30-45 minutes

Most youth (39.5%) answered that they would be willing to travel 15-30 minutes to participate in programs and activities, and this was followed by “15 minutes or less” for 31.9% of the youth.

- Older youth (20-24) and youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the younger youth to answer “15-30 minutes”. However, younger youth were more likely than the other 2 age groups to answer “45 minutes or more”.
- Female youth in all three age categories were more likely than their male counterparts to answer “15 minutes or less” and less likely to answer “15-30 minutes” or “45 minutes or more”.

Do you think that the youth have a say in this city?

29.3%	Not at all
26.6%	A little bit
23.0%	Somewhat
14.0%	Totally
6.9%	Not sure

29.3% of youth did not feel that youth had a say in the city; this was followed closely by those that answered “a little bit” (26.6%). A slightly smaller proportion (23.2%) answered “somewhat”.

- Older youth were more likely than the other 2 age groups to answer “not at all”; however, they were also more likely to answer “totally”. Responses from the other 2 age groups were very similar for each of the responses – the proportions for “somewhat”, “a little bit” and “not at all” were similar (at or around 25%).

Would you like to have more say in how this city is run?

61.9% Yes
22.6% Not sure
15.4% No

61.9% did want to have more of a say in how the city was run. Older youth (20-24) were more likely to answer “yes” than the younger 2 groups, and less likely to answer “not sure”.

Qualitative comments:

Youth were given an opportunity in the survey to suggest ways that they would like to have a say in how the city is run. The response rate for this question was quite high and several themes emerged. One prominent theme was youth expressing how they had a valid opinion and should have a voice. Many believe that currently youth opinion in Mississauga is not valued and youth need to be given a voice and listened to. There were numerous suggestions about how youth can provide a voice. Many respondents (at least 40) suggested surveys and polls. Forums, meetings or other leadership activities for youth were recommended by many (at least 20). Many youth suggested that they would like to have a say in how the city is run by having a more formal voice on council (at least 15). Formal structures such as committees or advisory boards for youth, voting, making suggestions through phone lines or online, and meetings with decision makers were also frequent responses.

“I'd like to provide input on policies affecting youth in Mississauga. The MYAC is firstly not something that everyone knows about and secondly inconvenient because of the time. There should be a forum in which all youth can share their opinion, even from the school level.”

“I believe that allotting youth ambassadors to the major areas (by credibility, and reference) and allowing them to meet with officials every couple of months would provide a bridge over the gap set up between the youth who live in these cities, and the way the city is run. That would also benefit the entire city, in that young leaders would be trained under our current leaders. Thus allowing them to become youth prodigies, and train those less experienced than them in the future.”

“I want to be able to tell the government what teens like myself need in our neighbourhoods and how we feel about what is going on in the area around us. I want to be informed about what is going on including money and new buildings and public transit should decrease their prices because most riders are students who only have part time jobs and go to school.”

“Well if youth are the key to the future, then shouldn't we like the city that we are living in by making things better from our perspective? I don't think a seat in government would be a suitable option, however I'm sure some kind of awareness or person be appointed as youth councillor to the city's youth, where we can address our concerns. Part of the problem is also when youth learn about these kinds of opportunities to voice their opinion, they feel that their word doesn't matter or won't have any affect.”

“I would feel great to have a say to help make decisions that have a big impact on the community. I believe being a teenager I understand the needs of students better than any adult therefore, teenagers should have the right to say.”

Which are should be a priority for spending by the City of Mississauga, the Region of Peel and or community

46.5%	Public transit
36.4%	Environment
30.9%	Housing
26.8%	Community Centres
28.3%	Sports
23.7%	Public parks
20.2%	Support for non-profit groups
15.2%	Arts: music, dance, video
13.4%	Police
12.0%	Support for businesses
8.0%	Arts: painting, drawing, graphic arts
7.1%	Arts: theatre, drama
4.5%	Support for for-profit groups

The most common response with respect to spending priorities was public transit (46.5%). This was followed by the environment (36.4%) and housing (30.9%). Approximately one-quarter of the respondents felt that sports (28.3%), community centres (26.8%), and public parks (23.7%) should be spending priorities.

- There were some age differences found in responses: youth in the older 2 age groups were more likely than younger youth to think that public transit should be a priority. Younger youth (12-15) and older youth (20-24) were more likely than the 16-19 year olds to think that housing should be a priority, and that “arts-music, dance, video” should be a priority. Youth in the younger 2 age groups were more likely than older youth to think that sports should be a priority, and youth in the older 2 groups were also more likely to think that support for non-profit groups should be a priority. Younger youth (12-15) were more likely than the older groups to think that spending money on police should be a priority.
- Finally, male youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the female youth that age to think that police spending should be a priority.

The Last Word: Final Additional Qualitative comments

Survey respondents were given an opportunity to provide additional comments that they believe to be important in developing a Youth Plan for the City of Mississauga. There were positive comments about the survey and/or consultation process, expressing appreciation for the process. There were other comments that the survey was long and/or boring. Most of the additional qualitative comments were about the City’s Transit system, suggesting that improvements needed to be made to the system. Specifically comments were made about expensive fares and long waiting times for bus.

Other themes in the comments included the idea that youth opinions needed to be respected and made to count, that there was a need for more activities, structures and/or events for Mississauga youth, a need to focus on the environment, a need to make youth aware of

programs and services, a need for increased job opportunities for youth, and a need to increase participation of all youth.

“Just mainly the transport. It is really horrible for those who need it the most. I have waited outside at night in the cold for an hour for a bus on the 1W line, near the terminus. Two 'Not in Service' buses passed by. I feel like these buses did not feel like picking anyone up because it was near the end of the line. They passed at 20 minute intervals, when the scheduled buses should have come. I tried to file a complaint over the telephone but was denied in doing so because it was not business hours. This is not the only incidence I have had like this. Many people I know have had similar incidences. If someone is running for a bus, oftentimes the bus driver drives away without waiting for them. This is very inconsiderate. These people are probably not having the best day if they have to run for the bus in the first place. They obviously don't have cars, so they NEED the bus. Also, buses don't come on time when they are supposed to. It is just really bad compared to other cities I have lived in where the transport is much more awesome. Another factor, it is way too expensive, especially considering the low quality of the service. Just compare it to other cities in Canada, not Toronto, which is also ridiculous. Take Montreal for example, the service is excellent and the prices are more than reasonable, and Montreal is a much bigger city than Mississauga. It is just unsatisfactory.”

“As you can see I have many concerns ideas and opinions that are just pouring out from every part of me that I need to voice. I hope you see the dedication I have for this issue and I would love to be a part of any efforts there are to make Mississauga a better place to live for Youth and all citizens. You will hear and be seeing me in the near future, my time and effort is always available because myself and my children are the future. I hope when they grow up they will not be as frustrated as I am.”

“I believe that knowing what we think is best for us is very important because adults cannot decide for us what is best unless they are back to their youth as well. Nobody should take teens and their word for granted. We are the future of the city and should not be mistreated and/or ignored. We fight for what we think is fair.”

“I think Mississauga is a great community. We do have some youth discrimination. This is what I would like to see change. Most youth today rebel because they feel rejected by society”

“Don't blame the youth, listen to them.”

“I think it's a great job doing this survey and having teenagers say. There's a lot of things you could improve on and the most important is to get the teenagers involved in other activities and opportunities.”

Face-to Face Public Meetings: Ward Consultations and Forums

Fifteen public meetings were held: 11 Ward Consultations and 4 city-wide Forums. The Ward Consultations were face-to-face events for young people held in every ward, with the City Councillor for the ward attending (with the exception of one meeting, where the Councillor had a sudden family emergency).

Below is a list of the ward consultations, with age range, location and Ward followed by the number of participants. Sign-in sheets were used to record attendance.

DATE	AGES	LOCATION	WARD	ATTENDANCE
Thurs. Feb14/08	11-23	MVCC	Ward 4	36
Tues. Feb. 19/08	11-16	A.A. Martin	Ward 1	12
Wed. Feb. 20/08	14-18	Applewood Heights	Ward 3	11
Tues. Feb. 26/08	13-17	Iona SS	Ward 2	10
Thurs. Feb. 28/08	12-20	Huron Park	Ward 7	11
Mon. March 3/08	12-21	Malton CC	Ward 5	41
Tues. March 4/08	Not Available	Woodlands SS	Ward 6	24
Thurs. March 6/08	11-26	South Common	Ward 8	31
Mon. March 17/08	11-18	Churchill Meadows	Ward 10	20
Tues. March 18/08	13-18	Meadowvale SS	Ward 9	35
Wed. March 19/08	13-18	St. Marcellinus	Ward 11	29

In addition to the Ward Consultations, which were focused primarily on youth between the ages of 12 – 18, there were also four city-wide Forums held:

- Community Agencies
- Youth City Wide Forum (12 – 18)
- Adults and Youth (Open to anyone)
- Older Youth (19 – 24)

DATE	AGE	LOCATION	WARD	ATTENDANCE
Thurs. Feb. 7/08		Mississauga Valley Community Centre	Agencies	36
Sat. Feb. 16/08	10-58	Noel Ryan	Youth 12-18	8
Wed. Feb. 27/08	15-58	Living Arts Centre	Open to All	11
Wed. March 5/08	20-25	University of Toronto Mississauga	Ages 19+	5

The process

City staff provided organizational and directional support and various members of the Youth Team led the process for the consultant team, supported by a technical advisor, a senior facilitator and a researcher.

The Consultations and Forums were advertised on Facebook, on the City website, in local schools, on portable street signs, in community centres, libraries, and shopping centres. The Youth Team used “guerrilla” marketing, face-to-face invitations at bus stations and other youth focused programs and places. As well, City staff promoted the Consultations and Forums to community programs and services within the City and Region. There proved to be some logistical challenges in terms of hours for venues being scheduled for 1 to 1.5 hours after the end of the school day, which made it difficult for youth to attend directly after school. Adjustments were made where possible and the numbers rose, ranging from 10 to 41 participants per meeting. Smaller numbers allowed for a rich discussion and proved to be an excellent qualitative counterpoint to the larger, web-based consultation through the survey process. This process allowed for greater exploration of issues and ideas in-depth.

During the day of the consultation, The Youth Team, supported by City staff, encouraged youth who were in or near the site to attend the Consultation, offering snacks, prizes, dinner and free passes to a local community centre for their participation. As youth entered the space, they were encouraged to complete a paper version of the survey.

Each Ward Consultation opened with introductions and a welcome from the Ward Councillor. Following this, the Youth Team introduced themselves and said why they were involved which were followed by community builder activities (also known as ice breakers). Each Consultation, proved to be very different with differing outcomes. Some groups, (often those with larger numbers of younger youth) were very active in the community builders and got to know one another and the Youth Team. Some of the consultations with older youth proved to be more challenging in terms of breaking down barriers of reserve, yet led by the increasingly experienced Youth Team members these groups too took part and participated fully.

The Youth Team facilitators spoke about different aspects of the project, (history, goals, PhotoVoice) and then began leading the youth through an interactive polling program, provided by the city. This was the first city use of this hardware and software (Turning Point)

for public consultation. Each participant was given a hand-held device the size of a small calculator that allowed them to anonymously vote on various questions, projected through a PowerPoint presentation, with the results displayed immediately afterwards on a projection system in the room. This allowed for further discussion and exploration of the group answers and proved to help stimulate dialogue, as well as giving young people direct feedback from the survey activity.

As the Ward Consultations and Forums progressed and the Youth Team grew in skill and confidence, more ideas were generated about the process and additions were added to the program. This allowed young people to share ideas and thoughts, and experiment with the consultation program. For example, they developed a 'What If Wall', which was a piece of paper young people could write their ideas on in different mediums. Small group discussions were utilized when the large group remained quiet, allowing for more personal discussions led by Youth Team members.

Following the small group discussions (or in some cases large group discussions), the Youth Team thanked the participants and City staff provided the free passes for local community centres. The youth participants were then invited to dinner while City staff drew door prizes for those in attendance.

The Ward Consultations and Forums: A Review of the Results

In all 320 people attended the public meeting series. Throughout the Ward Consultations and City-wide Forums a new technology to the City of Mississauga was used to collect data and generate discussions. Called Turning Point, the polling tool uses a hand-held wireless electronic device for each participant that provides immediate responses to questions as the facilitator asks them through a PowerPoint presentation. It was an excellent resource to gather information and generate meaningful dialogue. Although not available for all of the Consultations or Forums, it was a useful supplemental source of information and a youth-friendly tool for stimulating discussion. (Turning Point was not available for the Ward 11 consultation of March 19 and the Community Agencies Forum on Feb. 7)

There are some cautions re the data collected by the technology before the data is presented. Turning Point was used primarily as a process tool to stimulate discussion not as a data collection tool, as participants were encouraged to fill out the survey to ensure consistency in data collection. As a process tool, questions and presentations were adapted for the audience for each presentation so the data cannot be compared across all the sessions or with the same rigour as the survey and the field notes from the researchers. Some of the logistical elements that need to be accounted for when viewing the results include:

- The technology was not always working correctly (all the polling keypads in a Consultation would sometimes not function) so numbers of participants vary. (It was discovered that by “playing” with the keypad, youth and adults could switch channels so that the wireless response did not get sent to the laptop for data collection.)
- The questions were changed and adapted as consultations moved forward.
- On the rare occasion some adults and youth voted more than once, creating inaccurate final numbers of responses, as compared to those in attendance.
- In many sessions, the number of participants was small, so the number of responses is small, and should not be viewed as a representative sample of that ward or population.

However, with these cautions in mind, there was consistency in the responses with the survey data, and the results do allow for a snapshot of who participants were and their experiences. The Turning Point data provided support for the results generated by the survey and the discussion around the polling for each question at the meetings provided clarity around what the youth meant as they answered. Presented in the following section are the quantitative numbers gathered through the polling, amplified by the themes and field observations collected by the researchers at each consultation and forum. The notes of the meetings were analyzed and summarized by the Youth Team working with the consultant team.

Representation at the meetings

How old are you?

Age	Total	%
under 12	11	5.26
12-13	46	22.01
14-16	47	22.49
17-19	51	24.40
20-24	19	9.09
over 24	35	16.75
TOTAL	209	100

The diversity in age ranged based on the consultations though it should be noted that many of those who identified as over 24 years old would have been adults attending the meetings as supports and guests. (During the Feb 27th and March 5 consultations, 10 participants answered 15-19 and 1 answered under 15. These 11 participants have not been included in the table.)

What is your gender?

	Total	%
Male Total	101	43.72
Female		
Total	130	56.28
TOTAL	252	100

Where your parents born in Canada?

	Total	%
Yes	13	21.67
No	38	63.33
Choose not to say	9	15.00
Totals	60	100

The numbers of participants whose parents were not born in Canada, though a margin smaller are consistent with the survey respondents.

What grade are you in?

	Total	%
Grade 5 or less total	9	4.50
Grade 6-7		
totals	39	19.50
Grade 8-9 total	32	16.00
Grade 10-11 total	46	23.00
Grade 12 Total	32	16.00
College/University total	9	4.50
Alternative Education Program total	2	1.00
Not In School total	30	15.00
TOTAL	200	100

How did you hear about this meeting?

	Total	%
www.mississauga.ca	9	4.59
Community staff person	34	17.35
Library staff person	8	4.08
Community organization	11	5.61
school	30	15.31
friends	33	16.84
poster	6	3.06
Invited by youth team	56	28.57
total	196	100

These totals speak to the influence of both peers, (the Youth Team) as well as those adults who work with youth and have existing relationships (Community Centre staff person).

- It should be noted that youth of colour who self-identified as Black or “Urban” youth were over-represented in the Ward consultations compared to the survey and the population of Mississauga. This most likely reflects the effectiveness of the word-of-mouth recruiting of the black members of the Youth Core Team. (A balance was achieved overall in the total survey results, with black youth or “mixed” self-reporting as 5.4% of the sample.)

Who influences the music you listen to?

	total	%
Friends	34	26.15
Family	19	14.62
TV	11	8.46
Radio	11	8.46
Internet	14	10.77
Other	41	31.54
Total	130	100

This question was asked to explore who influences choices young people make and from the discussions that followed the youth identified their friends and themselves as the key informants on new information. Youth also rely on their family to help them make choices and to learn information. This supports the significance of “word of mouth” as a source of information for decisions young people make about what to do and not to do.

Main themes from the Consultations and Forums

Overall, there was a consistency in themes across consultations, and the results from the face-to-face consultations were consistent with the survey results.

- More programming/general activities
- Dance classes and places to dance

- Lack of things to do – youth feel they need to go to Toronto (desire for theme park, concerts etc in Mississauga)
- More sports opportunities, including drop-in and basketball
- More drop-in activities
- Lack of places to hang out
- Need lower prices for sports
- Activities are expensive
- Need diversity focus
- Lack of ethnic hairs salons
- Fundraising to raise money and get involved
- Lack of activities for females

Which of these would you like to see focused on in the Youth Plan?

	Total	%
More organized sports	45	21.63
More drop in sports	56	26.92
More drop in programs where youth can hang out	63	30.29
More volunteer opportunities	17	8.17
More volunteer opportunities for you to speak to adults...	27	12.98
Total	208	100

The responses to this question were echoed in all discussions that followed; young people were looking for somewhere to hang out, more drop in sports programs and increased number of organized sports.

Many consultations had young people describing, either visually or verbally what they were looking for in a place to ‘hang out’. Descriptions of youth “hang outs” were quite consistent across wards. It included a space that had diverse opportunities, including sports, a place to chill with couches, a place to dance, run in partnership between youth and adults with some structure but with a drop-in format.

Mississauga has enough places for youth to hang out.

	Total	%
So True	11	7.80
Pretty much	20	14.18
Uh-not sure	23	16.31
Not really	42	29.79
Who are you kidding?	45	31.91
Totals	141	100

More than half the respondents did not feel that there were enough places for youth to hang out and in the discussions that followed felt that an increased number of youth spaces would help reduce crime, violence and substance use in youth.

If you have or would like to learn more about dance, what kind of dance would you like to learn?

	Total	%
Hip Hop	35	26.32
Salsa	46	34.59
Ballroom	15	11.28
Ethnic	16	12.03
Ballet	5	3.76
Nope-not for me	16	12.03
Total	133	100

When asked about arts and culture many youth spoke about wanting to learn more about dance, both male and female respondents. Salsa and Hip Hop were clearly the most popular choices though in discussions many youth shared that they would be open to other forms of dance as well.

Barriers to engagement / Barrier to a youth friendly city

- Issues with transportation (very prominent theme)
- Fees – too much
- Not frequent enough programming
- Great distances between things – too far to travel to opportunities
- The last bus is too early for them to return home
- Youth segregation by culture (fairly prominent theme)
- Racism (very prominent theme)
- Attitude towards youth are negative and they feel unwelcome
- Harassed at malls (because of age or race)
- Kicked out of places where they try to hang out
- Stereotyping of youth
- They do not feel respected
- Lack of money
- Issues between police and youth
- Lack of safety such as bullying
- Lack of youth community
- Lack of Mississauga identity
- Lack of snow removal (had to mention as it came up many times!)

Issues such as ageism, racism and not knowing what was available were often discussed in the consultations. Young participants often felt that they were treated differently and / or poorly because of what they looked like, what they wore or how old they were. There was also often discussion about the interactions between police / security services, and young people thought that these issues needed to be addressed. The most predominant barrier vocalized at each of the consultations was transportation: its cost, the frequency and distance youth had to walk to use public transit.

How long will it take you to get home today after this Consultation?

	Total	%
Under 10 minutes	54	31.40
Between 10 and 30 minutes	66	38.37
Between 30 minutes and 1 hour	33	19.19
More then 1 hour	19	11.05
total	172	100

Some activities cost money. How much do you think its worth to pay for a drop in program?

	Total	%
Free	91	45.50
\$2 or less	32	16.00
\$3-\$5	39	19.50
More than \$5	21	10.50
Totals	200	100

The discussions, which followed this question many times revolved around the word ‘worth’. Though almost half of respondents said ‘Free’ many did indicate that if programs were enhanced they would be more likely to feel that it was ‘worth’ payment.

Respect

Young people engaged via the Consultations also spoke quite frequently about respect: what it meant to them. Below is a highlight of one of the discussions with a smaller group as to what respect means to them, as young citizens of Mississauga.

What does respect feel like?

- You get what you give.
- No one questions you.
- No dirty looks.
- No harassment.
- No one brushed me when I am walking.
- No racism or ageism.
- Treated equally.
- No stereotyping.
- No attitude.
- No keeping tabs on me.
- Be understanding.
- Be patient.

Differences by Wards: Safety, Interests, and Boredom

Three thematic areas did show some significant variations from ward to ward in terms of the polling results; these were the perceptions of Mississauga as a safe city, levels of boredom and main interests. However, the number of responses is so small that these numbers must be treated with caution.

The total polling results from all the consultations showed 46.32% thinking that the city was pretty safe and 17.37% thinking that it was totally safe; 19.47% thought it really was not safe at all.

	Total	%
So true-totally safe	33	17.37
Pretty much	88	46.32
Uh-not sure	25	13.16
Not really	33	17.37
Who are you kidding?	37	19.47
Totals	190	100

When youth talked about safety in Mississauga quite often there was references made to not 'wanting to be like Toronto' and a perception that Mississauga was overall a safe city. Bullying was specifically noted as an issue, which made young people feel unsafe.

However, both the discussion sessions and polling during the sessions showed that youth in certain wards thought that the city was either much safer or much less safe than youth in other wards. Ward 9 youth felt the city to be much safer than in Wards 2, 4 and 6.

"There are areas that safe, close to our churches, but I don't think our parks are safe. They are isolated, with trees; they need more lights, perhaps more police, and security guards."

