



R

RESEARCH REPORT

EXAMINING THE HOUSING
CHOICES OF INDIVIDUALS WITH
DISABILITIES

**EXTERNAL
RESEARCH
PROGRAM**



HOME TO CANADIANS
Canada

CMHC—Home to Canadians

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) is home to Canadians. In everything we do, we help Canadians live in safe, secure homes. As the Government of Canada's national housing agency, we play a major role in Canada's housing industry. CMHC develops new ways to finance home purchases. We encourage innovation in housing design and technology. Our mortgage loan insurance helps Canadians realize their dream of owning a home.

Canadians benefit from our work with public, private and not-for-profit partners to improve the quality, accessibility and affordability of housing everywhere in Canada.

CMHC assistance helps low-income and older Canadians, people with disabilities and Aboriginals live in decent, affordable homes. We create jobs for Canadians with products and services that help the housing industry export its knowledge and skills to other countries.

CMHC's leading-edge research improves the quality and affordability of housing. To help Canadians benefit from our housing expertise and make informed decisions, CMHC has become Canada's largest publisher of housing information. We also have Canada's most comprehensive selection of information about homes and housing.

Canadians can easily access our information through retail outlets and CMHC's regional offices.

You can also reach us by phone at

1 800 668-2642 (outside Canada, (613) 748-2003)

by fax at (613) 748-4069

To reach us online, visit our home page at www.cmhc-schl.gc.ca

Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation supports the Government of Canada policy on access to information for people with disabilities. If you wish to obtain this publication in alternative formats, call 1 800 668-2642.

EXAMINING THE HOUSING CHOICES OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES



Prepared by
Janice Solomon

This study was managed by the City of Regina with advice and assistance from the Advisory Committee on Access and the Department of Sociology and Social Studies, University of Regina. It was carried out with the assistance of a financial contribution from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation under the terms of the External Research Program. The views expressed are those of the author and do not represent the official views of CMHC.

Abstract

Many individuals with disabilities are concerned about the limited types of housing options available for persons with disabilities. However, information on the living arrangements and housing preferences of individuals with disabilities is limited. To begin to understand the situation better, this exploratory survey research study examines the housing choices of persons with mobility and/or agility disabilities living in Regina. The study provides information on the current living arrangements of individuals with disabilities; determines if there are individuals that could benefit from more accessible housing; explains what the term “more accessible housing” means in Regina and develops a profile of those people that could benefit from more accessible housing.

Executive Summary

The Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) awarded the City of Regina, with assistance from the Department of Sociology and Social Studies, University of Regina and the Advisory Committee on Access, an external research grant to undertake a survey research study regarding the housing needs of persons with mobility and agility disabilities.

The study is an exploratory study. Its objectives are:

- to describe the current living arrangements of individuals with disabilities living in Regina;
- to determine if there are individuals living in Regina that could benefit from more accessible housing;
- to explain what the term “more accessible housing” means in Regina; and
- to develop a profile of those people that could benefit from more accessible housing.

The target population was individuals with disabilities aged 15 and over years with mobility and/or agility disabilities living in Regina. Respondents were located using a non-probability sampling technique. The questionnaires were developed with assistance from the community. Participation in the survey was voluntary. All interviews were completed in person. Respondents were asked a variety of questions about their current living arrangements, desire to move and housing preferences.

For this study, 215 individuals were interviewed, of which 191 lived in households and 24 in institutions. Eight individuals living in households were screened out during the interview, resulting in 183 individuals completing all sections of the households questionnaire.

The households population was made up of the following individuals:

- Approximately 65% (118) were female and 36% were male. In spite of the large number of females, 48% were seniors (aged 65 or more years) and 52% were non-seniors (aged 64 or less years).
- Approximately 54% (98) were aged 64 or less years, and 46% were aged 65 or more years. Because of the good distribution of seniors and non-seniors, age was considered regularly during the analysis.
- The majority of respondents had low total family income in 1999. Over 70% had incomes of less than \$35,000, and 26% had incomes of less than \$15,000.
- Main sources of income were pensions [46% (84)], and wages and salaries [21% (38)]. Approximately 9% (17) received social assistance.
- Approximately 87% used a mobility assistive device or technical aid to move around. Eighty-six respondents used a wheelchair.

Among the study’s main findings were:

1. Over 51% (98) of the households were living in single family detached dwellings. Other respondents were living in high-rise or low-rise apartments [25% (48)]; non-profit or

subsidized housing [5% (10)]; row houses or town houses [4% (7)] and in other dwelling types such as foster homes, cooperatives, assisted living care homes and retirement complexes [9% (17)]. Higher percentages of seniors (31%) than non-seniors (21%) were living in apartments. Additionally, as the age of the senior increased, the percentage living in apartments increased substantially.