Mississauga is a safe city by Ward Consultation

	So true-totally safe	Pretty much	Uh-not sure	Not really	Who are you kidding?	# Responses
Ward 1	25.00%	58.33%	0.00%	08.33%	08.33%	12
Ward 2	00.00%	60.00%	00.00%	40.00%	00.00%	10
Ward 3	07.14%	42.86%	14.29%	21.43%	14.29%	14
Ward 4	04.35%	26.09%	8.70%	26.09%	34.78%	23
Ward 5	31.25%	12.50%	18.75%	12.50%	25.00%	16
Ward 6	05.00%	35.00%	10.00%	20.00%	30.00%	20
Ward 7	20.00%	40.00%	20.00%	00.00%	20.00%	10
Ward 8	04.76%	28.57%	04.76%	19.05%	42.86%	21
Ward 9	44.00%	40.00%	00.00%	08.00%	08.00%	25
Ward 10	11.11%	44.44%	44.44%	00.00%	00.00%	9
Ward 11	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data

A similar variation showed up in the survey filled out by 810 youth, where youth were asked to check off barriers that prevented them from participating in programs and activities. Not Feeling Safe was one of the choices for a barrier, and Not feeling safe got much higher ratings in some neighbourhoods than others. (Neighbourhoods, not wards, were used in the survey, as it was believed that most youth would not know what ward they lived in. Neighbourhoods did stretch in some cases from one ward to another.)

What the polling during the consultations and the survey do indicate is that there is a significant variation across areas of the city in terms of whether youth feel safe or not. In Meadowvale, 61.5% of youth filling out the survey indicated that Not feeling safe was a barrier to participation, whereas 5% of youth coming from Churchill Meadows indicated that not feeling safe was a barrier. See Table 41 for the complete break out of variations by neighbourhood for the survey.

High End of Rating	Not feeling safe as a barrier	Low end of Rating	
Meadowvale	61.5%	Churchill Meadows	5.0%
Lorne Park	44.7%	Cawthra	14.3%
Streetsville	33.3%	Hurontario	15.4%
River Grove	32.3%	Cooksville	17.9%
Erindale/SouthCommon	30.8%	% Courtney Park	17.9%

Although not a specific question asked during polling, boredom was an issue talked about at certain consultations more than others. Youth identified a connection between boredom and doing less positive activities, which connected to safety.

The notes from a Youth Facilitator after the Ward 10 consultation illustrate the connections that emerged between boredom, safety and activities: “He told me that one time he did graffiti on a bridge. He said he did it because he was bored and if he had other things to do he wouldn’t have done it. Another said that the community centre is too expensive – if he had a job he would give money to the community centre so that other kids could come for free. This same person said that if he could leave Mississauga he would and he’d go to Toronto. Mississauga is dull. ... There was a big emphasis on basketball for these youth. There are not enough basketball courts – one youth reported that he sometimes uses a shopping cart as a net. One guy commented that in California there are a lot more basketball courts and anyone can use them. I couldn’t believe how excited two of the boys were when they received their free Community Centre passes. It really meant a lot to them.”

In other consultations, most of the youth present were highly involved in various activities and boredom was not an issue that they raised.

There was a wide range of interests in terms of those attending the consultations in different wards: In Ward 10, 19.05% of the 21 answering played cricket, while in Ward 6, 52.38% and in Ward 1, 46.15% played cricket and wanted more opportunity to do so. In the Ward 1 meeting, 63.64% knew how to skateboard, but in most Wards the range was from 33.33% to 37.04%. a number that was matched pretty consistently by the number of youth who knew how to play cricket. Soccer was the most common sport that youth knew how to play, with most 87% to 92% of youth in most consultations indicating that they knew how to play soccer, except for Ward 10 and Ward 9 where the results were 68.42% and 69.57% respectively. Basketball scored more evenly across all Wards with 80% to 95.45% of youth knowing how to play.

	Organized Sports	Drop In Sports	Drop In Programs	Volunteer Activities	Opportunities for Youth to speak to Adults	# Responses
Ward 1	44.44%	33.33%	22.22%	00.00%	00.00%	9
Ward 2						
Ward 3	12.33%	26.67%	40.00%	06.67%	13.33%	15
Ward 4	28.00%	20.00%	36.00%	04.00%	12.00%	25
Ward 5	27.27%	18.18%	18.18%	00.00%	36.36%	22
Ward 6	18.18%	50.00%	31.82%	00.00%	00.00%	22
Ward 7	00.00%	40.00%	50.00%	10.00%	00.00%	10
Ward 8	30.43%	39.13%	26.09%	00.00%	04.35%	23
Ward 9	25.00%	50.00%	12.50%	08.33%	04.17%	24
Ward 10	22.73%	09.09%	18.18%	27.27%	22.73%	22
Ward 11	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data

As part of looking at the varying interests of youth, they were asked: if you have or would like to learn more about dance, what kind of dance would you like to learn. Again, there were some significant differences depending upon the group and the location. At the Ward 10 meeting, salsa ranked number one for 40% of the 20 responses, 30% chose ballroom and 30% ethnic. Salsa was also the top priority for the Ward 9 meeting, selected by 65% of the 25 respondents; hip hop was chosen by 16% and ballroom by 12% of the 25 respondents.

In Ward 5, however, hip hop was chosen by 41.18% of the 17 answering and salsa by 17.65%. Ward 6 was similar: hip hop at 54.55%, salsa at 18.18%.

	Hip Hop	Salsa	Ballroom	Ethnic	Ballet	Not for Me	# Responses
Ward 5	41.18%	17.65%	11.76%	05.88%	05.88%	17.65%	17
Ward 6	54.55%	18.18%	00.00%	09.09%	04.55%	13.64%	22
Ward 9	16%	64.00%	12.00%	00.00%	04.00%	04.00%	25
Ward 10	00.00%	40.00%	30.00%	30.00%	00.00%	00.00%	20

The differences across the Wards potentially illustrates the dangers of doing city-wide canvasses of user preferences and deciding to offer more or less of any one type of programming, such as more basketball courts and fewer cricket pitches. It suggests that programming needs to be diverse, varied and responsive to a changing youth dynamic, involving the users of existing programs and services in decisions, as well as engaging potential youth users in identifying what they would use.

Sample Brainstorming of Priorities for the Plan

This table illustrates the input generated during the youth engagement brainstorming sessions during the small group discussions at the Consultation in Ward 2 on February 26th, 2008.

How to involve young people?	Priorities for Youth Plan?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Newspapers - flyers - contact with schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - transportation – hard to get around, getting too expensive - more places for kids to hang out – that meet a variety of needs - more stuff to do after school – homework help/community hours - no low cost things to do on weekend – bowling, movies expensive - libraries viewing rooms for movies - Rec and Parks to program more intramurals/activities @ the school - Games, hang out – video, dominoes, dance studio, mini competitions - Combination of youth and adult run centre - More activities to keep youth busy - Bus just for youth to get there they need to be; youth friendly with music - Drop bus fare
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - similar activities - through school - helping each other - through photography - through dances - less rules and things that limit participation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - friends - opportunities to invite them - reduce hatred towards youth; in stores – no limits to number of youth in stores - more places to hangout and chill - better stores – clothes - make it easier getting to places like malls and Community Centres
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - nothing provided 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - make Mississauga safer - provide a diverse group of programs that everyone can participate in - improve transit (more frequent/cheaper) - new places to hang out (like a CC) & dances with dance hall - more advertised volunteer opportunities - change the way adults see youth for the better - employment services for youth - make city better lit (street lights) - more concerts and festivals, arts & culture - pedestrian only street with coffee shops - downtown @ city centre with clubs - cooking classes & co-op - public youth meetings/advisory committee in each community - movies in the park with projectors – drive-in (bus-ins) - art gallery bigger with young artists - more places to hang out (paintball)/amusement parks - rock climbing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - school websites - school newsletters - meeting others - posters - newsletters - commercials - community centres - malls - bus terminals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - More activities – sports, - Fundraising (e.g., walking) - Get all input from youth - Talent show to get more youth involved

Community Agency Forum Review

Overview

The Community Agency Forum was well attended, with 36 representatives of various community agencies present and strong support from City staff promoting the meeting. It was a lively discussion about the needs of young people, the organizations that serve them and who could be / should be responsible for delivering and funding programs and services.

Process

A considerable amount of time was spent examining ideas and effective practices from other communities gathered during the environmental scan to gauge the local organizations response. The Forum combined large group and small group work, and a brainstorm wall, called the “What If” wall, which allowed participants to put up ideas as they occurred to them. As well the participants were encouraged to connect with the Youth Team members and identify how they could support youth to participate in upcoming Mississauga Youth Plan activities. Several young people who attended later meetings and joined the Youth Team became engaged after the organization they were connected to participate in the Community Agency Forum.

Feedback: How do we make Mississauga a youth friendly city?

Participants were asked to rate first and second choice in terms of what’s required to make Mississauga a youth friendly city

- Places for youth to gather: selected 16 times – 8 first choice & 8 second
- Increase youth resources: selected 10 times - 7 first choice & 3 second
- Transportation – increased routes buses and different fare options: selected 9 times: 4 first choice a& 5 second
- Respect for youth in city and organizational run programs: selected 7 times – 2 first choice & 5 second
- Respect for youth in the City of Mississauga: selected 4 times – 3 first choice & 1 second
- A more secure/safe city: selected 3 times - 2 first choice & 1 second

Small Groups: Prioritizing Effective Practices

One

1. Adequate systemic support (policies, budget, dedicated staff and youth positions)
2. Focus on inclusion and diversity: Proactive outreach to disengaged youth and their families in an acceptable and respectable way
3. Strong strategic partnerships with community organizations, services and institutions
4. Approaching programs with a broader vision for youth recreation (e.g. drop-in activities or engagement in social activism/justice activities) and linking programs to overall community strategies.
5. Providing opportunities for children, youth and their families to be engaged (e.g. accessible locations, financially accessible, programs tailored to communities).

Two

This group blended some of the practices.

1. Provide a variety of meaningful roles and options for youth responsive to different cultures and changing interests and diverse youth groups with access to affordable transportation
2. Create sustainable funding strategies that are youth specific and that are blended to meet grass-roots and parks and recreation programs with family participations and support in a youth friendly environment that is accessible.

Three

This group put recommendations in the following order and then had some additional notes.

1. Engage youth in planning and development of programs, services/spaces and delivery of programs for youth, to foster “ownership” of programs.
Tied to this practice – Better public transportation – safe, easy, and frequent and reduced pollution – provide bus tickets, good cost for transportation, transit incentives.
Getting the attention of the youth
Youth incentives, pay, Community hours, trips, etc...
2. Providing opportunities for youth to build skills (training and support) and move into different (appropriate) roles as they **grow** (*added word*).
3. Building capacity of supportive adults (e.g. training as an important component) and fostering adult-youth led partnerships and shared decision making, (*this one was placed beside number 2 – supposedly meaning it is at par.*)
Tied to this practice – support for parents (permission too)
4. Hiring and promotion of youth in decision-making, planning and consultation roles and supporting them to build and continuously engage a constituency base of their peers.
Tied to this practice – Make our youth more independent by making transit more accessible and user-friendly – reimburse them for coming to events and make transit easier- Mississauga get a RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM
5. Integrating various municipal departments and regional/provincial services for youth.
Tied to practices 4 & 5 – ways to be sustainable

Sample Ideas:

Community Centre (s) on wheels

- Started as 1 mobile vehicle
- Expanded to more than 1 vehicle
- Can be rented out too

Would this work in Mississauga?

- Transportation is always an issue
- As a means, to go to the youth, e.g. police, create an information fair
- Can help address boredom – far from schoolmates, meet people in your community, make friends

Who is responsible?

- Who can benefit, such as a corporate sponsor?
- Engage a youth-type sponsor
- Would corporate take advantage of youth
- Community opportunity, community owns it

What role do you people have to do this?

- Hire youth from the beginning...focus groups
- If community responsibility – is there a fee?
- Universal access for all families (consider lower income families)
- Express, accessible bus to the centre (Co's, LAC...)
- Students with disabilities (buddies) I'm not sure if this continues here or if it's another idea)
- Buddies – youth
- Staff – youth
- Volunteer – youth
- Go to high schools to “teach” students how to (empower) create changes in their community – e.g. outreach, proposal writing
- Youth are “open” to ideas and youth/friends motivate (high school tour)
- Chat with Peel SB – Could students get a credit?
- Youth-friendly connection to Peel SB schools
- Start with organizations and youth you already have – they connect to other youth and they connect to other youth – then these youth go on to lead and create other opportunities
- Volunteers (hospital) need to pay – kids need free transportation

Bill of Rights Concept

- Children and youth – Charter of Rights of Peel
- Can we breathe life to them>
- Implementation of

Who are we accountable to?

- “5000’ Strategic plans in progress now
- Needs to be youth-driven as per this process

Who is responsible?

- Council/community youth & adults
- Watch dog for the Bill of Rights/Direct
- Political – get the whole city to buy in
- City mandate
 - Paid person to “approve” for youth friendliness for all city proposals
- Need to answer to youth – youth “vote”
- Youth officer/commissioner (I would say more than one youth, as this is intimidating)

Child Action Suitcase Plan and Build Mobile Unit

- To successfully engage youth
- Ensure youth “voice” is fed into bigger picture (s) e.g. BC21 and other Strategic Plans
- Adults don't have all the information for youth
- Youth programs in a “site for easy access
- Training to develop tools – how to properly engage young people? E.g. parachuting in and tokenism
- Kid Nation (a model) kids as “teachers”
- Child to child process (used in schools)

- Listen, trust, respect
- Mississauga youth council is involved with this project – balance with community youth vs. school-based

Feedback: What If? Wall

The group also had a creative list of ideas on the What If...Wall, which are listed below.

- There were annual youth grants for worthy projects from young people
- That excellence in community youth-based initiatives are recognized and celebrated
- Free-recording studio for youth 12 to 24
- Programs and services for transitional aged youth (17 to 24)
- More open--mic nights or poetry slams in local coffee shops
- More integrated or inclusive recreation activities with youth with disabilities
- Staff from organizations and City of Mississauga programs serving youth are trained on youth engagement (preventing tokenism)
- Money invested in youth-led, youth run programs.
- Understanding and money for non-traditional positions (workers to support holistically i.e., bringing youth to get groceries, to appointments, etc...)
- Social workers and Community Youth Workers in all high schools
- Advocates for youth issue (paid positions)
- Free recreation opportunities (local focus) where youth can “decide” what activities should be free – e.g. Free skating
- “Green” made easy – no more waste, garbage, pollution. The Fast food youth eats almost every day – make it healthier (organic McDonald’s) and environmentally friendly.
- Local community youth are often “separated” socially by many different school options, some go to Peel SB, some D.P.C.D.S.B, some private, some special – how to create a “local” youth community,
- Mississauga transit transportation was free during hours once a school card is give as an ID
- Bus fee for youth is too high – lower prices
- More transportation, but not subways or buses, e.g. Above ground, electric – look at models in other cities
- Safe walking and bike routes – bike lanes not on car lanes, but separate from car lanes
- We supported families as the primary youth influencers
- We partnered with groups in Urban Promise and Youth Unlimited (Launch)

Open Adult and Youth Forum

Overview

The Adult and Youth Forum had a small group of 11 participants who very committed and wanted to contribute to the process. Several adult participants came with youth and several community organizations that had not participated in the Community Agency forum had representatives present that evening.

Process

The small group work was very successful allowing tables of youth and adults to work collaboratively and have excellent discussions that filtered to the larger group sessions, which were also part of the format. The groups identified many areas where young people could be involved in decision making (advisory committees, youth panels) and ways that adults could support this involvement.

Each small group identified the main priority as they saw it for the Mississauga Youth Plan. These were: youth to be involved, find a spot for youth to be involved, communication out to youth of wants and needs, and local events to attend such as concerts. The next step asked the participants to vote individually on what they saw as the main priority. The results were:

Find a spot for youth to be involved - 40 %
Communication out to youth of wants and needs – 27 %
Youth to be involved – 20 %
Local events to attend such as concerts -13 %

The adults participating discussed their role as adults in supporting young people and their involvement and what programs / ideas they thought were most important. The younger participants discussed the role they could play. They also discussed who should be both delivering programs and funding them. Below are the ideas from the four groups.

Feedback

Who should deliver programs?

1. Older youth/city/agencies
2. Friends
3. Coalition of people
4. City
5. Schools (teachers)
6. Parents
7. Youth
8. Community organizations
9. Supported by the city and put on by individual groups
10. Partnerships between different groups – e.g. recreation and library
11. Youth and adult combination
12. Anyone of youth age with qualities of a leader
13. Combination of youth and adults
14. People that would do it to make money
15. Older people are more listened to
16. Youth mentoring youth with adult support

On the topic of who should fund these programs:

1. Community foundations, agencies
2. Government municipalities
3. Volunteers
4. Corporate sponsors
5. Fundraisers

Older Youth Forum

Overview

The Older Youth Forum had five participants, including several participants from Community Living Mississauga who provided great insight into the needs and experiences of disabled young people, particularly their feelings of being left out, excluded from opportunities to participate.

Process

Except for breakout groups, the process was similar to that used in all the Forums and Consultations, using discussion prompted by polling questions, and questions from the facilitators of the youth team. There was not a need for small break out groups and the group stayed together for the whole session.

Feedback

In the discussion as to what prevents young people from participating or feeling left out, several youth identified differing abilities. There was an excellent discussion about the need for a youth advisory board that included people of differing abilities, if a youth centre were to be opened.

“When I was in [NAME DELETED], I was left out because I was different from them; sometimes I would stay with disabled people because the regular people would go off with those like them. A lot of times when people go to regular schools, in my high school the people who are disabled stay with their disabled group – because they are different.”

Several of the participants were students at the University of Toronto Mississauga, (UTM) and they did share the concerns they had with mentoring or joining programs with younger youth or non-students based on the age gap and the mind set that is created when you are a university student.

“ I don’t relate to younger people ... U of T experience that jades you so much ... you end up with a different mentality and mindset. Pressure here is a bit different. No attendance, no teachers, it’s all up to you. You plunk down money for your books. Pressures are different. And what you are expected to do at the end are different. You come out of university, esp. U of T – you are expected to land a nice job. What you are going to ... your end point changes ... for me to look back ...like going backwards... That age gap”

In answer to the question “If you could have your own place for recreation – what would you have there? “, the themes were similar to the other consultations and survey results.

- swimming, skating, baseball, soccer
- drop-in centre
- have a library in the drop-in centre
- pool table in the drop-in centre
- maybe different food items – like a cafeteria – like ice cream days, or popcorn days
- couches for people to congregate

- arcade games
- swimming pool
- dance floor
- bus accessible
- bowling alley
- activity rooms – so people could have workshops like this – we have study rooms in library – where we have 6 chairs and a white board – people have study sessions in there
- people in charge – authority – to ensure everyone is secure – like security guards

An Interesting Idea: Good Behaviour Mimes

“Have openness; on bus if I see someone littering – I don’t go and say not to do it; I don’t see anyone else to do it so I don’t bother either; I was in one of my classes and a student was telling me about a city in Columbia where the mayor of city decided to bring in ... a bunch of mimes ...to show good behaviour; the crime rate actually dropped because you had people looking out for one another ...”

Youth City-wide Forum

Overview

The Youth City-Wide Forum attracted eight young people, in particular several younger youth, (ages 10 – 11). Their contribution was outstanding, in terms of their ideas and concepts of how Mississauga’s younger citizens can participate and create ideas for change.

Process

The process was similar to the other Forums and Consultations, a combination of discussion, interactive polling, and responses to probing questions from the facilitators, although there was not a need for small breakout group discussions.

Feedback

They discussed how they often are left out of sports programs based on their age, either in school or community based organizations. They also spoke about a need for more diverse activities that are more culturally relevant – specifically a desire for more cricket pitches and opportunities to play.

“ When kids go to the park, there are certain things you need – e.g. grass cut. In Australia, cricket is big. Here in Canada we have hockey, but hockey you have to pay for but if you had hockey or cricket for free, you would have more kids. What would be cool is if the public parks had a place where you could sign your name and get a cricket pallet, soccer ball, etc...”

“Outside of the library there is a big field. If they could add a cricket field there it would make a huge difference in Mississauga to see how other people live.”

“I talked about mentorship and I think that is very important because otherwise I would not get involved. A mentorship program would be good. I envision a facilitator hired by the city and contact organizations and recruit to mentor.”

“More activities. They are out there but they are expensive, I have wanted to take swimming or skateboarding but they are expensive and far away.”

“Mississauga would be a lot friendlier if we developed a sense of community. More walk-able. If there was a place for young people to meet. I don’t know how that works, but would like to have an outlet to meet young people that don’t come to my school.”

“Depending on what race we are we stick to ourselves. If we want this to work, we need to network with other groups.”

The participants at the Youth City-Wide Forum, though shy in size were not shy in ideas and they filled a What If...wall for how to make Mississauga a more child and youth friendly city.

What If Wall

- We had more frequent bus routes?
- There was a way to meet young people from different schools and feel safe (not organized sports)?
- Schools got their compost collected by the city?
- There was rock/wall climbing at city centre?
- Mississauga had more walk-able places like Port Credit?
- The arts disappear completely from schools?
- Mississauga developed an identity?
- If everyone turned off their lights for one hour (like Australia)?
- I could pay a small fee and could have access to a dark room without being in an organized photography class?
- You didn’t have to pay to enter ice rinks?
- There was a safe way for young people to get around?
- Public transit was less expensive? It’s especially too expensive for those of us who commute between Mississauga and Toronto- we’re paying double the fare each way: too expensive. This applies for all teens and adults.

Next Steps of the Process

Young people will continue to be engaged in the development of the Mississauga Youth Plan. The Youth Team continues to meet and will be involved in the development of the Framework, continued analysis of data and the development of the final Action Plan and Implementation Strategy.

Youth will also contribute to telling the story of the development of the Mississauga Youth Plan as the final Report is prepared and delivered to City staff, the Mayor and Council.

Lastly, the Youth Team will be given the opportunity to participate in a final evaluation of the project as the project comes to a close.

Challenges for engagement

The process of engaging youth in the consultation and development process for the Mississauga Youth Plan mirrors the very real barriers faced by city and community organizations in increasing the levels of youth participation throughout city and community programs, services and facilities. In particular, it provides insight into the challenges of initiating and sustaining the interest of diverse and non-engaged youth.

Initially the group of youth recruited for the Youth Team were young people who have faced personal, social and systemic challenges and who have historically been let down by adults and systems in their lives. The trust building process was at times challenging and was required to be addressed continually. Prior to the initial Forums and Ward Consultations having a consultant staff reside close to the Civic Centre and Square One Shopping Centre alleviated much of this, although trust and behavioural issues required ongoing attention to sustain the engagement of some members of the team. A short-term process such as this cannot address such deep systemic issues, and it points to the need for broad-based community collaboration around provision of programs, services and opportunities to wrap-around the participation of youth. This is an effective practice identified in the Environmental Scan.

Further complicating the process was the introduction of new members of the Youth Team, as the consultant sought to broaden the diversity of the team and add youth who faced less challenges, did well in school and came from different backgrounds.

This was important to the process and the process results are important to consider in the development of the Mississauga Youth Plan, because as observed throughout the consultations and as identified by youth in the various discussions, different groups of youth cluster together and attend programs together. Even when a group starts out diverse, the tendency will be to stabilize around a homogenous group, unless consistent and mindful attention is paid to the ongoing stimulation required to sustain diversity and values of inclusiveness.

Challenges and competition arise easily when some youth find it easy to attend meetings regularly and on-time, speak readily and concentrate and are not distracted by the pressures of uneven home life, parenthood, or lack of money. When diverse youth communities are brought together to work collaboratively, it requires ongoing attention and skilled facilitation, with an explicit expression on a repetitive basis of values and common purpose.

With very different life experiences and backgrounds, it took considerable time and effort for the youth to build a respectful and understanding team. This was at times noticeable publicly and was required to be addressed regularly. As the project moved forward there were increased partnerships among members of the youth team, city staff and the consultant adult team. Stronger relationships and understanding developed among the youth team, as did the ability and skills to “call” each other in a respectful manner when issues and “baggage” arose. Capacity of both youth and city staff to deal with these challenges increased throughout the process.

The winter season was also a challenge for not just the youth participants but the Youth Team as well. With limited access to transportation, some members of the Youth Team with small children and infants faced challenges arriving at Ward Consultations on time, as they were dependant on Mississauga Transit. Several members could not attend at all as there was too much snow at times to navigate with a stroller. It also proved challenging to have participants arrive at Ward Consultations or Forums in poor weather.

The Youth Team for all their recruiting had hoped for higher numbers of youth and adults at the various Ward Consultations and Forums. Again, there were some systemic and jurisdictional barriers to be overcome when scheduling meetings, especially when Ward Consultations and Forums were held in school settings. With limited to no access to the schools prior to Ward Consultations, it was challenging to recruit local youth to participate; especially those who had bus transportation home after school and therefore could not stay longer. Both the Youth Team and City team contacted schools and promoted the event by phone, email, mail outs and faxes but without the support of youth influencers such as teachers and school administrators it was very challenging to recruit youth when so many had already left prior to the Youth Team being allowed access to the school. As well several sites were not optimum for acoustics: making it difficult to hear the youth, record the Consultation and have open discussions.

Outcomes of engagement

In the effective practices review for the environmental scan, developing good collaborative partnerships of community and school is another one of those practices, as is the practice of wrap-around support and skill building teams of diverse youth, with strong adult allies to support the process. City staff did an excellent job of learning and adjusting to work with the realities that the youth team members brought with them.

The Youth Team was one of the strongest assets to the project; a group of diverse youth; in background, culture, life experience and race and all open to learning and developing their own personal and group capacity. This was complemented by the strong support and commitment from the City staff team who worked tirelessly on the project. In helping build relationships with the young people the City staff were able to respectfully support the Youth Team and allow the youth to lead with the adults being strong allies. Supportive City

Councillors, several school administrators and some key community organizations all effectively supported the Youth Team in its consultation activities.

The process of the engagement of 1, 130 diverse youth in the Mississauga Youth Plan consultation process, with many supportive organizational partners working together has been an example of effective practice at work. I

It is likely, based on the consultations, that the Action and Implementation Plan will contain recommendations around sustaining the increased engagement of diverse young people in the implementation of the plan, especially ongoing advisory, planning and marketing roles for programs, services and facilities throughout the city.

If this does happen, the development of the Mississauga Youth Plan to date, and its engagement of youth, has laid a very good foundation upon which to move forward.

Appendices

What Does A Youth Centre Look Like?

We asked youth in the consultations to describe to us what a Youth Centre, or place to 'hang out' would look like. This is what they shared with us.

1. Free
2. Dance floor with DJ
3. Basketball court – inside and outside
4. Vending machine
5. Stage – outside pool
6. Dart board
7. Pool table
8. Sofas
9. Bar (chicken wings) & restaurant
10. 24/7
11. Both adults and youth run it – partners
12. Hot tub
13. Video games and movies
14. Geared to ages 16-23
15. Geared to ages 16-20
16. You can get there on your own
17. City taxis bring you there
18. Giveaways
19. Friday night jams (\$2)
20. Open mic night
21. Rap battles
22. Metal detectors (no guns)
23. Computers
24. Dance battles (cash/prizes)
25. Plasma TV
26. Youth are there
27. Keep it safe, young people running it; look out for youth “security”
28. Willing to pay \$2
29. If we made our own youth centre – youth would be in charge (multicultural, respectable)
30. Music
31. Dance floor
32. Air hockey
33. Pool table
34. Internet
35. Outside ball court
36. Outside splash pad
37. Food – pizza, soul food, chicken
38. Vending machine
39. A pool
40. A sex-ed gym class
41. A better weekly jam class
42. A teen club
43. A dance studio
44. Better/bigger party rooms
45. Arcade room
46. Gym
47. Baseball diamond
48. Swimming pool
49. Music
50. Friday night specials: dances, movies
51. Boxing arena
52. Exclusive furniture
53. 19 plus bar
54. Youthful employees
55. Surround sound
56. Open at 9 a.m. And closed at 11 PM (dances start from 9 p.m. to 3)
57. Different weeks for different aged dances
58. 2 courts (1 for free time and the other for games)
59. Separate rooms (different colours)
60. Mini store where you can buy food, cds, sport supplies, dvds, etc...
61. Security for the store. 19 plus bar and Friday night
62. Membership for each activity should have a price
63. Urban barbershop
64. Should have its own bus stop
65. Stage
66. Basketball runs for girls

What If Wall

When asked, 'What If' youth participants in the development of the Mississauga Youth Plan had an idea, or two, or 421. They might not all agree on everything but in their words...what if:

1. We had more frequent bus routes?
2. There was a way to meet young people from different schools and feel safe (not organized sports)?
3. Schools got their compost collected by the city?
4. There was rock/wall climbing at city centre?
5. Mississauga had more walk-able places like Port Credit?
6. The arts disappear completely from schools?
7. Mississauga developed an identity?
8. If everyone turned off their lights for one hour (like Australia)?
9. I could pay a small fee and could have access to a dark room without being in an organized photography class?
10. You didn't have to pay to enter ice rinks?
11. There was a safe way for young people to get around?
12. Public transit was less expensive? It's especially too expensive for those of us who commute between Mississauga and Toronto- we're paying double the fare each way: too expensive. This applies for all teens and adults.
13. Transit was free for school kids from 3 to 5 p.m.
14. We had free things to do
15. Someone would talk to certain companies that will make exceptions and hire ex-convicts that really want to change their lives – or else they will go back to their old ways and do what they have to make \$\$
16. There was free afternoon skating school i.e. from 4 to 5 p.m. daily.
17. More gym availability for basketball at and affordable price
18. Cheaper bus fares
19. Icons and role models
20. There was more basketball programs
21. Build a baseball diamond and have some baseball tournaments
22. Have outdoor leagues for football, basketball for kids 8-10; 11-12; 13-14; 15-16
23. Indoor court for tennis around this area. Not any around here
24. Lower price for drop-in sports (basketball, soccer, hockey)
25. More parking lots
26. Less expensive food payments in cafeteria
27. More sidewalks
28. Mississauga subway
29. More clubs and organizations
30. More after school class – educations
31. More bike trails
32. Less crowded space in Mississauga
33. Skating rinks
34. More payphones
35. Bus fares were cheaper
36. There were more youth programs for free
37. There were more outdoor activities
38. There were more fields, basketball courts
39. We had community theatres
40. We had dog parks
41. We had a theme park
42. Ward 10 had a community centre
43. We had more parking
44. There was more advertisement for programs other than the Rec & Park book
45. We had more diverse programs – i.e., cricket
46. We had organized sports (teams)
47. We had more water parks
48. Every bus came very 10-15 minutes

49. Malls were open later
50. More trains/TTC direct to/from Toronto
51. More subways/cleaner buses
52. More cycle paths
53. Quicker snow removal
54. We had more dirt jumps
55. Closer age groups for programs
56. We had tutoring/peer support groups
57. We had campsites/conservation areas
58. "People of authority" were kinder
59. We had more skateboard
60. We had public parks
61. We had community BBQ
62. Bus fare was lowered (\$2.25 or \$2.00)
63. More info on programs/more programs/swimming, more ball
64. Young people get respected more
65. We had more outdoor lights
66. More jams (parties) – targeted to youth – free before a certain time
67. Violence decreased – also drugs should not be used anywhere
68. More computer access/more computers
69. More hospitals
70. More tutoring
71. South Common Mall/more useful stores (urban stores, "Stitches" etc.)
72. More teams targeted towards girls studio for people to make music
73. Bigger scooters
74. We learn more about global warming/environment
75. Stores that are easier to go to
76. Make transfers more than 2 hours
77. More salons for minorities
78. Talent/fashion shows – a lot of advertising (Facebook)
79. Cleaner streets
80. More youth employment
81. More arcades
82. More cultural events
83. In South Common – divide tennis court with a basketball court
84. More attractions (tourists come here too)
85. Another arena (bus accessible for all)
86. More express buses
87. Make community centre attraction (paint on wall – mural)
88. Faster plowing on sidewalks
89. More volunteer opportunities
90. Community centres bigger
91. More community rental space for youth to use – reasonable price – any time over you pay (better price for security)
92. We feel more welcome when going out (from adults) – it should be mutual respect
93. Should have personal belongings in stores (already cameras)
94. More poetry clubs
95. Bus times should be extended – bus frequency should increase
96. More small concert venues
97. We learned more about global warming
98. We had a sports centre
99. Badminton
100. What if we had a theme park
101. More street festivals
102. We had more pools with bigger slides
103. Outdoor basketball courts
104. What if we had more places to hang out
105. Big outdoor parks
106. Sports team for young people in Mississauga
107. We had more nature for kids to go and play sports like soccer
108. More outdoor parties (e.g., corn roast)
109. Jobs for kids under 14
110. There were more areas with security or adults for safety
111. There were healthy places for young people to eat
112. Libraries were renovated to be more appealing and youth friendly
113. More ball (free)
114. Cheaper bus fare
115. Increased wages
116. Canada day fireworks
117. More talent shows
118. Sports equipment at fields

119. More youth jobs
120. Lower the voting age
121. More gym/cheaper memberships
122. More community concerts
123. Drive in bus
124. Free cells for needy
125. Less pollution – green/tree planting
126. More football (for girls too) & flag
127. Volleyball (beach)
128. Paintball
129. Laser tag
130. Amusement park
131. Bbqs and street parties and food
132. Comedy club
133. More respect for women!
134. Downtown clubs
135. Pedestrian only club (coffee shops, clothing stores)
136. Caribbean-based restaurant
137. Biking friendly
138. More/new buses & different routes
139. Swimming programs
140. Youth spa (with massages)
141. Dark room – free use
142. Guest speakers & celebrities
143. Gondolas
144. Ski hill
145. Youth had more things to do!
146. Bus fare was lower (toonie!)
147. Sport activities in the community
148. More produce, “fresher gear” in stores down here – rather than Toronto
149. More basketball! Drop-in
150. Closer club venues
151. Outdoor ball courts
152. Opportunities for adults to listen to youth without being stereotypical or biased
153. More black history month focus/events
154. Put money into schools
155. Dance in curriculum for girls gym
156. Block parties, jams in the community
157. Feds weren't biased. They need to be reasonable
158. Paintball
159. Go karts
160. More organizations to help youth find employment
161. More volunteer programs
162. More drop-in programs
163. School days were longer, but we had Fridays off
164. We had a club district
165. We should have small concert venues in Mississauga so that we don't have to go to Toronto or Brampton
166. Meadowvale community centre should be repainted and there should be more windows where the pool is (like the Milton pool)
167. More ball courts (inside)
168. Better stores in MTC (Meadowvale Town Centre)
169. Extend time schedule
170. Children that are in school should pay less
171. Show down (dance off)
172. Organize tournaments for different sports
173. Football, soccer
174. Cosmetology programs within every school and community centers
175. Jams at schools and community centers (16 and up, 24 and under)
176. More black focus programs (besides February history month)
177. More music affiliated programs (community centres)
178. More African Canadian role models (black teachers)
179. More consultation
180. More youth counselors
181. Transit
182. The cost
183. More bus shelters and heating and cooling
184. More programs like this (more awareness)
185. School should give students a “metro pass” – maybe include it in the annual activity fee that you pay every year
186. If Mississauga had a subway system
187. Mississauga community events and competitions for youth e.g. Singing – Mississauga idol)

188. The dam youth drop-in wasn't the only option
189. Maintain the parks
190. Youth discount cards
191. Jobs- more acceptance for youth
192. Respect for students in stores
193. Better (new) library books
194. Clean the lake
195. Recommendation box
196. Need community centre basketballs (new)
197. Need new lines on the courts
198. Outside improve courts (gated)
199. Nets are gone inside
200. Need metal ones
201. Shovel the sidewalk
202. Discounts for teens (\$2.75 is too expensive)
203. Pass (school) like New York's metro pass
204. Paintball
205. Free activities
206. \$2 bus fare
207. Better malls – there are not enough in this area)
208. Cheaper gyms (fitness cheaper) like premier fitness with track and weights
209. Bowling
210. Theme parks – roller coaster
211. Zoo aquarium
212. Closer movie theatres
213. Stop/ban smoking
214. Greener city
215. Composting in schools
216. Environmentally sound transit
217. No racism felt in the community
218. Cultural sports in schools
219. Easier access to language classes
220. Faster bus routes (square 1 takes forever)
221. Better football field (turf)
222. Reusable space – a football field that can convert into a soccer field
223. More restaurants with student discounts
224. Free SPC cards
225. Outdoor stores like queen street
226. Bigger pool – 10 ft deep
227. Rt memorials
228. Bigger community centre
229. Subway
230. More go trains
231. Better switching between cities
232. Street cars
233. High ropes
234. More kayaking, canoeing
235. Cheaper gift cards – pay less than work of card
236. Shooting range and archery courses
237. Destination trips for youth from different high schools
238. Cheaper gas
239. More buses
240. Yoyos tournament
241. Fencing
242. Kickboxing
243. Self-defense for women in schools
244. Lower prices for stuff
245. Raise the tax
246. Mississauga as a leading city working towards global issues
247. Big events like sports tournaments
248. Clubs with party for a cause
249. We need a university and college in Mississauga
250. Recycling needed at Meadowvale Secondary School in the cafeteria
251. I am not going to live in Mississauga when I grow up.”
252. All student art gallery
253. Competitions with prizes
254. Scholarship specific to Mississauga
255. Another hospital
256. Every school should have lock down blinkers
257. Closer fire and police stations-have no idea where the fire station is
258. Indoor basketball
259. More frequent bus routes
260. More entrepreneurial opportunities
261. More employment opportunities
262. Connection between TTC, Mississauga transit and Brampton transit
263. Longer bus hours
264. Lower bus fares
265. Dances
266. Clubs

- 267. Student bus fare rate
- 268. Talent shows
- 269. Outdoor all courts
- 270. Outdoor track
- 271. Indoor track
- 272. Community centre by the 9th line
- 273. More malls
- 274. What if Mississauga bus fare was cheaper
- 275. Mississauga had a hoop dome
- 276. Events like hoop it up
- 277. Ball tournaments
- 278. More dances (\$2)
- 279. Multicultural festivals
- 280. More black hair salons (male and female separate)
- 281. Bus run more frequently
- 282. More awareness for job opportunities
- 283. More concerts
- 284. Female activities
- 285. More community centre and recreation centres
- 286. More after school activities
- 287. Programs at community centres cheaper
- 288. Leadership programs
- 289. Homework clubs (tutors)
- 290. More retail stores
- 291. Cheaper go bus prices
- 292. More events
- 293. Fashion show
- 294. Hands on - guys can design cars and clothes
- 295. Community events outdoors spring, free food and picnic (like for companies)
- 296. Bring in different animals and activities teach you about it – stuff like the wetlands
- 297. Fancy dinner/gala for young people to meet and dance
- 298. Parade
- 299. More libraries in Mississauga
- 300. Not always soccer and basketball
- 301. Small fundraisers
- 302. Maybe a snack bar at Churchill Meadows Park
- 303. If ward 10 had a community centre
- 304. There was less traffic on tenth line
- 305. Sightseeing and vintage shops like queen street
- 306. Career day in middle school
- 307. Volunteering for kids
- 308. Animal shelters
- 309. I wasn't too young
- 310. No more chocolates for fundraisers at schools
- 311. Set up booths with schools
- 312. Better way to get between cities
- 313. Shouldn't limit spaces at community centre - # of people
- 314. Fair for kids who are entrepreneurs
- 315. Kid market
- 316. More police stations
- 317. Don't feel safe at nights – flashlights
- 318. Like "campus security" in parks
- 319. Community centre with parks
- 320. Sometimes I wish everything was safe then my parents would be o.k.
- 321. We had a "safe zone"
- 322. Move smoke free areas
- 323. Smoke zone ½ km away
- 324. Another fire station
- 325. If I were to live in Canada, I would be here
- 326. Living arts around here (little theatre)
- 327. You have to buy tickets early and it fills up
- 328. Reserved tickets for youth
- 329. The 49 bus route was more accessible
- 330. Mississauga transit money
- 331. More dances
- 332. Mississauga had a community centre with basketball and fast food and food court.
- 333. Entertainment
- 334. Party centre close to Ward 10
- 335. Venue for more concerts
- 336. Food place – e.g. McDonalds
- 337. Movie theatre
- 338. Kite flying session
- 339. Cameras (security) outside bike racks
- 340. Homework tutoring
- 341. Instruments and community centres
- 342. Community band
- 343. Swimming pools

344. Camps – summer
 345. Schools – middle and high school should be connected
 346. More and frequent buses
 347. Community picnics
 348. Bowling alley
 349. Scooters (roller palace)
 350. Street festivals with roller coaster rides
 351. Circus for a week
 352. Drive-in movie theatre outside community centre
 353. Bring professional locals for youth classes
 354. Swimming
 355. Arts class/photography
 356. Community theatre for youth
 357. Video making club
 358. More computer in the library
 359. Club for teens
 360. Swimming pool (in school)
 361. Get rid of uniforms
 362. Hang out for teens
 363. Subway
 364. Go-carting
 365. Skating rink
 366. Better water park
 367. Recreation centre
 368. Theatre (drive through)
 369. Paintball
 370. Hair salon
 371. Nice restaurant (eat out)
 372. Teenage pregnancy clinic
 373. Mini putting
 374. Cheap banquet park
 375. Good scenery
 376. Environmental
 377. More low income housing
 378. Theme park
 379. Water park
 380. Concerts with celebrities: r.kelly, Beyonce, Chris Brown, Omarion...
 381. More indoor football
 382. Lower bus fare
 383. More playgrounds
 384. More updated opportunities
 385. More fields
 386. More parties
 387. More basketball
 388. What if there were more parties, basketball, more water parks close to home
 389. What if there were extended hours and cheaper buses
 390. Salsa classes were available for free
 391. More basketball indoor and outdoor centres
 392. Less harassment in stores
 393. More sports in general
 394. More sports organizations
 395. More frequent buses
 396. Better soccer fields with nice lights
 397. More fitness facilities
 398. More yoga studios and classes
 399. More youth meetings
 400. More opportunities for the kids of our future – in the future we can't vote or anything, I would like my kids to be able to vote and stand up for their rights they should respect us and not stereotype us without knowing what we are about.
 401. There's indoor football and soccer
 402. More basketball, jam
 403. Later buses after 2 a.m.
 404. Frequent buses
 405. Cheaper rates for transit – 34 hours
 406. 24 hour parks
 407. Extended mall hours
 408. Lower time period to get drivers license
 409. Flying cars
 410. More apartments
 411. What if we had in Meadowvale
 - a. A block party
 - b. A dance hall
 - c. Free organized skate
 - d. Festivals – jerk fest
 - e. Teen Caribanna
 - f. A mall
 - g. A movie theatre
 - h. A food court
 - i. Cultural hair salon
- And lastly...What if...
412. The city of Mississauga does not agree with us

Demographic Profile of Survey Participants

Total # of Surveys Completed:

First time completers: 87.9%
(n=767)
Completed survey before: 7.2%
(n=63)
Information was missing for
4.9% (n=43)

Those that answered that they had completed the survey before were EXCLUDED from the analyses performed, including the demographic information presented below.

Age:

12-15: 46.5% (n=377)
16-19: 40.7% (n=330)
20-24: 7.0% (n=57)

Information was missing for 5.7% (n=46).

Gender:

Male: 38.4% (n=311)
Female: 54.2% (n=439)
Transgender: 1.4% (n=11)

Information was missing for 6.0% (n=49)

Please note: because of the extremely small sample size for the transgender youth, these youth were excluded from the gender crosstabs completed and reported on later in this document.

Respondent Born in Canada?

Yes: 68.0% (n=551)
No: 25.8% (n=209)
Information missing for
6.2% (n=50)

Mother Born in Canada?

Yes: 24.4% (n=198)
No: 68.6% (n=556)
Information missing for
6.9% (n=56)

Father Born in Canada?