2. The majority of respondents used specialized features to enter and leave, and inside their dwelling. The features ranged from accessible drop-off or pick-up zones [62% (113)]; accessible parking [59% (107)]; ramps or street-level entrances [54% (98)]; grab bars [72% (68)] and widened doorways [44% (41)] to lowered light switches [25% (23)] and sinks and counters [18% (17)]. However, 53% (97) reported that there were features inside their dwelling that they needed, but did not have. These included things as inexpensive as grab bars [16% (30)] and lever door handles [6% (10)] to more costly modifications such as lowered counters, sinks and switches [15% (27)], and widened doorways [14% (25)].
3. In spite of the need for additional specialized features, the majority of respondents were satisfied (either “very” or “somewhat”) with various features of their current living arrangement, including the level of privacy, the neighbourhood, and the inside and outside accessibility.
4. Among the 183 household respondents, 26% (48) wanted to move, 6% (10) was not sure and 68% (125) did not want to move. Age more so than income and other variables influenced a respondent’s desire to move. Approximately 88% (42) of the respondents wanting to move were aged 64 or less years. Close to 43% (42) of respondents aged 64 or less years wanted to move. This compares to 7% (6) among seniors.
5. Respondents aged 22 to 42 years were particularly interested in moving. Approximately 69% (20) of respondents aged 22 to 42 years wanted to move. Additionally, respondents living in low-rise apartments were more likely than respondents living in other types of dwellings to want to move. Among the 6 respondents aged 22 to 42 years living in low-rises, 5 wanted to move.
6. Accessibility inside and outside the dwelling and condition of the dwelling were strong motivators to move.
7. Respondents wanting to move indicated a number of reasons for not having moved. These included:
 - no suitable accommodations [78% (45)];
 - cannot afford other accommodations [59% (34)]; and
 - too costly to move [57% (33)].Most respondents wanting to move indicated that they would need assistance to move, especially help in finding accommodations.
8. Among the 58 respondents wanting to move/not sure about moving, the preferred types of dwellings were: single family detached dwelling [60% (35)], apartment [21% (12)] and row or townhouse [10% (6)]. Among the 12 respondents preferring an apartment, 8 individuals

were aged 22 to 42 years. Among the 20 individuals aged 22 to 42 years and wanting to move, 40% (8) preferred an apartment.

9. Among all 183 respondents, the preferred type of dwelling was influenced by whether the respondent was aged 64 or less years, or aged 65 or more years. For example, 74% (72) of non-seniors and 35% (30) of seniors preferred single family detached dwellings. A high percentage of seniors indicated that an apartment [42% (36)] was their preferred dwelling.
10. Among the 24 respondents living in institutions, most were satisfied with their current living arrangements. Five respondents wanted to move. Four of the respondents wanting to move were aged 45 to 52 years. One was aged 67 years. Two respondents preferred a single family detached dwelling. Two preferred an apartment. One preferred a dwelling with disability-related supports.

The findings suggest that the variable “age” needs to be considered closely when addressing the housing needs of individuals with disabilities. There are substantial differences between seniors and non-seniors in their levels of satisfaction with their current living arrangements, in their desire to locate to other accommodations, and in their preferred housing types. It is recommended that this finding be examined further in this study’s next steps and in future research studies. The findings also indicate that there are a substantial percentage of respondents living in housing, which they report has limitations. Many of these respondents, however, indicate no interest in locating and moving to other accommodations. Further research, including community consultation, might help to explain this finding. In addition, the findings suggest that information and resources such as accessible housing inventories, counselling and manuals are needed to assist people in their search for suitable accommodations and in their efforts to undertake modifications. Finally, it is recommended that these findings be shared with affected parties so that individuals with disabilities can add to the findings, and most importantly be an integral part of the planning process.

In conclusion, the findings suggest that the following program and policy options be considered further:

1. an enhanced Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program for Persons with Disabilities;
2. a more accommodating tax structure to address the added costs of disability;
3. adequate funding for community-based organizations to enable them to provide accurate information on accessible housing in a community and on making housing accessible; and
4. a course of action be developed after consultation with individuals with disabilities.

Résumé

La Société canadienne d'hypothèques et de logement (SCHL), avec la collaboration du département de sociologie et d'études sociales de l'université de Regina et du comité consultatif de cette ville sur l'accessibilité, a accordé une subvention à la Ville de Regina aux termes du Programme de subventions de recherche pour qu'elle entreprenne une étude sur les besoins en matière de logement des personnes à mobilité réduite.