Yes: 21.1% (n=171)
No: 71.6% (n=580)
Information missing for 7.3% (n=59)

Cultural/Ethnic Identity:

A cultural identity was based upon several questions asked – all open-ended – and these included the languages spoken in the home and the person’s own self-described ethnicity. Therefore, there were a variety of answers. The youth team, along with a member of the research team, went through all the responses and developed cultural codes. The most common cultural codes were:

East Asian: 10.0% (n=81)
South Asian: 9.7% (n=78)
European: 8.8% (n=71)
Mixed: 5.4% (n=44)
Caucasian: 4.8% (n=39)
Canadian: 4.7% (n=38)
Canadian & European: 3.5%
(n=28)

More than one-third of the responses (n=321, 39.7%) were missing or could not be coded (i.e., information given did not answer the question or it was impossible to determine a cultural “code”).

With whom do you live?

With my parents:	87.7% (n=710)
With extended family:	5.8% (n=47)
With a guardian/foster parent:	1.7% (n=14)
In my own place:	4.1% (n=33)
In a group home:	1.4% (n=11)
With a friend:	1.9% (n=15)
I am homeless:	1.6% (n=13)
Other:	1.7% (n=14)

Where in Mississauga do you live?

Cawthra	1.9% (n=14)
Churchill Meadows	2.7% (n=20)
Clarkson	1.9% (n=14)
Cooksville	7.8% (n=57)
Courtney Park	5.3% (n=39)
Dixie	4.4% (n=32)
Erindale/South Common	7.3% (n=53)
Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills	4.4% (n=32)
Lorne Park	13.0% (n=95)
Malton	10.8% (n=79)
Meadowvale	1.8% (n=13)
Meadowvale Village	8.3% (n=61)
Mississauga Valley	1.8% (n=13)
Port Credit	5.1% (n=37)
River Grove	4.2% (n=31)
Streetsville	9.4% (n=69)
Hurontario	1.8% (n=13)
Other	6.2% (n=45)
Outside of Mississauga	1.9% (n=19)

Information was missing for 9.8% (n=79).

How long have you lived in Mississauga?

Less than 1 year	4.4% (n=36)
1-2 years	5.6% (n=45)
3-4 years	10.2% (n=83)
5+ years	72.5% (n=587)

Information was missing for 7.3% (n=59).

Schooling

In elementary school	22.0% (n=178)	Information was missing for 6.5% (n=53).
In high school	60.5% (n=490)	
In college	1.2% (n=10)	
In university	6.3% (n=51)	
Not in school anymore	2.6% (n=21)	
Other	0.9% (n=7)	

Job Status

No	66.2% (n=273)	Have job or not? → Information was missing for 0.1% (n=1)
Yes	33.7% (n=273)	Job type? → Information was missing for 8.4% (n=23)
	Full-time: 10.0% (n=25)	
	Part-time: 74.8% (n=187)	
	Occasional: 8.8% (n=22)	
	Summer only: 6.4% (n=16)	

Have enough money?³

To meet basic needs?

Yes: 41.6% (n=337)
 Mostly: 20.2% (n=164)
 Sometimes: 18.4% (n=149)
 Hardly ever: 6.3% (n=51)

Information was missing 8.1% (n=66)

To do fun things?

Yes: 29.4% (n=238)
 Mostly: 23.3% (n=89)
 Sometimes: 21.2% (n=172)
 Hardly ever: 11.0% (n=89)

Information was missing for 8.5% (n=69)

Involved in Justice System?

Juvenile Justice System

Yes: 6.4% (n=52)
 No: 87.0% (n=705)

Information was missing 6.5% (n=53)

Adult Justice System:

Yes: 3.5% (n=28)
 No: 89.4% (n=724)

Information was missing for 7.2% (n=58)

³ Although income range was asked it was not completed by almost three-quarters of the participants (70.7%): they either left it blank (9.5%), answered “don’t know” (46.2%), or responded “choose not to answer” (15.1%). Therefore, income is not presented here.

How to Read the Tables

The survey that youth completed included many questions about their participation in different activities and programs, their impressions of the City, priorities for spending, and some demographic questions that would give us a picture of the youth. The results from the different questions asked in the survey are presented in the tables that follow.

In each table, the results for all of the youth answering the survey questions are reported in the “all” column. As well, the responses were also analyzed by the three age groupings: 12-15, 16-19, and 20-24. In the table, there are three columns that present the results for each of these groups. Further, responses by gender, for each of the three age groupings, were also analyzed. The results for gender are presented within each of the columns for age as M=male and F=female. As mentioned previously too few “transgender” youth responded to the survey to include them in the gender breakdowns.

Statistically significant differences between age groups, and between genders within those age groups, are reported by using the chi-square statistic. A chi square (χ^2) statistic is used to investigate whether distributions of categorical variables (e.g., male/female) differ from one another. Differences were considered worth reporting if the probability of obtaining that result by chance was 10% or less. In each table the chi-square statistic is reported for age (χ^2 - age) and for gender within each age group (χ^2 - gender). The lower the probability level (the “p” value), the less likely it is that the result happened simply by chance; that is, the smaller the p value the more likely it is that there truly is a difference between the groups being reported. If the p-value was greater than .1%0, then the result was considered “not significant” and is reported as “ns” in the table.

Table 1: Where do you hang out with friends?

Where?	X ² - age	X ² -gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
School/college/university	ns	12-15: ns	69.1%	68.7%		70.3%		64.9%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		73.0%	65.6%	73.4%	69.7%	63.6%	66.7%
YMCA or other sports clubs	ns	12-15: ns	18.8%	20.7%		16.7%		19.3%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=5.53, p=.02		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (1)=6.14, p=.02		22.3%	18.8%	21.6%	11.9%	36.4%	9.1%
Recreational clubs	ns	12-15: X ² (1)=3.95, p=.06	17.0%	17.0%		18.2%		10.5%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		11.5%	19.3%	19.4%	17.8%	18.2%	6.1%
Shopping mall	X ² (2)=18.95, p=.000	12-15: X ² (1)=30.66, p=.00	70.0%	64.5%		78.2%		59.6%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=10.66, p=.00		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		48.0%	76.1%	69.8%	84.9%	50.0%	63.6%
Movie theatres	X ² (2)=9.35, p=.009	12-15: X ² (1)=7.69, p=.01	34.7%	37.4%		29.4%		47.4%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=8.34, p=.00		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		54.1%	68.3%	62.6%	77.3%	50.0%	51.5%
Public parks	X ² (2)=4.76, p=.09	12-15: ns	49.3%	53.3%		45.8%		43.9%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		52.0%	55.0%	40.3%	49.7%	50.0%	39.4%
Community centres	X ² (2)=5.47, p=.06	12-15: ns	65.7%	62.1%		70.3%		63.2%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (1)=5.24, p=.04		41.9%	35.8%	33.1%	27.6%	54.5%	24.2%
Privately owned gyms	ns	12-15: ns	5.8%	4.2%		6.7%		10.5%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=5.18, p=.04		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		6.1%	3.2%	10.1%	3.8%	13.6%	9.1%

Where?	X ² - age	X ² -gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
						%		%	
Religious institutions	X ² (2)=10.42, p=.005	12-15: ns	16.6%	20.7%		13.6%		7.0%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		20.9%	19.7%	10.1%	16.2%	13.6%	3.0%
Other	X ² (2)=8.63, p=.01	12-15: ns	35.1%	37.7%		30.0%		47.4%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=7.81, p=.00		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		34.5%	39.9%	22.3%	36.8%	54.5%	42.4%

- Shopping malls (70.0%), schools/colleges/universities (69.1%), & community centres (65.7%) were the places where most youth indicated they hung out with friends. Youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the other two age groups to hang out in shopping malls. As well, in the 2 younger age groups, girls were more likely than boys to hang out at shopping malls.
- Youth aged 16-19 were less likely than the other 2 age groups, particularly those aged 20-24, to hang out at movie theatres. Female youth in both the younger age categories were more likely than male youth in those age categories to hang out at theatres.
- Female youth in the older 2 age categories were less likely than male youth to indicate they hung out at the YMCA or other sport organizations.
- Youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the other 2 age groups to hang out at Community Centres. And in the older age group, young men indicated they were more likely to hang out at the Community Centres than young women.
- Youth aged 12-15 were more likely than the older 2 age groups to hang out with friends at religious institutions.
- Older youth aged 20-24 were more likely to hang out at privately owned gyms.
- Finally, older youth, and to a lesser extent youth aged 12-15, were more likely than the youth aged 16-19 to provide other places where they hung out.

Table 2: Which places are youth friendly?

Where?	X ² - age	X ² -gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
School/college/university	ns	12-15: ns	58.1 %	58.9%		57.9%		63.2%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		62.2 %	57.3 %	54.0 %	62.2 %	68.2 %	60.6 %
YMCA or other sports clubs	ns	12-15: ns	23.2 %	21.8%		24.5%		24.6%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (1)=4.61, p=.06		21.6 %	21.6 %	28.1 %	21.1 %	40.9 %	15.2 %
Recreational clubs	ns	12-15: X ² (1)=7.27, p=.01	21.2 %	19.4%		23.3%		21.1%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		12.2 %	23.4 %	23.0 %	23.8 %	27.3 %	18.2 %
Shopping mall	X ² (2)=5.76, p=.06	12-15: X ² (1)=8.12, p=.00	49.1 %	45.9%		53.9%		42.1%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=3.67, p=.06		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		37.2 %	52.3 %	48.2 %	58.9 %	50.0 %	36.4 %
Movie theatres	ns	12-15: X ² (1)=7.64, p=.01	48.3 %	47.5%		50.6%		40.4%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=3.40, p=.07		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		38.5 %	53.2 %	45.3 %	55.7 %	40.9 %	36.4 %
Public parks	X ² (2)=5.91, p=.05	12-15: ns	34.7 %	38.5%		32.1%		24.6%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		37.2 %	39.4 %	33.8 %	31.4 %	22.7 %	24.2 %
Community centres	Ns	12-15: ns	36.1 %	38.5%		33.9%		33.3%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (1)=4.97, p=.04		39.2 %	38.5 %	37.4 %	31.9 %	50.0 %	21.2 %
Privately owned gyms	Ns	12-15: ns	7.5 %	6.4%		8.8%		7.0%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		8.1%	5.5%	10.1 %	7.0%	4.5%	9.1%
Religious institutions	X ² (2)=5.53, p=.06	12-15: ns	20.0 %	22.8%		18.5%		10.5%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=3.37,		M	F	M	F	M	F

Where?	X ² - age	X ² -gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
		p=.08							
		20-24: ns		25.0 %	21.1 %	13.7 %	21.6 %	13.6 %	9.1%
Other	X ² (2)=11.10, p=.004	12-15: ns	23.0 %	27.1%		17.3%		29.8%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		26.4 %	28.4 %	15.1 %	18.9 %	31.8 %	27.3 %

- Only one of the items – schools/colleges/universities – had more than one-half of the youth (58.1%) responding that these were youth-friendly places. Just less than one-half of the youth thought that shopping malls (49.1%), and movie theatres (48.3%) were youth-friendly. One-third or more of the respondents also indicated community centres and public parks as youth-friendly places.
- Youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the other 2 age groups to indicate shopping malls as youth friendly places. Younger youth aged 12-15, and to a lesser extent youth aged 16-19 were more likely than older youth to indicate that public parks are youth friendly.
- Younger youth aged 12-15, and to lesser extent 16-19, were more likely to think religious institutions were youth friendly. Girls in the 16-19 age range were more likely than the boys to think that religious institutions were youth friendly.
- Younger and older youth (12-15 and 20-24) were more likely than those aged 16-19 to provide other places that were youth friendly.
- Female youth in the younger two age groups were more likely than male youth to think that shopping malls and movie theatres were youth friendly.
- Female youth aged 20-24 were less likely than male youth to think that community centres were youth friendly.

Table 3: How Proud of Mississauga’s ...Housing

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	26.7%	26.0%		27.6%		26.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		29.0%	27.7%	26.3%	29.0%	28.6%	24.2%
Somewhat Proud	49.2%	53.3%		47.2%		33.9%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		50.3%	55.5%	51.1%	49.8%	28.6%	39.4%
Neutral/not sure	16.6%	15.6%		17.2%		19.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		17.2%	14.7%	14.6%	19.1%	19.0%	26.2%
Not Proud	4.7%	3.0%		4.3%		17.9%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		1.4%	4.3%	2.9%	5.5%	23.8%	15.2%
Not at all Proud	2.8%	2.2%		3.7%		1.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		2.1%	1.9%	5.1%	1.6%	0	0
X ² -age	X ² (8)=26.61,p=.00						
X ² -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- With respect to Mississauga’s housing, the majority of the youth answered “somewhat proud” (49.2%) or “very proud” (26.7%). Younger youth (ages 12-15 and 16-19) were more likely than younger youth to answer this way and older youth were more likely than the other 2 age groups to answer “neutral/not sure” or “not proud”.
- There were no gender differences within the age groups.

Table 4: How Proud of Mississauga’s ...Public Parks

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	20.8%	20.9%		21.5%		16.1%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		23.4%	19.2%	22.8%	20.8%	19.0%	15.2%
Somewhat Proud	44.6%	46.5%		40.9%		53.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		48.3%	44.1%	39.0%	42.6%	47.6%	57.6%
Neutral/not sure	21.2%	20.4%		23.4%		14.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20.0%	21.6%	25.0%	23.0%	19.0%	12.1%
Not Proud	9.7%	9.0%		10.8%		8.9%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		7.6%	10.3%	8.8%	12.0%	14.3%	6.1%
Not at all Proud	3.6%	3.3%		3.4%		7.1%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		0.7%	4.7%	4.4%	1.6%	0.0%	9.1%
X ² -age	ns						
X ² -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- With respect to Mississauga’s public parks, again most youth answered “somewhat proud” (44.6%) and similar proportions answered “very proud” (20.8%) and “neutral/not sure” (21.2%). Less than 15% were “not proud” or “not at all proud”.
- There were no age differences, nor were there gender differences within each of the age groupings.

Table 5: How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Public Transit

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	15.1%	15.7%		15.3%		10.7%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		16.7%	14.8%	18.4%	12.3%	4.8%	15.2%
Somewhat Proud	29.9%	34.0%		26.2%		25.0%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		42.4%	29.1%	23.5%	28.5%	23.8%	24.2%
Neutral/not sure	25.9%	26.1%		25.9%		25.0%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		22.9%	27.1%	28.7%	24.6%	38.1%	18.2%
Not Proud	18.6%	17.7%		18.1%		26.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		14.6%	20.7%	14.0%	21.8%	28.6%	27.3%
Not at all Proud	10.5%	6.5%		14.6%		12.5%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		3.5%	8.4%	15.4%	12.8%	1.8%	15.2%
X ² -age	X ² (8)=17.98,p=.02						
X ² -gender	12-15: X ² (4)=10.00,p=.04 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- Of all the items on which youth were queried with respect to feeling proud, public transit was given the lowest rating – 29.1% answered either “not proud” (18.6%) or “not at all proud” (10.5%). A fair proportion also answered “neutral/not sure” (25.9%). Nonetheless the largest proportion (29.9%) answered “somewhat proud”.
- Older youth were more likely to answer negatively than the younger 2 age groups – 39.3% answered either “not proud” or “not at all proud”. Younger youth aged 12-15 had more positive rating of public transit than the other 2 age groups; boys in this age range were less likely than the girls to give a negative rating (18.1% vs. 29.1%).

Table 6: How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Community Centres

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	28.2%	29.8%		28.5%		16.1%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		37.5%	23.9%	34.1%	23.6%	19.0%	15.2%
Somewhat Proud	43.9%	47.0%		41.7%		35.7%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		41.7%	51.6%	42.0%	42.9%	27.3%	37.0%
Neutral/not sure	18.9%	15.6%		20.2%		32.1%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		15.3%	16.0%	17.4%	22.5%	19.0%	39.4%
Not Proud	6.6%	4.9%		7.7%		10.7%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		3.5%	6.1%	5.1%	9.9%	9.5%	12.1%
Not at all Proud	2.5%	2.7%		1.8%		5.4%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		2.1%	2.3%	1.4%	1.1%	.0%	6.1%
X ² -age	X ² (8)=18.96,p=.01						
X ² -gender	12-15: X ² (4)=8.40,p=.08 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- Community Centres were rated fairly positively with most respondents answering “somewhat proud” (43.9%) or “very proud” (28.2%). Less than 10% of respondents gave a negative response.
- Youth aged 12-15 or 16-19 were more likely than those aged 20-24 to answer that they were proud of the community centres. Nonetheless, the largest proportion of 20-24 year olds did answer “somewhat proud” (35.7%); a slightly smaller proportion answered “neutral/not sure” (32.1%).
- Male youth aged 12-15 were more likely than the girls that age to answer “very proud” (37.5% vs. 23.9%).

Table 7: How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Environment in General

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	21.3%	19.1%		22.4%		28.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		24.3%	19.6%	23.5%	20.7%	33.3%	27.3%
Somewhat Proud	42.5%	42.9%		41.7%		44.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		41.0%	45.8%	47.8%	38.6%	52.4%	39.4%
Neutral/not sure	20.2%	22.1%		19.0%		14.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		19.4%	24.5%	16.9%	21.2%	9.5%	18.2%
Not Proud	11.6%	10.9%		12.6%		10.7%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		11.1%	10.4%	8.8%	15.8%	4.8%	15.2%
Not at all Proud	4.4%	4.9%		4.3%		1.8%⁴	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		4.2%	4.7%	2.9%	3.8%	.0%	.0%
X ² -age	ns						
X ² -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- Most youth felt “somewhat proud” of Mississauga’s environment (42.5%); approximately 15% gave this item a negative rating.
- There were no statistically significant differences between the age groups on this item, nor were there gender differences within the age groups.

⁴ The person who answered “not proud at all” in this age range did not provide his/her gender.

Table 8: How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Shopping

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	39.8%	44.0%		35.3%		39.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		39.4%	46.2%	39.7%	32.4%	23.8%	48.5%
Somewhat Proud	40.1%	39.6%		40.9%		39.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		49.9%	37.3%	37.5%	43.4%	47.6%	36.4%
Neutral/not sure	12.2%	10.4%		14.9%		8.9%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		12.7%	9.4%	14.7%	15.4%	19.0%	3.0%
Not Proud	4.8%	2.7%		6.2%		10.7%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		2.1%	2.8%	5.9%	6.6%	9.5%	12.1%
Not at all Proud	3.0%	3.3%		2.8%		1.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		1.4%	4.2%	2.2%	2.2%	.0%	.0%
X ² -age	X ² (8)=15.52,p=.05						
X ² -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- This item was the most positively rated item by the youth that completed the survey. In total, approximately 80% of the respondents answered either “very proud” (39.8%) or “somewhat proud” (40.1%) to this item. Very few respondents (7.8%) answered negatively.
- Younger youth (aged 12-15) had the highest ratings with over 80% answering either “very proud” or “somewhat proud”; they were also less likely than the youth in the other 2 age groupings to answer “not proud” or “not at all proud”.
- There were no gender differences found in the different age groups.

Table 9: How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Multicultural/diverse

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	42.4%	42.3%		43.3%		38.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		46.9%	39.7%	41.3%	45.1%	31.8%	42.4%
Somewhat Proud	32.5%	30.1%		34.7%		35.1%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		25.2%	33.5%	37.7%	33.0%	31.8%	39.4%
Neutral/not sure	18.3%	19.9%		17.5%		12.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20.3%	19.1%	18.1%	17.0%	22.7%	6.1%
Not Proud	3.6%	3.9%		2.5%		8.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		2.8%	4.8%	1.4%	33	13.6%	6.1%
Not at all Proud	3.2%	3.9%		2.1%		5.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		4.9%	2.9%	1.4%	1.6%	.0%	6.1%
X ² -age	ns						
X ² -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- Youth also rated the city’s multicultural and diverse nature very positively; in fact, this item had the highest proportion of youth reporting that they were “very proud” (42.4%). Approximately three-quarters of the youth answered either “somewhat proud” or “very proud”. Very few youth (6.8%) answered “not proud” or “not at all proud”.
- There were no statistically significant age differences in responses, nor were there gender differences within the age groups.

Table 10: How Proud of Mississauga’s ... City Council

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	27.6%	24.5%		29.2%		38.2%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		24.3%	24.9%	29.1%	30.1%	35.0%	39.4%
Somewhat Proud	30.0%	30.4%		31.7%		18.2%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		30.7%	30.6%	32.8%	31.1%	25.0%	15.2%
Neutral/not sure	34.1%	36.5%		32.3%		29.1%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		34.3%	37.8%	29.9%	33.9%	30.3%	30.3%
Not Proud	3.8%	3.3%		2.8%		12.7%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		3.6%	2.9%	3.7%	2.2%	10.0%	15.2%
Not at all Proud	4.5%	5.3%		4.0%		1.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		7.1%	3.8%	4.5%	2.7%	.0%	.0%
X ² -age	X ² (8)=22.07,p=.005						
X ² - gender	12-15: ns 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- The largest proportion of youth answered “neutral/not sure” for this item (34.1%). Slightly smaller proportions answered “somewhat proud” (30.0%) or “very proud” (27.6%).
- Older youth aged 20-24 were more likely to answer “very proud” (38.2%) than their younger counterparts; however, they were also more likely to answer “not proud” than the other 2 groups (12.7%).
- There were no gender differences found within the 3 age groups.

Table 11: How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Debt-free city government

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	31.1%	28.0%		32.8%		50.9%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		29.4%	26.9%	31.1%	34.6%	57.1%	50.0%
Somewhat Proud	24.3%	27.1%		22.8%		14.5%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		29.4%	26.0%	26.7%	20.1%	14.3%	15.6%
Neutral/not sure	36.6%	37.0%		37.8%		27.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		35.3%	38.0%	37.8%	38.5%	23.8%	28.1%
Not Proud	4.3%	4.0%		4.4%		5.5%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		2.9%	4.8%	3.7%	4.5%	4.8%	6.3%
Not at all Proud	3.0%	4.0%		2.2%		1.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		2.9%	4.3%	0.7%	2.2%	.0%	.0%
X^2 -age	$X^2(8)=15.40, p=.05$						
X^2 -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- Youth were also most likely to answer “neutral/not sure” (36.6%) on how proud they were that they had a debt-free city government. Again, however, the majority answered at least “somewhat proud” (55.4%). Less than 10% of the respondents (7.3%) answered “not proud” or “not at all proud”.
- Older youth were more likely than the younger 2 groups to answer “very proud” on this item; and less likely to answer “somewhat proud” or “neutral/not sure”.
- There were no gender differences found within the three age groups on this item.

Table 12: How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Education

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	32.4%	38.3%		27.7%		20.4%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		46.5%	32.7%	33.6%	23.1%	20.0%	21.9%
Somewhat Proud	45.8%	42.1%		49.5%		48.1%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		36.1%	46.3%	44.5%	59.4%	55.0%	43.8%
Neutral/not sure	10.3%	9.5%		11.1%		11.1%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		10.4%	8.9%	11.7%	10.4%	15.0%	9.4%
Not Proud	7.8%	6.3%		8.3%		14.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		4.2%	7.9%	6.6%	9.9%	10.0%	18.8%
Not at all Proud	3.7%	3.8%		3.4%		5.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		2.8%	4.2%	3.6%	2.2%	.0%	6.3%
X ² -age	X ² (8)=16.46,p=.04						
X ² -gender	12-15: X ² (4)=9.00, p=.06 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- This item also received a very high rating by the youth; 78.2% of the youth answered at least “somewhat proud”.
- Younger youth (ages 12-15) were more likely than the other 2 groups to answer “very proud”; and boys in that age range were more likely than girls to answer in this way (46.5% vs. 32.7%).

Table 13: How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Sports Activities

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	37.8%	47.3%		29.5%		24.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		53.8%	42.7%	32.6%	27.6%	27.3%	21.2%
Somewhat Proud	36.3%	33.2%		39.5%		38.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		30.3%	35.2%	41.3%	38.4%	45.5%	36.4%
Neutral/not sure	15.6%	13.3%		18.5%		14.0%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		11.7%	14.1%	13.0%	23.2%	9.1%	18.2%
Not Proud	7.8%	4.3%		7.4%		21.1%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		3.4%	5.2%	8.0%	10.8%	18.2%	24.2%
Not at all Proud	2.4%	1.9%		3.0%		1.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		0.7%	2.8%	5.1%	.0%	.0%	.0%
X^2 -age	$X^2(8)=43.12, p=.000$						
X^2 -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: $X^2(4)=15.20$, p=.00 20-24: ns						

- Similar proportions of youth answered this item either “very proud” (37.8%) or “somewhat proud” (36.3%). About 10% answered either “not proud” or “not at all proud”.
- Younger youth (aged 12-15) were more likely than youth in the other 2 age groups to answer “very proud”. Older youth (aged 20-24) were more likely than the younger youth in both groups to answer “not proud”.
- Female youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the male youth in that age group to answer “neutral/not sure” and were a little less likely to answer “very proud” or “somewhat proud”.

Table 14: How Proud of Mississauga’s ... Arts/culture activities

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	29.3%	36.8%		24.0%		12.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		29.5%	41.7%	21.0%	27.0%	13.6%	9.1%
Somewhat Proud	36.5%	35.1%		36.5%		45.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		41.1%	31.3%	32.6%	38.9%	50.0%	45.5%
Neutral/not sure	23.0%	19.3%		27.1%		22.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		21.9%	18.0%	33.3%	22.7%	22.7%	24.2%
Not Proud	7.7%	6.0%		8.5%		14.0%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		5.5%	6.2%	9.4%	8.1%	13.6%	15.2%
Not at all Proud	3.5%	2.7%		9.0%		5.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		2.1%	2.8%	3.6%	3.2%	0.0%	6.1%
X ² -age	X ² (8)=27.71,p=.001						
X ² -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- The largest majority of respondents felt “somewhat proud” (36.5%) of the city’s arts/culture activities; a further 29.3% were “very proud”. Almost one-quarter (23.0%) were “neutral/not sure”.
- Youth in the youngest age group were more likely to answer “very proud” than youth in the older 2 groups. They were also less likely to answer “not proud” or “not at all proud”. Oldest youth were less likely to answer “very proud” but more likely to answer “somewhat proud” and “not proud”, than the other 2 age groups.
- There were no gender differences found within the age groups.

Table 15: How Proud of Mississauga's ... Other activities available

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	38.7%	45.9%		34.7%		15.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		46.9%	45.0%	39.9%	30.8%	13.6%	19.2%
Somewhat Proud	37.2%	34.1%		39.3%		45.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		33.6%	34.6%	37.0%	42.3%	40.9%	6.0%
Neutral/not sure	15.5%	13.5%		17.2%		19.5%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		14.0%	13.3%	13.8%	19.2%	31.8%	1.6%
Not Proud	6.2%	4.1%		6.4%		17.5%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		2.8%	5.2%	7.2%	6.0%	13.6%	21.2%
Not at all Proud	2.4%	2.5%		2.8%		1.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		2.8%	1.9%	2.2%	1.6%	.0%	.0%
X ² -age	X ² (8)=33.07,p=.000						
X ² -gender	ns						

- Youth were also given the opportunity to rate how proud they were of Mississauga's "other" activities – and were given some examples (e.g., Playdium, RibFest, events/activities at the International Centre). Most rated these activities well – with almost equal proportions answering "very proud" (38.7%) or "somewhat proud" (37.2%). Less than 10% answered "not proud" or "not at all proud".
- Younger youth aged 12-15 were more likely than the other 2 age groups to answer "very proud"; older youth aged 20-24 were more likely to answer "somewhat proud", "neutral/not sure" or "not proud".
- There were no gender differences found in the 3 different age groups.

Table 16: How Proud of Mississauga's ... Other please specify

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Very Proud	22.3%	28.6%		18.8%		9.5%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		26.3%	29.1%	26.8%	12.3%	0	10.0%
Somewhat Proud	24.5%	28.6%		23.8%		9.5%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		36.8%	21.8%	22.0%	26.3%	22.2%	.0%
Neutral/not sure	34.5%	27.6%		38.6%		47.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		23.7%	32.7%	36.6%	42.1%	55.6%	50.0%
Not Proud	6.4%	2.0%		9.9%		9.5%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		0	3.6%	12.2%	8.8%	11.1%	10.0%
Not at all Proud	12.3%	13.3%		8.9%		23.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		13.2%	12.7%	2.4%	10.5%	11.1%	30.0%
X ² -age	X ² (8)=17.81,p=.02						
X ² -gender	ns						

- Respondents were also given the opportunity to rate other things of which they were proud in Mississauga – they provided the rating and then provided some open-ended comments. The open-ended comments only commented on things of which they were not proud. Nonetheless, in the rating of the “other” category, most respondents did NOT give a negative rating (only about 19%). Most rated these “other” things as “neutral/not sure” (34.5%).
- Older youth were more likely than younger youth in both age groups to answer “not proud at all” or “neutral/not sure”. The youngest age group was more likely to answer positively (“very proud” or “somewhat proud”).
- No gender differences were found in the age groups on this item.

Table 17: Participated in any of the following programs or activities

Activities	X2-age	X2-gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Organized sport program through Rec. and parks	$X^2(4)=10.37$, $p=.03$	12-15: $X^2(2)=19.97$, $p=.00$	55.2%	57.3%		55.6%		39.3%	
		16-19: $X^2(2)=5.77$, $p=.06$		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		71.4%	47.9%	61.6%	50.8%	42.9%	36.4%
Organized sport prog not through Rec. and parks	$X^2(4)=8.62$, $p=.07$	12-15: $X^2(2)=17.81$, $p=.00$	54.5%	52.1%		58.7%		45.6%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		65.7%	43.3%	61.6%	56.8%	45.5%	45.5%
Extra-curricular school-based sports	ns	12-15: ns	65.0%	66.2%		64.4%		60.7%	
		16-19: $X^2(2)=4.57$, $p=.10$		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: $X^2(3)=4.58$, $p=.10$		70.1%	63.8%	70.3%	60.5%	66.7%	57.6%
Art programs through Rec. and parks	$X^2(4)=14.58$, $p=.01$	12-15: $X^2(2)=5.22$, $p=.07$	38.3%	42.0%		36.7%		24.6%	
		16-19: $X^2(2)=10.73$, $p=.00$		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		35.9%	46.6%	26.3%	44.0%	9.1%	33.3%
Art programs not through Rec. or parks	ns	12-15: ns	37.0%	35.9%		37.5%		41.1%	
		16-19: $X^2(2)=10.40$, $p=.01$		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: $X^2(2)=6.32$, $p=.04$		33.6%	37.3%	27.7%	49.9%	23.8%	51.5%
Drop-in type activity at comm.. centre	ns	12-15: ns	69.3%	71.9%		67.4%		63.2%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		70.6%	73.4%	69.2%	70.3%	68.2%	60.6%
Drop-in activity not at a comm. centre	ns	12-15: ns	36.5%	37.6%		33.7%		45.6%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: $X^2(2)=6.22$, $p=.04$		38.9%	36.6%	36.5%	31.1%	31.8%	54.5%
Extra-	ns	12-15:	64.	66.8%		63.4%		60.7%	

Activities	X2-age	X2-gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
curricular school based clubs		$\chi^2(2)=8.39$, p=.01	8%						
		16-19: $\chi^2(2)=5.58$, p=.06		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		57.9 %	72.6%	57.0%	67.9%	50.0%	68.8%
Used or gone to a library	ns	12-15: $\chi^2(2)=6.33$, p=.04	85.8%	84.7%		87.5%		83.6%	
		16-19: $\chi^2(2)=5.90$, p=.05		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		79.6 %	88.8%	82.5%	91.3%	76.2%	90.6%
Environmental programs	$\chi^2(4)=17.39$,p=.00	12-15: ns	17.7%	17.7%		17.9%		8.9%	
		16-19: $\chi^2(2)=6.94$, p=.03		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		20.8 %	19.9%	22.5%	12.4%	9.5%	6.1%
Volunteered in your community	$\chi^2(4)=30.15$,p=.00	12-15: ns	66.2%	56.9%		75.4%		73.2%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: $\chi^2(2)=5.94$, p=.05		51.7 %	59.6%	70.1%	79.1%	57.1%	84.8%
Advisory activities	ns	12-15: ns	25.5%	22.9%		27.9%		28.1%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		25.7 %	21.1%	32.4%	23.9%	22.7%	30.3%
Cultural or religious-based prog/activities	ns	12-15: ns	47.4%	49.6%		45.5%		43.9%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: $\chi^2(2)=8.33$, p=.01		47.6 %	51.2%	45.9%	45.6%	22.7%	57.6%
Other comm. based programs or activities	$\chi^2(4)=8.97$, p=.06	12-15: $\chi^2(2)=10.32$, p=.00	21.5%	22.9%		18.5%		30.2%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		28.5 %	18.8%	20.7%	15.0%	23.8%	33.3%

- One-half or more of the youth that responded to the survey had gone to a library (85.8%), volunteered in their community (66.2%), and participated in a drop-in activity at a community centre (69.3%), extra-curricular school-based sports (65.0%), extra-curricular school-based clubs (64.8%), organized sport through Recreation and Parks (55.2%), and organized sport not through Recreation and Parks (54.5%).
- There were some age differences in participation levels: younger youth aged 12-15 and 16-19 were more likely than older youth to have participating in organized sport either through Recreation and Parks, or outside of Recreation and Parks.

- Boys were more likely than girls, in both ages 12-15 and 16-19, to have participated in organized sport – either through Recreation and Parks, or outside of Recreation and Parks.
- Younger youth aged 12-15, and to a lesser extent those aged 16-19, were more likely than older youth to have participated in arts programs through Recreation and Parks. Girls were more likely than boys in both the younger age groups to have participated in these activities. Female youth were also more likely than male youth in both older age groups (16-19 and 20-24) to have participated in arts activities outside of Recreation and Parks.
- Young women aged 20-24 were more likely than their male counterparts to have participated in a drop-in activity outside of Recreation and Parks.
- Female youth aged 12-15 and 16-19 were more likely than male youth to have participated in school-based clubs and to have gone to a library.
- Male youth aged 16-19 were more likely than female youth in that same age range to have participated in environmental programs.
- Young women aged 20-24 were more likely than their male counterparts to have volunteered in their community or to have participated in cultural or religious-based programs or activities.
- Boys aged 12-15 were more likely than girls in that same age range to have participated in other community based programs or activities.

Table 18: Do you think Mississauga had enough of the following (those answering “no”)

Places	X ² -age	X ² -gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Public parks	ns	12-15: X ² (2)=4.94 , p=.08	39.8 %	37.1%		40.6%		52.6%	
		16-19: X ² (2)=5.59 , p=.06		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		30.3%	40.9 %	33.1 %	46.2 %	50.0 %	54.5 %
Indoor ice skating rink	ns	12-15: ns	37.7 %	39.6%		36.0%		35.1%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		33.8%	43.3 %	31.6 %	39.1 %	40.9 %	30.3 %
Outdoor skating rinks	ns	12-15: ns	53.5 %	53.9%		54.5%		45.6%	
		16-19: X ² (2)=10.19, p=.01		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		49.7%	56.3 %	44.9 %	62.5 %	54.5 %	39.4 %
Skateboard parks	X ² (4)=8.87, p=.06	12-15: ns	46.7 %	49.1%		42.2%		57.9%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		47.6%	49.8 %	40.4 %	42.9 %	50.0 %	63.6 %
Extreme sports parks/locations	ns	12-15: ns	59.8 %	58.5%		60.0%		66.7%	
		16-19: X ² (2)=5.51 , p=.06		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		55.2%	60.5 %	52.2 %	65.2 %	59.1 %	72.7 %
Indoor swimming pools	X ² (4)=8.92, p=.06	12-15: ns	24.4 %	24.9%		24.0%		22.8%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		22.8%	25.1 %	23.5 %	23.9 %	9.1% %	30.3 %
Outdoor swimming pools	ns	12-15: ns	46.2 %	44.4%		48.9%		42.1%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		40.0%	47.0 %	47.8 %	44.5 %	31.8 %	4.8% %
Teen/youth centres or drop ins	ns	12-15: X ² (2)=9.59 , p=.01	41.4 %	37.4%		44.6%		41.4%	
		16-19: X ² (2)=6.97 , p=.03		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		27.6%	43.3 %	40.4 %	47.3 %	40.9 %	54.5 %

Places	X ² -age	X ² -gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Youth activities at community centres	X ² (4)=12.78, p=.01	12-15: X ² (2)=5.18, p=.07	32.4%	26.6%		36.9%		43.9%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		20.7%	30.7%	36.8%	35.9%	36.4%	48.5%
Basketball courts	X ² (4)=14.79, p=.00	12-15: ns	34.5%	30.4%		35.4%		56.1%	
		16-19: X ² (2)=5.94, p=.05		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (2)=5.48, p=.06		30.3%	30.2%	39.7%	32.1%	45.5%	63.6%
Baseball diamonds	ns	12-15: ns	31.2%	30.6%		31.4%		33.3%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		33.8%	28.4%	34.6%	28.8%	27.3%	36.4%
Volunteer opportunities	X ² (4)=8.93, p=.06	12-15: ns	35.6%	35.0%		34.2%		47.4%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (2)=6.76, p=.03		35.9%	33.5%	34.6%	33.7%	31.8%	57.6%
Advisory activities	X ² (4)=15.82, p=.00	12-15: ns	34.6%	30.6%		35.7%		54.4%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		29.7%	31.2%	32.4%	38.0%	40.9%	63.6%

- One-half or more of the youth responding to the survey felt that Mississauga did not have enough extreme sport parks/locations (59.8%) or outdoor skating rinks (53.5%).
- One-third or more of the youth felt that there were not enough skateboard parks (46.7%), outdoor swimming pools (46.2%), teen youth centres or drop-ins (41.4%), public parks/conservation areas (39.8%), indoor ice skating rinks or ice time (37.7%), volunteer opportunities (35.6%), advisory, planning or decision-making activities or opportunities (34.6%), and basketball courts (34.5%).
- Older youth (particularly female youth) were more likely to think that the city needed more skateboard and extreme sport parks/locations.
- Older youth were more likely than the other two age groups to answer “not sure” with respect to indoor swimming pools.
- Older youth aged 20-24, and to a lesser extent those aged 16-19, were more likely than the youngest youth to think the city did not have enough youth activities at community centres. Older youth (aged 20-24) were also more likely than the younger youth (aged 16-19 and 12-15) to think that the city did not have enough basketball courts, volunteer opportunities, or advisory, planning or decision-making activities or opportunities.
- Female youth aged 16-19 were more likely than male youth in that same age range to think that the city did not have enough outdoor skating rinks or extreme sports parks/locations.
- Female youth aged 12-15 and those aged 16-19 were also more likely than the male youth in those age ranges to think that the city did not have enough youth centres or drop-ins. Girls aged 12-15 were more likely than boys in that same age range to think that there were not enough youth activities at community centres.

- Male youth aged 16-19 were more likely than female youth that same age to report that the city did not have enough basketball courts.
- Young women aged 20-24 reported more frequently than young men that age that the city did not have enough volunteer opportunities.

Table 19: Do you think Mississauga should have more of the following for youth?

Programs	X ² -age	X ² -gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Employment programs	X ² (4)=33.01, p=.00	12-15: ns	73.5%	65.0%		81.8%		82.5%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (2)=5.27 p=.07		60.5%	68.2%	82.2%	82.1%	72.7%	90.9%
Apprenticeship Programs	X ² (4)=22.94, p=.00	12-15: ns	67.5%	60.7%		73.1%		80.7%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		58.5%	62.2%	74.8%	72.2%	72.7%	87.9%
Mentoring programs	X ² (4)=22.64, p=.00	12-15: ns	66.9%	60.2%		72.8%		77.2%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		56.5%	62.2%	69.6%	75.0%	77.3%	78.8%
Leadership training	X ² (4)=19.78, p=.00	12-15: ns	64.4%	59.1%		69.4%		70.2%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		53.7%	62.2%	68.9%	69.0%	68.2%	72.7%
Health programs	X ² (4)=13.74, p=.01	12-15: ns	63.3%	58.8%		65.7%		78.9%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		53.7%	60.8%	59.3%	70.1%	72.7%	84.8%
Parenting programs	X ² (4)=8.00, p=.09	12-15: ns	56.2%	52.9%		58.0%		66.7%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		47.6%	56.7%	55.6%	59.8%	72.7%	63.6%
Homework clubs	ns	12-15: ns	51.4%	49.5%		51.2%		64.9%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		45.6%	53.0%	48.9%	52.7%	77.3%	57.6%
Peer counseling programs	X ² (4)=10.44, p=.03	12-15: ns	56.7%	52.1%		59.9%		68.4%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		48.3%	55.3%	55.6%	63.0%	72.7%	66.7%

- Over one-half of the respondents reported that more of all the possible programs reported above were needed in Mississauga. Although there were age differences found, the largest proportions of youth in all three age groups felt that more Employment Programs were needed., followed by Apprenticeship Programs.
- All items but one in the table above (homework clubs) were rated differently by the 3 age groups. Where age difference were found the general pattern was that as age increased so did the proportions indicating that more programs were needed. That is, the youngest youth showed the smallest proportions and the older youth showed the highest proportions.
- There was only one gender difference found: female youth aged 20-24 were more likely than male youth in that same age range to think that more Employment Programs were needed.

Table 20: Where learn about opportunities, activities or resources available?

Where?	X ² -age	X ² -gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Friends or word-of-mouth	ns	12-15: X ² (1)=16.17 p=.00	80.4%	78.5%		83.3%		82.5%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=7.90 p=.00		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		68.2%	85.8%	77.0%	88.6%	77.3%	87.9%
School, college or university	X ² (2)=21.63, p=.00	12-15: ns	74.6%	79.3%		73.3%		50.0%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		83.1%	77.5%	71.2%	76.2%	54.5%	48.5%
City of Mississauga website	X ² (2)=6.35, p=.04	12-15: X ² (1)=2.32 p=.08	20.5%	17.8%		21.8%		31.6%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		20.3%	14.2%	21.6%	22.2%	40.9%	27.3%
Recreation and parks guide	ns	12-15: ns	26.3%	29.4%		27.0%		35.1%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		26.4%	22.5%	23.7%	29.2%	31.8%	36.4%
Local community newspaper	ns	12-15: ns	31.9%	34.2%		30.0%		28.1%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		33.8%	33.5%	28.8%	29.7%	40.9%	18.2%
Community or cultural organization	X ² (2)=8.36, p=.01	12-15: ns	15.1%	18.8%		11.5%		10.5%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		20.9%	16.1%	10.8%	11.9%	13.6%	9.1%
Community centres	X ² (2)=6.94, p=.03	12-15: ns	33.0%	37.1%		30.0%		22.8%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		40.5%	35.3%	32.4%	28.6%	22.7%	21.2%
Other	ns	12-15: ns	13.7%	14.9%		11.8%		17.5%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=52.66 p=.07		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		14.2%	15.6%	8.6%	14.6%	22.7%	12.1%

- By far, most youth learn about different opportunities, activities or resources available through their friends or word-of-mouth (80.4%) or through their schools/colleges/universities (74.6%).
- About one-third reported they also learn about different opportunities, activities or resources through the Community Centres (33.0%) or through the local community newspaper (31.9%).
- Older youth were less likely than the other 2 groups to learn about opportunities, activities or resources through schools/colleges/universities, and were more likely to use the City's website.
- Younger youth were more likely than the other 2 age groups to learn about opportunities, activities or resources through community or cultural organizations or through the Community Centres.

- Older youth, and the youngest youth, were more likely than those aged 16-19 to report “other” ways in which they learned about opportunities, activities or resources.
- Female youth in the youngest 2 age groups were more likely than the male youth to learn through friends or word-of-mouth.
- Male youth in the youngest age group were more likely than the female youth to use the City’s website.
- Female youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the male youth to cite “other” ways that they learned about opportunities, activities or resources.

Table 21: Do you think that you are aware of the various opportunities available to young people in Mississauga?

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Totally	11.2%	12.5%		9.8%		10.5%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		12.2%	12.8%	12.8%	7.6%	13.6%	6.1%
Somewhat	42.2%	40.3%		45.6%		35.1%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		46.3%	37.2%	48.2%	43.5%	50.0%	27.3%
A little bit	36.6%	34.4%		31.5%		40.4%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		32.0%	35.8%	27.7%	35.3%	22.7%	54.5%
Not at all	9.1%	8.5%		9.8%		8.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		5.4%	10.6%	8.0%	10.9%	9.5%	12.1%
Not sure	4.0%	4.3%		3.4%		5.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		4.1%	3.7%	3.6%	2.7%	9.1%	.0%
X ² -age	ns						
X ² -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: ns 20-24: X ² (4)=9.73,p=.04						

- Most youth (42.2%) felt that they were at least “somewhat” aware of the various opportunities available to young people in Mississauga. A slightly smaller proportion (36.6%) felt they were “a little bit” aware. Less than 10% (9.1%) thought that were “not at all” aware.
- There were no age differences in responses.
- There was one gender difference found: male youth aged 20-24 were more likely than female youth to think that they were either “somewhat” aware or “totally” aware of opportunities available to young people.

Table 22: Should the City of Mississauga do more to make youth more aware of the different opportunities available to them?

Response	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Yes	72.3%	70.6%		72.7%		80.7%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		67.6%	72.9%	62.6%	80.5%	68.2%	90.9%
No	10.5%	8.0%		13.3%		10.5%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		10.8%	6.4%	20.1%	7.6%	18.2%	3.0%
Not sure	17.3%	21.5%		13.9%		8.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		21.6%	20.6%	17.3%	11.9%	13.6%	6.1%
X ² -age	X ² (4)=13.96,p=.007						
X ² -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: X ² (2)=14.80, p=.00 20-24: X ² (2)=5.00, p=.08						

- Close to three-quarters of the youth (72.3%) felt that the City should do more to make youth more aware of the different opportunities available to them.
- Older youth (20-24) were more a little more likely to answer “yes” and younger youth were a little more likely to answer “not sure”.
- In both the 16-19 and 20-24 age ranges there were gender differences: in both groups the female youth were more likely than the male youth to answer “yes”.

Table 23: Have any of the following possible barriers prevented you from participating in activities that are available to youth?

Barriers	X ² -age	X ² -gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Locations too far away	ns	12-15: ns	71.6 %	68.4%		75.2%		71.9%	
		16-19: X ² (2)=10.20,p=.01		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (2)=14.38,p=.00		66.4%	70.0 %	66.2 %	81.1 %	45.5 %	90.9 %
Lack of transportation	X ² (4)=19.77, p=.00	12-15: X ² (2)=6.54,p=.04	66.4 %	60.4%		72.1%		71.9%	
		16-19: X ² (2)=8.23,p=.02		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		53.4%	65.9 %	63.3 %	77.8 %	63.6 %	78.8 %
Not feeling welcomed by staff	ns	12-15: ns	34.7 %	34.0%		35.2%		36.8%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		30.8%	35.9 %	32.4 %	36.2 %	22.7 %	45.5 %
Not feeling welcomed by other part.	ns	12-15: X ² (2)=6.30,p=.04	36.8 %	37.7%		35.5%		38.6%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (2)=5.91,p=.05		39.2%	40.6 %	33.1 %	36.8 %	22.7 %	48.5 %
Not feeling safe	ns	12-15: ns	28.5 %	30.7%		27.0%		22.8%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		31.5%	30.0 %	30.2 %	23.2 %	18.2 %	24.2 %
Hours are not convenient	ns	12-15: ns	58.9 %	54.3%		62.7%		66.7%	
		16-19: X ² (2)=7.88,p=.02		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (2)=5.39,p=.06		47.9%	57.6 %	54.0 %	69.2 %	50.0 %	78.8 %
Cost was too much	ns	12-15: ns	60.3 %	61.0%		60.6%		54.4%	
		16-19: X ² (2)=10.87,p=.00		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (2)=7.64,p=.02		57.5%	64.1 %	50.4 %	68.1 %	31.8 %	69.7 %
Not aware of programs	ns	12-15: X ² (2)=7.69,p=.02	65.6 %	62.0%		68.5%		71.9%	

or activities		02							
		16-19: $X^2(2)=10.39, p=.01$		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: $X^2(2)=14.03, p=.00$		53.4%	67.7%	58.3%	75.1%	45.5%	90.9%
Not allowed to go	$X^2(4)=13.28, p=.01$	12-15: ns	35.9%	49.4%		32.4%		26.3%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		40.4%	41.0%	35.3%	29.7%	27.3%	29.2%
Reputation of neighborhood or facility	$X^2(4)=21.84, p=.01$	12-15: ns	31.4%	29.9%		33.1%		31.6%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		29.5%	30.0%	34.5%	31.4%	27.3%	33.3%

- More than one-half of the youth felt that the following barriers prevented them from participating: locations too far away (71.6%), lack of transportation (66.4%), not aware of programs/activities (65.6%), cost was too much (60.3%), and hours were not convenient (58.9%).
- Approximately one-third or more felt that not feeling welcomed by other participants (36.8%), not feeling welcomed by staff (34.7%), not being allowed to go (35.9%) and the reputation of the neighbourhood or facility were barriers as well. Less than one-third (28.5%) felt that not being safe was a barrier.
- Older youth were more likely than the younger 2 age groups to cite lack of transportation as a barrier. Younger youth were more likely to indicated that “not allowed to go” was a barrier and they were more likely to answer “not sure” about the reputation of the neighbourhood/facility as a barrier.
- There were gender differences found in some of the barriers listed. And in each case it was the females answering “yes” more frequently than the males. Locations too far away, lack of transportation, not feeling welcomed by other staff, hours not convenient, cost too prohibitive, and not being aware of programs or activities were all barriers where female youth were more likely than male youth to answer “yes”.

Table 24: What is longest time willing to travel to participate in programs and/or activities?

Time	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
15 minutes or less	31.9%	31.8%		31.8%		31.9%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		23.9%	37.5%	28.4%	35.1%	22.7%	39.4%
15-30 minutes	39.5%	35.0%		43.2%		47.4%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		30.3%	38.0%	46.3%	40.5%	59.5%	45.5%
30-45 minutes	13.6%	13.7%		13.6%		12.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		18.6%	10.6%	11.2%	15.7%	13.6%	12.1%
45 minutes or more	15.0%	19.4%		11.4%		7.0%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		27.6%	13.9%	19.2%	8.6%	9.1%	3.0%
X ² -age	X ² (6)=13.98,p=.03						
X ² -gender	12-15: X ² (3)=19.20, p=.00 16-19: ns 20-24: ns						

- The majority of youth (39.5%) answered that they would be willing to travel 15-30 minutes to participate in programs and activities, and this was followed by “15 minutes or less” for 31.9% of the youth.
- Older youth (20-24) and youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the younger youth to answer “15-30 minutes”. However, younger youth were more likely than the other 2 age groups to answer “45 minutes or more”.
- Female youth in all three age categories were more likely than their male counterparts to answer “15 minutes or less” and less likely to answer “15-30 minutes” or “45 minutes or more”.

Table 25: Do you think that the youth have a say in this city?

Time	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Totally	14.0%	14.7%		12.0%		21.1%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		17.7%	12.4%	15.3%	8.7%	18.2%	21.2%
Somewhat	23.2%	24.3%		24.2%		10.5%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		21.8%	25.8%	28.5%	20.8%	18.2%	6.1%
A little bit	26.6%	24.1%		29.8%		24.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20.4%	27.2%	27.7%	31.1%	22.7%	27.3%
Not at all	29.3%	28.1%		29.1%		38.6%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		19.3%	27.2%	21.2%	36.1%	31.8%	45.5%
Not sure	6.9%	8.8%		4.9%		5.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		10.9%	7.4%	7.1%	3.3%	9.1%	.0%
X ² -age	X ² (8)=15.62, p=.05						
X ² -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: X ² (4)=13.57, p=.01 20-24: ns						

- The majority of youth (29.3%) did not feel that youth had a say in the city; this was followed closely by those that answered “a little bit” (26.6%). A slightly smaller proportion (23.2%) answered “somewhat”.
- Older youth were more likely than the other 2 age groups to answer “not at all”; however, they were also more likely to answer “totally”. Responses from the other 2 age groups were very similar for each of the responses – the proportions for “somewhat”, “a little bit” and “not at all” were similar (at or around 25%).
- In the 16-19 age range, the male youth were more likely than the female youth to answer “totally” or “somewhat” and female youth were more likely to answer “not at all”.

Table 26: Would you like to have more say in how this city is run?

Time	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Yes	61.9%	58.4%		63.0%		78.9%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		59.7%	60.6%	58.3%	65.9%	68.2%	90.9%
No	15.4%	14.6%		16.4%		15.8%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		18.2%	11.5%	23.0%	11.9%	21.3%	6.1%
Not sure	22.6%	27.1%		20.6%		5.3%	
		M	F	M	F	M	F
		27.0%	28.0%	18.7%	22.2%	4.5%	3.0%
X ² -age	X ² (4)=15.32,p=.004						
X ² -gender	12-15: ns 16-19: X ² (2)=7.10, p=.03 20-24: X ² (2)=5.00, p=.08						

- The majority of youth (61.9%) did want to have more of a say in how the city was run. Older youth (20-24) were more likely to answer “yes” than the younger 2 groups, and less likely to answer “not sure”.
- Female youth in the older 2 age groups were more likely than the younger 2 age groups to answer “yes”.

Table 27: Which are/should be a priority for spending by the City of Mississauga, the region of Peel and/ or community?

Areas for spending money	X ² -age	X ² -gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
Housing	X ² (2)=8.40, p=.01	12-15: ns	30.9%	35.3%		25.5%		31.6%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		37.8%	34.9%	28.8%	22.7%	31.8%	30.3%
Public transit	X ² (2)=11.31, p=.00	12-15: ns	46.5%	40.3%		52.4%		52.6%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		37.2%	44.0%	51.1%	54.1%	50.0%	57.6%
Public parks	ns	12-15: X ² (1)=2.12, p=.09	23.7%	23.9%		22.1%		31.6%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		27.7%	21.1%	22.3%	21.6%	31.8%	30.3%
Community centres	ns	12-15: ns	26.8%	25.7%		26.4%		36.8%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		23.0%	27.1%	24.5%	28.1%	27.3%	45.5%
Sports	X ² (2)=7.83, p=.02	12-15: X ² (1)=28.17, p=.00	28.3%	29.2%		30.0%		12.3%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=32.82, p=.00		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: X ² (1)=6.98, p=.01		43.9%	18.3%	46.8%	17.3%	27.3%	3.0%
Environment	ns	12-15: ns	36.4%	38.5%		35.2%		29.8%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=2.51, p=.07		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		35.1%	41.3%	30.9%	39.5%	22.7%	33.3%
Support for non profit groups	X ² (2)=9.39, p=.01	12-15: X ² (1)=13.31, p=.00	20.2%	15.6%		24.5%		24.6%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=7.22, p=.05		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		6.8%	20.6%	17.3%	30.3%	22.7%	27.3%
Support for-profit groups	ns	12-15: X ² (1)=2.48, p=.1%0	4.5%	4.5%		4.8%		1.8%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		6.1%	2.8%	3.6%	4.9%	4.5%	0.0%
Support for businesses	ns	12-15: ns	12.0%	9.5%		14.5%		14.0%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=5.21, p=.02		M	F	M	F	M	F

Areas for spending money	X ² -age	X ² -gender	All	Ages 12-15		Ages 16-19		Ages 20-24	
		20-24: ns		8.8%	9.2%	9.4%	18.4%	9.1%	18.2%
Arts- music, dance, video	X ² (2)=7.53, p=.02	12-15: X ² (1)=9.89, p=.00	15.2%	17.8%		11.2%		21.1%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=2.11, p=.1%0		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		10.1%	22.9%	7.1%	13.0%	22.7%	21.2%
Arts-Painting, drawing, graphic arts	ns	12-15: X ² (1)=4.84, p=.02	8.0%	8.8%		6.7%		10.5%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		10.1%	22.9%	7.9%	13.0%	22.7%	21.2%
Arts-theatre/drama	ns	12-15: X ² (1)=5.23, p=.02	7.1%	7.2%		7.0%		7.0%	
		16-19: ns		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		4.7%	11.0%	5.0%	7.6%	4.5%	15.2%
Police	X ² (2)=5.08, p=.08	12-15: ns	13.4%	15.9%		11.5%		7.0%	
		16-19: X ² (1)=2.69, p=.07		M	F	M	F	M	F
		20-24: ns		19.6%	14.2%	15.1%	9.2%	4.5%	9.1%

- The most common response with respect to spending priorities was public transit (46.5%). This was followed by the environment (36.4%) and housing (30.9%).
- Approximately one-quarter of the respondents felt that sports (28.3%), community centres (26.8%), and public parks (23.7%) should be spending priorities.
- There were some age differences found in responses: youth in the older 2 age groups were more likely than younger youth to think that public transit should be a priority. Younger youth (12-15) and older youth (20-24) were more likely than the 16-19 year olds to think that housing should be a priority, and that “arts-music, dance, video” should be a priority. Youth in the younger 2 age groups were more likely than older youth to think that sports should be a priority, and youth in the older 2 groups were also more likely to think that support for non-profit groups should be a priority. Younger youth (12-15) were more likely than the older groups to think that spending money on police should be a priority.
- There were also some gender differences found in the age groups. With respect to public parks, male youth in the 12-15 age range were more likely than the female youth to think that this should be a priority. Male youth in each of the age groups were more likely than the female youth to think that sports should be a priority. Young women aged 16-19 were more likely than the young men to think that the environment should be a priority.
- Female youth aged 12-15 and 16-19 were more likely than the male youth in those age groups to think that support for non-profit groups and spending on the arts (music, dance, video) should be a priority; and female youth aged 12-15 were also more likely than the male youth to think that spending on other arts (both theatre/drama & painting, drawing, graphic arts) should also be a priority.
- Male youth aged 12-15 were more likely than the female youth to think that support for for-profit groups should be a priority. Female youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the male youth in that age range to think that support for businesses should be a priority.

- Finally, male youth aged 16-19 were more likely than the female youth that age to think that police spending should be a priority.

Analysis by Neighbourhood

Key questions from the survey were analyzed by ward. These included:

- How proud are you of ...?: youth rated various aspects of the city on a 5-point scale from “very proud” to “not at all proud”.
- Does Mississauga have enough of the following?: youth checked “yes”, “no” or “not sure” with respect to a list of different resources/activities/programs.
- Should Mississauga do more of the following?: youth checked “yes”, “no” or “not sure” with respect to a list of different programs and opportunities.
- Have any of the following possible barriers prevented you from participating in programs and activities available to you?: youth checked “yes”, “no” or “not sure” with respect to a list of possible barriers.
- Do you think that youth have a say in how the city is run?: youth answered on a 5-point scale from “totally” to “not at all”.
- Would you like to have more say in how the city is run?: youth answered “yes”, “no” or “not sure”.

It should be noted that the number of youth in each neighbourhood varied considerably:

Cawthra	N=14
Churchill Meadows	N=20
Clarkson	N=14
Cooksville	N=57
Courtney Park	N=39
Dixie	N=32
Erindale/South Common	N=53
Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills	N=32
Lorne Park	N=95
Malton	N=79
Meadowvale	N=13
Meadowvale Village	N=61
Mississauga Valley	N=13
Port Credit	N=37
River Grove	N=31
Streetsville	N=69
Hurontario ⁵	N=13
Other ⁶	N=45
Outside of Mississauga ⁷	N=19

⁵ Hurontario was a neighbourhood code developed by members of the youth team for the neighbourhood around Hurontario and between Burnhamthorpe & Bristol. Respondents who gave a closest intersection, rather than a neighbourhood, and lived in this general area were coded as “Hurontario”. The City Planning District of Hurontario has Highway 403 as the south and eastern boundary, Mavis on west, Matheson Blvd. E and Gateway on north.

⁶ Sometimes, given the lack of information provided by respondents, it was impossible to come up with neighbourhood code and these were coded as “other”.

⁷ Respondents’ answers from outside of Mississauga are not presented in the tables and information that follows.

Table 28: How Proud Are you of Mississauga's ... Housing by neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	7.1%	50.0%	28.6%	7.1%	7.1%
Churchill Meadows	30.0%	55.0%	15.0%	.0%	.0%
Clarkson	7.7%	61.5%	30.8%	.0%	.0%
Cooksville	23.6%	52.7%	18.2%	5.5%	.0%
Courtney Park	44.7%	44.7%	10.5%	.0%	.0%
Dixie	18.8%	65.6%	12.5%	3.1%	.0%
Erindale/South Common	22.6%	39.6%	20.8%	7.5%	9.4%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	34.4%	37.5%	21.9%	3.1%	3.1%
Lorne Park	21.1%	61.1%	12.2%	3.3%	2.2%
Malton	28.9%	40.8%	18.4%	9.2%	2.6%
Meadowvale	23.1%	69.2%	.0%	7.7%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	31.1%	54.1%	14.8%	.0%	.0%
Mississauga Valley	23.1%	61.5%	7.7%	7.7%	.0%
Port Credit	27.0%	48.6%	21.6%	2.7%	.0%
River Grove	26.7%	36.7%	23.3%	6.7%	6.7%
Streetsville	26.1%	52.2%	14.5%	2.9%	4.3%
Hurontario	38.5%	23.1%	30.8%	7.7%	.0%
Other	29.5%	50.0%	9.1%	6.8%	4.5%
$\chi^2(72)=109.11, p=.00$					

- There were differences found between the neighbourhoods ($\chi^2(72)=109.11, p=.00$) on youths' ratings of housing in the city.
- Approximately one-third or more of the youth in some neighbourhoods gave very high ratings ("very proud") to the housing including: Courtney Park (44.7%), Hurontario (38.5%), Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills (34.4%), Meadowvale Village (31.1%) and Churchill Meadows (30.0%).
- Fewer than 20% of youth from all of the neighbourhoods responded that they were "not proud" or "not at all proud" of the housing in the city. In fact, in some cases there were no youth that answered this item in this way (Churchill Meadows, Clarkson, Courtney Park, and Meadowvale Village).
- Approximately 15% of youth from the following neighbourhoods answered "not proud" or "not at all proud": Erindale/South Common (16.9%), Cawthra (14.2%), and River Grove (13.4%).

Table 29: How Proud Are you of Mississauga's ... Public parks/Conservation Areas by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	21.4%	42.9%	14.3%	14.3%	7.1%
Churchill Meadows	15.0%	70.0%	10.0%	.0%	5.0%
Clarkson	7.1%	42.9%	28.6%	7.1%	14.3%
Cooksville	9.1%	40.0%	29.1%	14.5%	7.3%
Courtney Park	28.2%	46.2%	20.5%	2.6%	2.6%
Dixie	29.0%	41.9%	16.1%	12.9%	.0%
Erindale/South Common	17.0%	39.6%	24.5%	9.4%	9.4%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	21.9%	53.1%	9.4%	12.5%	3.1%
Lorne Park	28.6%	47.3%	17.6%	4.4%	2.2%
Malton	21.3%	40.0%	26.7%	12.0%	.0%
Meadowvale	7.7%	53.8%	15.4%	23.1%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	30.0%	40.0%	23.3%	6.7%	.0%
Mississauga Valley	15.4%	38.5%	23.1%	23.1%	.0%
Port Credit	21.6%	48.6%	16.2%	10.8%	2.7%
River Grove	10.0%	50.0%	20.0%	13.3%	6.7%
Streetsville	13.0%	55.1%	17.4%	10.1%	4.3%
Hurontario	23.1%	30.8%	15.4%	30.8%	.0%
Other	20.5%	45.5%	25.0%	2.3%	6.8%
$\chi^2(72)=91.54, p=.06$					

- As noted in Table 28, some neighbourhoods had higher numbers of youth completing the survey than others.
- There were differences found between the neighbourhoods ($\chi^2(72)=91.54, p=.06$) of youth's ratings of the City's parks and conservation areas.
- In all neighbourhoods the majority of respondents answered "somewhat proud".
- The neighbourhoods where a large proportion (approximately two-thirds or more) of respondents answered positively (either very proud or somewhat proud) included: Churchill Meadows (85.0%), Lorne Park (75.9%), Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills (75.0%), Courtney Park (74.4%), Dixie (70.9%), Port Credit (70.2%), Meadowvale Village (70.0%), Streetsville (68.1%), and "other" (66.0%).
- Neighbourhoods with the poorest ratings (at least 20% answered "not proud" or "not at all proud") included: Hurontario (30.8%), Meadowvale (23.1%), Mississauga Valley (23.1%), Cawthra (21.4%), Clarkson (21.4%), and River Grove (20.0%).

Table 30: How Proud Are you of Mississauga's ... Public Transit by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	7.1%	28.6%	35.7%	14.3%	14.3%
Churchill Meadows	10.5%	42.1%	21.1%	15.8%	10.5%
Clarkson	.0%	50.0%	33.3%	8.3%	8.3%
Cooksville	11.8%	31.4%	23.5%	15.7%	17.6%
Courtney Park	16.7%	44.4%	19.4%	11.1%	8.3%
Dixie	12.9%	32.3%	12.9%	25.8%	16.1%
Erindale/South Common	13.5%	36.5%	26.9%	9.6%	13.5%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	12.5%	21.9%	40.6%	18.8%	6.3%
Lorne Park	27.8%	40.0%	17.8%	10.0%	4.4%
Malton	13.2%	23.7%	19.7%	21.1%	22.4%
Meadowvale	30.8%	.0%	38.5%	23.1%	7.7%
Meadowvale Village	18.3%	20.0%	35.0%	18.3%	8.3%
Mississauga Valley	7.7%	23.1%	23.1%	38.5%	7.7%
Port Credit	2.8%	36.1%	36.1%	19.4%	5.6%
River Grove	13.3%	26.7%	30.0%	23.3%	6.7%
Streetsville	10.1%	27.5%	27.5%	30.4%	4.3%
Hurontario	8.3%	8.3%	58.3%	8.3%	16.7%
Other	14.6%	31.7%	22.0%	24.4%	7.3%
$\chi^2(72)=109.61, p=.00$					

- There were differences found in response to the item about how proud youth were of the City's public transit system based upon the youth's neighbourhood ($\chi^2(72)=91.54, p=.06$).
- Most of the youth, in each of the neighbourhoods answered "somewhat proud" or "neutral/not sure" to how proud they were of Mississauga's public transit system.
- The neighbourhoods that had the most positive rating (50% or more answering "very proud" or "somewhat proud") included Lorne Park (67.8%), Courtney Park (61.1%), Churchill Meadows (52.6%), Clarkson (50.0%), and Erindale/South Common (50.0%).
- Youth from neighbourhoods with the poorest ratings (approximately one-third or more answering "not proud" or "not at all proud") included: Cooksville (33.3%), Dixie (41.9%), Malton (43.5%), Mississauga Valley (46.2%), River Grove (30.0%), Streetsville (34.7%), and "other" (31.7%).

Table 31: How Proud Are you of Mississauga's ... Community Centres by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/ not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	35.7%	64.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Churchill Meadows	30.0%	55.0%	10.0%	5.0%	.0%
Clarkson	14.3%	35.7%	35.7%	7.1%	7.1%
Cooksville	27.3%	41.8%	12.7%	16.4%	1.8%
Courtney Park	25.6%	43.6%	23.1%	2.6%	5.1%
Dixie	21.9%	59.4%	12.5%	6.3%	.0%
Erindale/South Common	20.8%	34.0%	34.0%	7.5%	3.8%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	32.3%	41.9%	22.6%	.0%	3.2%
Lorne Park	43.3%	50.0%	5.6%	1.1%	.0%
Malton	21.8%	44.9%	17.9%	12.8%	2.6%
Meadowvale	.0%	46.2%	38.5%	15.4%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	35.6%	37.3%	22.0%	5.1%	.0%
Mississauga Valley	15.4%	38.5%	15.4%	23.1%	7.7%
Port Credit	35.3%	29.4%	29.4%	5.9%	.0%
River Grove	19.4%	41.9%	25.8%	12.9%	.0%
Streetsville	20.3%	47.8%	24.6%	4.3%	2.9%
Hurontario	16.7%	50.0%	16.7%	8.3%	8.3%
Other	25.6%	51.2%	9.3%	7.0%	7.0%
$\chi^2(72)=115.87, p=.00$					

- There were differences found in response to the item about how proud youth were of the City's Community Centres based upon the youth's neighbourhood ($\chi^2(72)=115.87, p=.00$).
- Most of the youth, in each of the neighbourhoods answered "somewhat proud" to how proud they were of Mississauga's Community Centres.
- The neighbourhoods that had the most positive rating (approximately one-third or more answering "very proud") included Lorne Park (43.3%), Cawthra (35.7%), Meadowvale Village (35.6%), Port Credit (35.3%), Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills (32.3%), and Churchill Meadows (30.0%).
- Very few youth gave poor ratings. Neighbourhoods with 15% or more of youth responding "not proud" or "not at all proud" included Mississauga Valley (30.8%), Cooksville (18.2%), Meadowvale (15.4%), and Malton (15.4%).

Table 32: How Proud Are you of Mississauga's ... Environment in General by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/ not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	14.3%	71.4%	7.1%	7.1%	.0%
Churchill Meadows	45.0%	20.0%	25.0%	10.0%	.0%
Clarkson	21.4%	42.9%	35.7%	.0%	.0%
Cooksville	19.6%	44.6%	14.3%	16.1%	5.4%
Courtney Park	28.2%	38.5%	17.9%	10.3%	5.1%
Dixie	21.9%	34.4%	12.5%	21.9%	9.4%
Erindale/South Common	13.7%	43.1%	15.7%	23.5%	3.9%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	22.6%	61.3%	12.9%	.0%	3.2%
Lorne Park	21.1%	43.3%	25.6%	6.7%	3.3%
Malton	28.2%	37.2%	17.9%	9.0%	7.7%
Meadowvale	.0%	61.5%	30.8%	7.7%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	26.7%	45.0%	11.7%	15.0%	1.7%
Mississauga Valley	7.7%	53.8%	23.1%	15.4%	.0%
Port Credit	22.9%	45.7%	17.1%	14.3%	.0%
River Grove	20.7%	41.4%	20.7%	17.2%	.0%
Streetsville	11.6%	49.3%	27.5%	5.8%	5.8%
Hurontario	15.4%	23.1%	46.2%	15.4%	.0%
Other	11.6%	39.5%	23.3%	16.3%	9.3%
$\chi^2(72)=90.89, p=.07$					

- There were differences found in response to the item about how proud youth were of the environment in general based upon the youth's neighbourhood ($\chi^2(72)=90.89, p=.07$).
- With the exception of Churchill Meadows (where the majority of youth, 45.0%, answered "very proud") and Hurontario (where the majority of youth, 46.2%, answered "neutral/not sure"), most of the youth answered "somewhat proud" to how proud they were of Mississauga's environment in general.
- Twenty percent or more of the youth in the following neighbourhoods answered "not proud" or "not at all proud" to the item about the City's environment: Dixie (31.3%), Erindale/South Common (27.4%), Cooksville (21.5%) and "other" (25.6%).

Table 33: How Proud Are you of Mississauga's ... Shopping by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	46.2%	23.1%	15.4%	15.4%	.0%
Churchill Meadows	40.0%	45.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
Clarkson	57.1%	21.4%	14.3%	.0%	7.1%
Cooksville	37.5%	44.6%	8.9%	7.1%	1.8%
Courtney Park	39.5%	44.7%	10.5%	.0%	5.3%
Dixie	46.7%	30.0%	16.7%	.0%	6.7%
Erindale/South Common	31.4%	41.2%	17.6%	5.9%	3.9%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	25.8%	48.4%	12.9%	6.5%	6.5%
Lorne Park	40.4%	33.7%	14.6%	9.0%	2.2%
Malton	42.3%	44.9%	9.0%	2.6%	1.3%
Meadowvale	15.4%	53.8%	15.4%	.0%	15.4%
Meadowvale Village	43.3%	43.3%	10.0%	3.3%	.0%
Mississauga Valley	38.5%	38.5%	7.7%	15.4%	.0%
Port Credit	52.9%	35.3%	11.8%	.0%	.0%
River Grove	32.3%	41.9%	19.4%	6.5%	.0%
Streetsville	29.0%	53.6%	10.1%	4.3%	2.9%
Hurontario	25.0%	33.3%	41.7%	.0%	.0%
Other	46.5%	34.9%	7.0%	7.0%	4.7%
<i>Chi-square was ns</i>					

- There were no significant differences found between the neighbourhoods with respect to how youth responded to how proud they were of the City's shopping.
- This item was answered very positively with most youth answering "very proud" or "somewhat proud".
- Few youth answered "not proud" or "not at all proud" – with 15% or fewer of the youth answering in this way in all neighbourhoods.

Table 34: How Proud Are you Mississauga Being Multicultural/Diverse by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	42.9%	28.6%	14.3%	.0%	14.3%
Churchill Meadows	45.0%	40.0%	15.0%	.0%	.0%
Clarkson	42.9%	28.6%	28.6%	.0%	.0%
Cooksville	43.6%	30.9%	20.0%	1.8%	3.6%
Courtney Park	47.4%	28.9%	15.8%	2.6%	5.3%
Dixie	31.3%	37.5%	21.9%	6.3%	3.1%
Erindale/South Common	49.1%	26.4%	17.0%	5.7%	1.9%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	37.5%	37.5%	18.8%	3.1%	3.1%
Lorne Park	48.3%	33.7%	13.5%	1.1%	3.4%
Malton	37.2%	33.3%	23.1%	5.1%	1.3%
Meadowvale	53.8%	30.8%	.0%	7.7%	7.7%
Meadowvale Village	32.2%	42.4%	16.9%	6.8%	1.7%
Mississauga Valley	46.2%	23.1%	23.1%	7.7%	.0%
Port Credit	61.1%	27.8%	8.3%	2.8%	.0%
River Grove	41.4%	34.5%	17.2%	3.4%	3.4%
Streetsville	43.3%	34.3%	14.9%	3.0%	4.5%
Hurontario	16.7%	50.0%	25.0%	8.3%	.0%
Other	39.5%	25.6%	25.6%	2.3%	7.0%
<i>Chi-square was ns</i>					

- There were no significant differences found between the neighbourhoods with respect to how youth responded to how proud they were of the City's multicultural and diverse nature.
- This item was answered very positively with the highest proportion of youth in almost all of the neighbourhoods answering "very proud".
- Few youth answered "not proud" or "not at all proud"; 10% or fewer of youth in every neighbourhood but one answered in this way. The one exception was Meadowvale; where only a slightly higher proportion (approximately 15%) answered in this way.

Table 35: How Proud Are you of Mississauga's ... City Council by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	50.0%	14.3%	28.6%	7.1%	.0%
Churchill Meadows	30.0%	20.0%	45.0%	.0%	5.0%
Clarkson	42.9%	21.4%	35.7%	.0%	.0%
Cooksville	30.9%	18.2%	40.0%	5.5%	5.5%
Courtney Park	33.3%	30.8%	25.6%	2.6%	7.7%
Dixie	18.8%	31.3%	37.5%	3.1%	9.4%
Erindale/South Common	26.9%	25.0%	38.5%	7.7%	1.9%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	12.5%	46.9%	25.0%	6.3%	9.4%
Lorne Park	21.7%	42.2%	32.5%	2.4%	1.2%
Malton	30.7%	25.3%	34.7%	6.7%	2.7%
Meadowvale	38.5%	30.8%	23.1%	7.7%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	29.3%	29.3%	37.9%	.0%	3.4%
Mississauga Valley	30.8%	15.4%	38.5%	15.4%	.0%
Port Credit	47.1%	23.5%	20.6%	5.9%	2.9%
River Grove	13.3%	36.7%	40.0%	3.3%	6.7%
Streetsville	27.9%	32.4%	30.9%	2.9%	5.9%
Hurontario	23.1%	46.2%	23.1%	.0%	7.7%
Other	20.9%	32.6%	39.5%	.0%	7.0%
<i>Chi-square was ns</i>					

- There were no significant differences found between the neighbourhoods with respect to how youth responded to how proud they were of the City Council.
- This item was answered positively with some neighbourhoods having the majority of youth answering “very proud”, including: Cawthra (50.0%), Port Credit (47.1%), Clarkson (42.9%), Meadowvale (38.5%), and Courtney Park (33.3%).
- In some neighbourhoods the largest proportion of youth answered “somewhat proud”, including: Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills (46.9%), Lorne Park (42.2%), Hurontario (46.2%), and Streetsville (32.4%).
- In the remaining neighbourhoods (Churchill Meadows, Cooksville, Dixie, Erindale/South Common, Malton, Meadowvale Village, Mississauga Valley, River Grove, and “other”) the majority of youth answered “neutral/not sure”.
- Very few youth answered “not proud” or “not at all proud”; approximately 10% or fewer of youth in most neighbourhoods answered in this way.

Table 35: How Proud Are you of Mississauga's ... Debt-Free City by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	35.7%	28.6%	35.7%	.0%	.0%
Churchill Meadows	52.6%	5.3%	42.1%	.0%	.0%
Clarkson	42.9%	14.3%	42.9%	.0%	.0%
Cooksville	36.4%	10.9%	47.3%	3.6%	1.8%
Courtney Park	28.2%	33.3%	28.2%	5.1%	5.1%
Dixie	29.0%	25.8%	38.7%	3.2%	3.2%
Erindale/South Common	28.0%	20.0%	40.0%	6.0%	6.0%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	30.0%	40.0%	20.0%	3.3%	6.7%
Lorne Park	28.9%	34.9%	30.1%	3.6%	2.4%
Malton	36.0%	28.0%	32.0%	4.0%	.0%
Meadowvale	30.8%	15.4%	46.2%	7.7%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	25.9%	24.1%	43.1%	6.9%	.0%
Mississauga Valley	46.2%	7.7%	38.5%	7.7%	.0%
Port Credit	45.7%	17.1%	31.4%	5.7%	.0%
River Grove	20.0%	23.3%	46.7%	6.7%	3.3%
Streetsville	26.1%	24.6%	39.1%	4.3%	5.8%
Hurontario	25.0%	33.3%	33.3%	.0%	8.3%
Other	37.2%	20.9%	30.2%	4.7%	7.0%
<i>Chi-square was ns</i>					

- There were no significant differences found between the neighbourhoods with respect to how youth responded to how proud they were of having a debt-free city.
- This item was answered positively with some neighbourhoods having the majority of youth answering “very proud”, including: Churchill Meadows (52.6%), Port Credit (45.7%), Mississauga Valley (46.2%), “other” (37.2%), and Malton (36.0%).
- In some neighbourhoods the largest proportion of youth answered “somewhat proud”, including: Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills (40.0%), Lorne Park (34.9%), and Courtney Park (33.3%).
- In other neighbourhoods the majority of youth answered “neutral/not sure”, including: Cooksville (47.3%), Dixie (38.7%), Erindale/South Common (40.0%), Meadowvale (46.2%), Meadowvale Village (43.1%), River Grove (46.7%), and Streetsville (39.1%).
- In the remaining neighbourhoods responses were split between two answers – either “very proud” and “neutral/not sure” (Cawthra, Clarkson) or “somewhat proud” and “neutral/not sure” (Hurontario).
- Very few youth answered “not proud” or “not at all proud”; approximately 10% or fewer of youth in most neighbourhoods answered in this way.

Table 36: How Proud Are you of Mississauga's ... Education by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	46.2%	46.2%	7.7%	.0%	.0%
Churchill Meadows	45.0%	40.0%	15.0%	.0%	.0%
Clarkson	35.7%	21.4%	14.3%	28.6%	.0%
Cooksville	35.7%	39.3%	8.9%	7.1%	8.9%
Courtney Park	43.6%	46.2%	5.1%	2.6%	2.6%
Dixie	28.1%	46.9%	6.3%	15.6%	3.1%
Erindale/South Common	17.0%	47.2%	17.0%	11.3%	7.5%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	28.1%	46.9%	9.4%	12.5%	3.1%
Lorne Park	39.6%	44.0%	8.8%	4.4%	3.3%
Malton	33.3%	44.9%	14.1%	5.1%	2.6%
Meadowvale	15.4%	69.2%	7.7%	7.7%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	29.3%	56.9%	6.9%	6.9%	.0%
Mississauga Valley	15.4%	61.5%	7.7%	15.4%	.0%
Port Credit	31.4%	57.1%	5.7%	5.7%	.0%
River Grove	23.3%	56.7%	3.3%	13.3%	3.3%
Streetsville	31.8%	48.5%	6.1%	9.1%	4.5%
Hurontario	23.1%	38.5%	23.1%	15.4%	.0%
Other	34.9%	32.6%	14.0%	11.6%	7.0%
<i>Chi-square was ns</i>					

- There were no significant differences found between the neighbourhoods with respect to how youth responded to how proud they were of the City's education system.
- In all but two of the neighbourhoods, the majority of youth answered "somewhat proud" to this item. In Churchill Meadows and Clarkson, the majority of youth answered "very proud" (45.0% and 35.7%, respectively); in Cawthra the proportions of youth answering "very proud" or "somewhat proud" were the same (46.2%).
- The neighbourhoods that had the highest proportion of youth answering "not proud" or "not at all proud" included: Clarkson (28.6%), Erindale/South Common (18.8%), Dixie (18.7%), and "other" (18.6%). In all other neighbourhoods approximately 15% or fewer of the youth answered in this way.

Table 37: How Proud Are you of Mississauga's ... Sports Activities by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	28.6%	28.6%	21.4%	14.3%	7.1%
Churchill Meadows	45.0%	40.0%	10.0%	.0%	5.0%
Clarkson	57.1%	14.3%	21.4%	7.1%	.0%
Cooksville	35.7%	35.7%	16.1%	10.7%	1.8%
Courtney Park	38.5%	46.2%	12.8%	2.6%	.0%
Dixie	31.3%	40.6%	12.5%	15.6%	.0%
Erindale/South Common	22.6%	47.2%	9.4%	18.9%	1.9%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	37.5%	40.6%	15.6%	3.1%	3.1%
Lorne Park	44.0%	33.0%	12.1%	8.8%	2.2%
Malton	35.4%	32.9%	22.8%	8.9%	.0%
Meadowvale	33.3%	50.0%	8.3%	8.3%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	31.7%	41.7%	16.7%	6.7%	3.3%
Mississauga Valley	23.1%	46.2%	7.7%	23.1%	.0%
Port Credit	44.4%	27.8%	19.4%	8.3%	.0%
River Grove	33.3%	36.7%	23.3%	3.3%	3.3%
Streetsville	42.0%	31.9%	18.8%	4.3%	2.9%
Hurontario	30.8%	38.5%	15.4%	15.4%	.0%
Other	37.2%	37.2%	18.6%	4.7%	2.3%
<i>Chi-square was ns</i>					

- There were no significant differences found between the neighbourhoods with respect to how youth responded to how proud they were of the City's sports activities.
- In some of the neighbourhoods, the majority of youth answered "very proud" to this item, including: Clarkson (57.1%), Churchill Meadows (45.0%), Port Credit (44.4%), Lorne Park (44.0%), Streetsville (42.0%), and Malton (35.4%). In three neighbourhoods (Cawthra, Cooksville, and "other"), the proportions of youth answering "very proud" and "somewhat proud" were the same (28.6%, 35.7% and 37.2%, respectively).
- Although the differences were not significant, as reported above, there were a few neighbourhoods where youth seemed more likely to have responded "not proud" or "not at all proud", including: Mississauga Valley (23.1%), Cawthra (21.4%), and Erindale/South Common (20.8%). In all other neighbourhoods approximately 15% or fewer youth answered in this way.

Table 38: How Proud Are you of Mississauga's ... Arts/Culture Activities by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	very proud	somewhat proud	neutral/not sure	not proud	not at all proud
Cawthra	35.7%	28.6%	21.4%	14.3%	.0%
Churchill Meadows	50.0%	25.0%	20.0%	5.0%	.0%
Clarkson	21.4%	28.6%	42.9%	7.1%	.0%
Cooksville	32.1%	28.6%	28.6%	10.7%	.0%
Courtney Park	28.9%	42.1%	23.7%	2.6%	2.6%
Dixie	37.5%	25.0%	25.0%	9.4%	3.1%
Erindale/South Common	24.5%	35.8%	24.5%	13.2%	1.9%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	25.0%	43.8%	9.4%	12.5%	9.4%
Lorne Park	34.1%	41.8%	15.4%	7.7%	1.1%
Malton	19.2%	38.5%	28.2%	7.7%	6.4%
Meadowvale	15.4%	61.5%	15.4%	7.7%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	33.3%	40.0%	18.3%	5.0%	3.3%
Mississauga Valley	23.1%	53.8%	15.4%	7.7%	.0%
Port Credit	30.6%	36.1%	27.8%	5.6%	.0%
River Grove	23.3%	23.3%	36.7%	10.0%	6.7%
Streetsville	26.1%	40.6%	21.7%	7.2%	4.3%
Hurontario	7.7%	53.8%	23.1%	7.7%	7.7%
Other	34.9%	32.6%	25.6%	2.3%	4.7%
<i>Chi-square was ns</i>					

- There were no significant differences found between the neighbourhoods with respect to how youth responded to how proud they were of the City's arts/culture activities.
- In most neighbourhoods the majority of youth answered "somewhat proud", including: Meadowvale (61.5%), Mississauga Valley (53.8%), Hurontario (53.8%), Courtney Park (42.1%), Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills (43.8%), Lorne park (41.8%), Streetsville (40.6%), Meadowvale Village (40.0%), Malton (38.5%), and Erindale/South Common (35.8%).
- In several of the neighbourhoods, the majority of youth answered "very proud" to this item, including: Churchill Meadows (50.0%), Dixie (37.5%), Cooksville (32.1%) and "other" (34.9%).
- Although the differences were not significant, as reported above, there were a couple of neighbourhoods where youth seemed more likely to have responded "not proud" or "not at all proud", including: Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills (21.9%) and River Grove (16.7%). In all other neighbourhoods approximately 15% or fewer youth answered in this way.

Table 39: Do you think Mississauga had enough of the following (those answering “no”)? by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	Public parks	Indoor skating rink	Outdoor skating rinks	Skateboard parks	Extreme sports parks/ locations	Indoor pools	Outdoor pools	Youth centres or drop-ins	Youth activities at comm.. centres	Bball courts	Baseball diamonds	Volunteer Opportunities	Advisory, Planning, Decision-Making
Cawthra	42.9%	35.7%	35.7%	57.1%	71.4%	21.4%	50.0%	42.9%	21.4%	35.7%	35.7%	28.6%	35.7%
Churchill Meadows	20.0%	40.0%	55.0%	40.0%	60.0%	25.0%	25.0%	35.0%	30.0%	15.0%	25.0%	40.0%	25.0%
Clarkson	35.7%	35.7%	71.4%	35.7%	57.1%	7.1%	42.9%	35.7%	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	21.4%	50.0%
Cooksville	53.6%	35.7%	51.8%	50.0%	66.1%	30.4%	48.2%	46.4%	37.5%	30.4%	23.2%	35.7%	48.2%
Courtney Park	35.9%	38.5%	71.8%	48.7%	61.5%	33.3%	48.7%	41.0%	33.3%	43.6%	30.8%	20.5%	17.9%
Dixie	43.8%	37.5%	43.8%	43.8%	62.5%	25.0%	40.6%	56.3%	50.0%	37.5%	34.4%	34.4%	43.8%
Erindale/ South Common	41.5%	28.3%	37.7%	45.3%	58.5%	22.6%	41.5%	43.4%	45.3%	41.5%	35.8%	37.7%	39.6%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	43.8%	40.6%	59.4%	43.8%	62.5%	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	34.4%	50.0%	40.6%	40.6%	43.8%
Lorne Park	34.8%	40.2%	44.6%	46.7%	54.3%	28.3%	50.0%	29.3%	20.7%	26.1%	45.7%	38.0%	30.4%
Malton	36.8%	40.8%	59.2%	48.7%	63.2%	21.1%	55.3%	48.7%	38.2%	39.5%	34.2%	35.5%	31.6%
Meadowvale	30.8%	53.8%	69.2%	69.2%	84.6%	38.5%	76.9%	38.5%	46.2%	53.8%	23.1%	46.2%	61.5%
Meadowvale Village	26.7%	36.7%	60.0%	48.3%	56.7%	20.0%	43.3%	33.3%	25.0%	30.0%	23.3%	23.3%	23.3%
Mississauga Valley	53.8%	46.2%	92.3%	53.8%	46.2%	30.8%	61.5%	53.8%	30.8%	61.5%	30.8%	46.2%	30.8%
Port Credit	37.1%	34.3%	45.7%	42.9%	57.1%	17.1%	45.7%	37.1%	22.9%	25.7%	22.9%	31.4%	28.6%
River Grove	48.3%	27.6%	48.3%	48.3%	69.0%	24.1%	34.5%	41.4%	27.6%	34.5%	27.6%	48.3%	34.5%
Streetsville	45.6%	38.2%	63.2%	50.0%	61.8%	17.6%	38.2%	33.8%	27.9%	27.9%	27.9%	39.7%	36.8%
Hurontario	69.2%	61.5%	69.2%	61.5%	69.2%	38.5%	61.5%	69.2%	61.5%	53.8%	69.2%	46.2%	38.5%
Other	43.2%	34.1%	38.6%	50.0%	56.8%	29.5%	43.2%	40.9%	36.4%	38.6%	22.7%	38.6%	38.6%

Neighbourhood	Public parks	Indoor skating rink	Outdoor skating rinks	Skateboard parks	Extreme sports parks/locations	Indoor pools	Outdoor pools	Youth centres or drop-ins	Youth activities at comm. centres	Bball courts	Baseball diamonds	Volunteer Opportunities	Advisory, Planning, Decision-Making
Chi-square	$\chi^2(36)=47.65$, p=.09	ns	$\chi^2(36)=61.10$, p=.01	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	$\chi^2(36)=58.40$, p=.01	$\chi^2(36)=62.00$, p=.00	$\chi^2(36)=50.04$, p=.06	ns	ns

Table 39: Do you think Mississauga had enough of the following (those answering “no”)?: Notes

- When respondents were asked if Mississauga had enough of a variety of different resources and activities, there were some neighbourhood differences found across the items.
- With respect to public parks/conservation areas, outdoor skating rinks or skate time, youth activities at community centres, basketball courts, and baseball diamonds, there were differences across the neighbourhoods. For all other items there were no significant differences found.
- The neighbourhoods of Hurontario, Mississauga Valley and Cooksville had the highest proportions of youth answering that there were not enough public parks/conservation areas with 69.2%, 53.8%, and 53.6%, respectively, answering in this way. Only two neighbourhoods (Churchill Meadows and Meadowvale Village) had less than one-third of the youth indicating that more public parks were needed.
- The neighbourhoods of Hurontario, Dixie, Meadowvale, and Erindale/South Common had the highest proportions of youth answering that there were not enough youth activities at community centres with 61.5%, 50.0%, 46.2% and 45.3%, respectively, answering in this way. Four neighbourhoods (Meadowvale Village, Port Credit, Cawthra, Lorne Park, and Clarkson) had one-quarter or less of the youth indicating that there were not enough youth activities at community centres.
- Mississauga Valley, Meadowvale, Hurontario and Erin meadows/Central Erin Mills neighbourhoods were more likely to have youth that thought that there were not enough basketball courts with 61.5%, 53.8%, 53.8% and 50.0% responding in this way. These neighbourhoods were followed closely by Courtney Park (43.6%) and Erindale/South Common (41.5%). Two neighbourhoods – Churchill Meadows (15.0%) and Clarkson (14.3%) had the fewest youth responding that there were not enough basketball courts, while the remaining neighbourhoods had approximately 25%-40% of youth answering in this way.
- In most neighbourhoods approximately 25% or less of the youth felt that more baseball diamonds were needed; the neighbourhoods with the highest proportions answering this way included Hurontario (69.2%), Lorne Park (45.7%) and Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills (40.6%).

Table 40: Do you think Mississauga should have more of the following? by Neighbourhood

Neighbour-hood	Employment Programs	Apprenticeship Programs	Mentoring Programs	Leadership Training	Health Programs	Parenting Programs	Homework Clubs	Peer Counselling
Cawthra	57.1%	64.3%	71.4%	64.3%	57.1%	42.9%	42.9%	64.3%
Churchill Meadows	65.0%	50.0%	45.0%	55.0%	55.0%	50.0%	40.0%	55.0%
Clarkson	64.3%	78.6%	71.4%	78.6%	71.4%	50.0%	57.1%	50.0%
Cooksville	83.9%	71.4%	67.9%	62.5%	66.1%	67.9%	57.1%	64.3%
Courtney Park	71.8%	71.8%	61.5%	59.0%	51.3%	56.4%	38.5%	51.3%
Dixie	78.1%	81.3%	75.0%	68.8%	71.9%	62.5%	59.4%	62.5%
Erindale/ South Common	81.1%	67.9%	73.6%	64.2%	64.2%	52.8%	43.4%	56.6%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	75.0%	65.6%	71.9%	68.8%	59.4%	56.3%	53.1%	56.3%
Lorne Park	77.2%	72.8%	69.6%	69.6%	65.2%	56.5%	69.6%	55.4%
Malton	70.1%	67.5%	66.2%	67.5%	57.1%	62.3%	55.8%	54.5%
Meadowvale	76.9%	76.9%	61.5%	61.5%	76.9%	69.2%	53.8%	61.5%
Meadowvale Village	70.0%	66.7%	61.7%	58.3%	70.0%	51.7%	50.0%	60.0%
Mississauga Valley	84.6%	92.3%	84.6%	92.3%	92.3%	76.9%	69.2%	92.3%
Port Credit	77.8%	69.4%	77.8%	77.8%	72.2%	61.1%	58.3%	66.7%
River Grove	90.0%	73.3%	80.0%	73.3%	80.0%	63.3%	46.7%	60.0%
Streetsville	65.2%	62.3%	63.8%	60.9%	53.6%	47.8%	39.1%	52.2%
Hurontario	61.5%	42.9%	76.9%	61.5%	69.2%	69.2%	53.8%	69.2%
Other	61.4%	54.5%	52.3%	56.8%	59.1%	38.6%	31.8%	43.2%
Chi-square	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	$\chi^2(36)=65.44, p=.00$	ns

- The only significant difference found between neighbourhoods with respect to the question of whether Mississauga needs more of the following programs, was for the item “homework clubs” ($\chi^2(36)=65.44, p=.00$).
- While all of the neighbourhoods at least one-third of the respondents indicating that more homework clubs were needed, there were some neighbourhoods that one-half or more. These neighbourhoods included: Lorne Park (69.6%), Mississauga Valley (69.2%), Dixie (59.4%) Clarkson (57.1%), Cooksville (57.1%), Courtney Park (57.1%), Malton (55.8%), Hurontario (53.8%) and Meadowvale Village (50.0%).

Table 41: Have any of the possible barriers prevented you from participating in programs and activities?

Neighbourhood	Location too far	Lack of Transportation	Not Welcomed by Staff	Not Welcomed by Others	Not Feeling Safe	Hours Inconvenient	Cost Too Much	Not Aware	Not Allowed	Reputation of Neighbourhood
Cawthra	71.4%	71.4%	35.7%	35.7%	14.3%	57.1%	71.4%	64.3%	14.3%	21.4%
Churchill Meadows	65.0%	70.0%	10.0%	20.0%	5.0%	55.0%	30.0%	75.0%	35.0%	30.0%
Clarkson	78.6%	71.4%	28.6%	57.1%	28.6%	57.1%	50.0%	78.6%	14.3%	21.4%
Cooksville	71.4%	67.9%	35.7%	41.1%	17.9%	58.9%	66.1%	57.1%	41.1%	30.4%
Courtney Park	69.2%	61.5%	23.1%	25.6%	17.9%	53.8%	59.0%	56.4%	28.2%	30.8%
Dixie	78.1%	78.1%	31.3%	37.5%	25.0%	56.3%	71.9%	75.0%	40.6%	31.3%
Erindale/ South Common	82.7%	78.8%	44.2%	32.7%	30.8%	67.3%	67.3%	75.0%	26.9%	21.2%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	71.9%	68.8%	40.6%	40.6%	28.1%	68.8%	62.5%	81.3%	25.0%	37.5%
Lorne Park	70.2%	57.4%	47.9%	48.9%	44.7%	55.3%	59.6%	52.1%	37.2%	43.6%
Malton	74.7%	69.6%	31.6%	32.9%	24.1%	57.0%	54.4%	72.2%	27.8%	31.6%
Meadowvale	92.3%	84.6%	46.2%	46.2%	61.5%	69.2%	84.6%	76.9%	23.1%	30.8%
Meadowvale Village	70.5%	60.7%	34.4%	39.3%	29.5%	50.8%	59.0%	68.9%	42.6%	36.1%
Mississauga Valley	69.2%	69.2%	53.8%	53.8%	23.1%	69.2%	76.9%	53.8%	46.2%	15.4%
Port Credit	62.2%	59.5%	27.0%	32.4%	21.6%	59.5%	40.5%	56.8%	37.8%	29.7%
River Grove	87.1%	71.0%	29.0%	35.5%	32.3%	80.6%	71.0%	83.9%	54.8%	29.0%
Streetsville	71.0%	68.1%	27.5%	31.9%	33.3%	71.0%	66.7%	68.1%	56.5%	36.2%
Hurontario	69.2%	92.3%	23.1%	46.2%	15.4%	46.2%	61.5%	92.3%	30.8%	30.8%
Other	60.0%	55.6%	31.1%	26.7%	24.4%	46.7%	55.6%	53.3%	33.3%	24.4%
Chi-square	ns	$\chi^2(36)=47.74,$ $p=.09$	$\chi^2(36)=49.53,$ $p=.07$	$\chi^2(36)=54.58,$ $p=.02$	$\chi^2(36)=57.60,$ $p=.01$	$\chi^2(36)=48.46,$ $p=.08$	$\chi^2(36)=47.71,$ $p=.09$	$\chi^2(36)=52.46,$ $p=.04$	$\chi^2(36)=56.37,$ $p=.02$	$\chi^2(36)=62.00,$ $p=.00$

- Significant neighbourhood differences were found for all of the barriers but one – location too far – for that barrier, the majority of youth from each of the neighbourhoods indicated that this had been a barrier to participation.
- Lack of transportation was also cited as a barrier for the majority of youth (50% or more) in each neighbourhood – but youth in some neighbourhoods were more likely to cite this as a barrier. These neighbourhoods include: Hurontario (92.3%), Meadowvale (84.6%), Erindale/South Common (78.8%) and Dixie (78.1%).
- With the exception of Mississauga Valley (53.8%), less than 50% of the youth in each of the neighbourhoods cited “not feeling welcomed by staff” as a barrier to participation. One-quarter or fewer of the youth in Churchill Meadows (10.0%), Courtney Park (23.1%) and Hurontario (23.1%) cited this as a barrier.
- With the exception of Clarkson (57.1%) and Mississauga Valley (53.8%), less than 50% of the youth in each of the neighbourhoods cited “not feeling welcomed by other participants” as a barrier to participation. The neighbourhoods of Churchill Meadows (20.0%), Courtney Park (25.6%) and “other” (26.7%) had the fewest youth reporting this as a barrier.
- With the exception of Meadowvale (61.5%) and Lorne Park (44.7%), one-third or fewer of the youth in each of the neighbourhoods cited “not feeling safe” as a barrier to participation. Churchill Meadows (5.0%) had a particularly small proportion of youth citing this as a barrier.
- With the exception of Hurontario (46.2%) and “other” (46.7%), more than 50% of youth in all other neighbourhoods cited inconvenient hours as a barrier to participation. This was a particular barrier for youth in River Grove (80.6%), Streetsville (71.0%), Mississauga Valley (69.2%), Meadowvale (69.2%), Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills (68.8%) and Erindale/South Common (67.3%).
- Cost was considered particularly prohibitive for youth in Meadowvale (84.6%), Mississauga Valley (76.9%), Cawthra (71.4%), River Grove (71.0%), Erindale/South Common (67.3%), Streetsville (66.7%) and Cooksville (66.1%) with approximately two-thirds or more of the youth citing this as a barrier. With the exception of Churchill Meadows (30.0%) and Port Credit (40.5%), at least 50% of youth in all the other neighbourhoods cited cost as a barrier to participation.
- The majority of youth (50% or more) in all of the neighbourhoods cited not being aware of programs and activities as a possible barrier to participation. This barrier was cited most frequently by youth in Hurontario (92.3%), River Grove (83.9%), Clarkson (78.6%), Meadowvale (76.9%), Dixie (75.0%), Churchill Meadows (75.0%), and Erindale/South Common (75.0%) – where at least three-quarters of youth felt this was a barrier.
- In only two neighbourhoods (Streetsville, 56.5% and River Grove, 54.8%) was there a majority of youth that reported not being allowed to participate (i.e., by a parent or guardian) as a barrier. This was cited by a barrier by at least one-third of the youth in Mississauga Valley (46.2%), Meadowvale Village (42.6%), Dixie (40.6%), Port Credit (37.8%), Lorne Park (37.2%), Churchill Meadows (35.0%) and “other” (33.3%).
- The reputation of the neighbourhood or facility was cited as barrier by less than 50% of the youth in all of the neighbourhoods. The neighbourhoods with the highest proportion of youth citing this as a barrier included: Lorne Park (43.6%), Erin Meadows/Central Erin Mills (37.5%), Streetsville (36.2%), and Meadowvale Village (36.1%). Mississauga Valley had the lowest proportion of youth citing this as a barrier (15.4%).

Table 42: Do you think youth have a say in how the city is run?

Neighbourhood	totally	somewhat	a little bit	not at all	not sure
Cawthra	28.6%	7.1%	28.6%	28.6%	7.1%
Churchill Meadows	15.0%	45.0%	25.0%	.0%	15.0%
Clarkson	7.1%	28.6%	14.3%	42.9%	7.1%
Cooksville	8.9%	25.0%	33.9%	28.6%	3.6%
Courtney Park	10.3%	10.3%	33.3%	33.3%	12.8%
Dixie	16.1%	29.0%	29.0%	25.8%	.0%
Erindale/South Common	11.3%	22.6%	13.2%	49.1%	3.8%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	23.3%	30.0%	16.7%	30.0%	.0%
Lorne Park	23.4%	31.9%	16.0%	22.3%	6.4%
Malton	10.3%	21.8%	28.2%	33.3%	6.4%
Meadowvale	15.4%	23.1%	7.7%	53.8%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	11.5%	23.0%	34.4%	18.0%	13.1%
Mississauga Valley	15.4%	15.4%	23.1%	38.5%	7.7%
Port Credit	13.5%	27.0%	29.7%	21.6%	8.1%
River Grove	9.7%	9.7%	41.9%	38.7%	.0%
Streetsville	11.6%	15.9%	29.0%	36.2%	7.2%
Hurontario	23.1%	15.4%	46.2%	7.7%	7.7%
Other	20.5%	22.7%	20.5%	25.0%	11.4%
$\chi^2(72) = 107.84, p = .00$					

- There were significant differences in how youth across the neighbourhoods answered the question “do you think youth have a say in how the city was run?”. The most positive responses came from Churchill Meadows (60.0%), Lorne Park (55.3%) Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills (53.3%) where over 50% of the youth answered “totally” or “somewhat”.
- The neighbourhoods with the highest proportions of youth answering “not at all” included Meadowvale (53.8%), Erindale/South Common (49.1%), Clarkson (42.9%), River Grove (38.7%), Mississauga Valley (38.5%), Streetsville (36.2%), Malton (33.3%) and Courtney Park (33.3%) where at least one-third of the youth responded in this way.

Table 43: Would you like to have more of a say in how the city is run? by Neighbourhood

Neighbourhood	yes	no	not sure
Cawthra	78.6%	7.1%	14.3%
Churchill Meadows	65.0%	25.0%	10.0%
Clarkson	42.9%	21.4%	35.7%
Cooksville	75.4%	10.5%	14.0%
Courtney Park	59.0%	12.8%	28.2%
Dixie	65.6%	21.9%	12.5%
Erindale/South Common	69.8%	11.3%	18.9%
Erin Meadows/ Central Erin Mills	46.9%	31.3%	21.9%
Lorne Park	54.7%	20.0%	25.3%
Malton	64.6%	15.2%	20.3%
Meadowvale	84.6%	15.4%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	54.1%	16.4%	29.5%
Mississauga Valley	69.2%	15.4%	15.4%
Port Credit	59.5%	8.1%	32.4%
River Grove	77.4%	3.2%	19.4%
Streetsville	63.8%	14.5%	21.7%
Hurontario	69.2%	.0%	30.8%
Other	46.7%	20.0%	33.3%
<i>Chi square was ns.</i>			

- There were no significant differences in how youth across the neighbourhoods answered the question “would you like to have more of a say in how the city was run?”.

Table 44: Which areas should be a priority for spending? (by Neighbourhood)

Neighbourhood	Housing	Public Transit	Public Parks/ Cons. Areas	Comm. Centres/ Rec Opp.	Sports/ Sport Opp.	Environment	Support for Non-Profit Grps Offering Youth Prog.	Support for For-Profit Grps Offering Youth Prog.	Support for Businesses Offering Youth Employ.	Arts-Music DanceVideo	Arts-Paint., Draw., Graph Arts	Arts – Theatre Drama	Police
Cawthra	28.6%	50.0%	42.9%	14.3%	7.1%	35.7%	28.6%	.0%	7.1%	21.4%	7.1%	14.3%	7.1%
Churchill Meadows	45.0%	55.0%	15.0%	35.0%	25.0%	30.0%	20.0%	5.0%	5.0%	10.0%	15.0%	5.0%	10.0%
Clarkson	7.1%	57.1%	28.6%	35.7%	21.4%	28.6%	21.4%	14.3%	.0%	14.3%	14.3%	21.4%	14.3%
Cooksville	31.6%	59.6%	26.3%	36.8%	17.5%	36.8%	24.6%	3.5%	14.0%	8.8%	3.5%	7.0%	17.5%
Courtney Park	33.3%	64.1%	28.2%	28.2%	25.6%	33.3%	10.3%	2.6%	7.7%	12.8%	5.1%	12.8%	15.4%
Dixie	18.8%	56.3%	25.0%	25.0%	15.6%	31.3%	21.9%	3.1%	9.4%	21.9%	.0%	9.4%	12.5%
Erindale/ S. Common	24.5%	54.7%	17.0%	26.4%	17.0%	30.2%	26.4%	3.8%	18.9%	18.9%	9.4%	5.7%	7.5%
Erin Mead. Central Erin Mills	34.4%	37.5%	18.8%	25.0%	34.4%	28.1%	28.1%	3.1%	18.8%	15.6%	9.4%	3.1%	6.3%
Lorne Park	4.0%	27.4%	22.1%	33.7%	34.7%	27.4%	12.6%	8.4%	8.4%	14.7%	5.3%	8.4%	21.1%
Malton	26.6%	50.6%	19.0%	25.3%	26.6%	40.5%	24.1%	2.5%	16.5%	11.4%	15.2%	7.6%	7.6%
Meadowvale	23.1%	46.2%	30.8%	15.4%	23.1%	53.8%	15.4%	7.7%	.0%	23.1%	15.4%	15.4%	.0%
Meadowvale Village	36.1%	34.4%	29.5%	26.2%	32.8%	47.5%	13.1%	1.6%	11.5%	19.7%	8.2%	4.9%	19.7%
Mississauga Valley	23.1%	30.8%	46.2%	38.5%	38.5%	38.5%	30.8%	7.7%	.0%	30.8%	.0%	7.7%	7.7%
Port Credit	27.0%	51.4%	18.9%	24.3%	43.2%	48.6%	13.5%	2.7%	10.8%	18.9%	2.7%	5.4%	8.1%
River Grove	25.8%	54.8%	12.9%	32.3%	19.4%	35.5%	25.8%	3.2%	19.4%	16.1%	16.1%	6.5%	9.7%
Streetsville	27.5%	40.6%	30.4%	15.9%	36.2%	44.9%	21.7%	7.2%	15.9%	14.5%	5.8%	5.8%	18.8%
Hurontario	53.8%	53.8%	15.4%	53.8%	15.4%	30.8%	23.1%	.0%	15.4%	7.7%	7.7%	.0%	23.1%

Neighbourhood	Housing	Public Transit	Public Parks/ Cons. Areas	Comm. Centres/ Rec Opp.	Sports/ Sport Opp.	Environment	Support for Non-Profit Grps Offering Youth Prog.	Support for For-Profit Grps Offering Youth Prog.	Support for Businesses Offering Youth Employ.	Arts-Music DanceVideo	Arts-Paint., Draw., Graph Arts	Arts – Theatre Drama	Police
Other	28.9%	48.9%	26.7%	15.6%	31.1%	31.1%	15.6%	6.7%	13.3%	8.9%	11.1%	4.4%	8.9%
Chi-square	ns	X ² (18)= 35.84, p=.01	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

- When asked about spending priorities for the City, the Region of Peel, and/or community organizations/foundations, only one neighbourhood difference was found: for spending on public transit. The majority of youth (50% or more) in the following communities recommended spending on public transit: Courtney Park (64.1%), Cooksville (59.6%), Clarkson (57.1%), Dixie (56.3%), Churchill Meadows (55.0%), River Grove (54.8%), Erindale/South Common (54.7%), Hurontario (53.8%), Port Credit (51.4%), Malton (50.6%), and Cawthra (50.0%).
- Less than one-third of the youth from Lorne Park (27.4%) and Mississauga Valley (30.8%) rated public transit as a spending priority.