Cette étude exploratoire avait pour objectifs :

- de décrire les modalités de vie de personnes handicapées habitant à Regina;
- de déterminer si des habitants de Regina pourraient tirer avantage de logements plus accessibles;
- d'expliquer ce que signifie l'expression « logements plus accessibles »;
- de tracer le profil des personnes qui pourraient bénéficier de logements plus accessibles.

La population ciblée est constituée des personnes à mobilité réduite âgées de 15 ans et plus vivant à Regina. On a trouvé les répondants au moyen d'une technique d'échantillonnage non probabiliste. Les questionnaires ont été rédigés avec l'aide de la collectivité. Les participants n'étaient pas obligés de répondre aux questions, et toutes les entrevues ont été réalisées en personne. On a posé aux répondants diverses questions concernant leurs modalités de vie actuelles, leur désir de déménager et leurs préférences en matière d'habitation.

Pour les besoins de cette étude, les chercheurs ont interrogé 215 personnes, parmi lesquelles 191 vivaient dans un ménage et 24 dans un établissement. Huit personnes vivant dans un ménage ont été retirées de l'échantillon au moment de l'entrevue. Par conséquent, ce sont 183 personnes qui ont rempli toutes les sections du questionnaire destiné aux personnes vivant dans un ménage.

L'échantillon des personnes vivant dans un ménage possède les caractéristiques suivantes :

- Environ 65 % (118) des personnes interrogées sont de sexe féminin et 36 % de sexe masculin. En dépit du grand nombre de femmes au sein de ce groupe, 48 % ont 65 ans et plus (aînés) et 52 % ont 64 ans ou moins (non-aînés).
- Quelque 54 % (98) de l'ensemble des répondants ont 64 ans ou moins et 46 % ont 65 ans ou plus. Étant donné la bonne répartition d'aînés et de non-aînés, l'âge a régulièrement été pris en considération lors de l'analyse.
- La majorité des répondants disposent d'un faible revenu familial total en 1999. Plus de 70 % ont un revenu inférieur à 35 000 \$, et 26 % ont un revenu de moins de 15 000 \$.
- Les principales sources de revenu sont les pensions [46 % (84)] et les salaires [21 % (38)]. Environ 9 % (17) des répondants reçoivent de l'aide sociale.
- Approximativement 87 % des personnes interrogées ont recours à un appareil d'aide à la mobilité ou à une aide technique pour se déplacer. Quatre-vingt-six répondants utilisent un fauteuil roulant.

Principales constatations de l'étude :

1. Plus de 51 % (98) des ménages occupent une maison individuelle isolée. Les autres répondants habitent dans une tour d'habitation ou un petit immeuble d'appartements [25 % (48)]; dans un logement sans but lucratif ou subventionné [5 % (10)]; dans une maison en rangée [4 % (7)]; dans un autre genre d'habitation comme un foyer d'accueil, une coopérative d'habitation, une résidence-services ou un complexe de retraite [9 % (17)]. Plus d'aînés (31 %) que de non-aînés (21 %) vivent en appartement. En outre, plus l'âge des aînés augmente, plus ils sont nombreux à vivre en appartement.
2. La majorité des répondants font appel à des aménagements spécialisés pour entrer et sortir, et pour se faciliter la tâche à l'intérieur de leur logement. Ces aménagements sont divers : aire de débarquement ou d'embarquement accessible [62 % (113)]; stationnement accessible [59 % (107)]; rampe d'accès ou entrée au niveau de la rue [54 % (98)]; barres d'appui [72 % (68)]; embrasures de porte élargies [44 % (41)]; interrupteurs d'éclairage [25 % (23)] évier et comptoirs abaissés [18 % (17)]. Cependant, 53 % (97) des répondants indiquent qu'ils auraient besoin de certains autres éléments chez eux, mais qu'ils ne les ont pas. Ils mentionnent par exemple des dispositifs aussi peu coûteux que des barres d'appui [16 % (30)] et des poignées de porte en bec de cane [6 % (10)], mais aussi des modifications coûteuses comme des comptoirs, des évier et des interrupteurs abaissés [15 % (27)] ainsi que des embrasures de porte élargies [14 % (25)].
3. Même si les personnes interrogées auraient besoin d'éléments spécialisés additionnels, la majorité des répondants sont satisfaits (soit « très » ou « assez » satisfaits) des diverses caractéristiques de leur logement, notamment au chapitre du niveau d'intimité, du quartier et de l'accessibilité intérieure et extérieure.
4. Parmi les 183 répondants vivant dans un ménage, 26 % (48) souhaitent déménager, 6 % (10) ne sont pas certains et 68 % (125) ne veulent pas déménager. L'âge plus que le revenu et d'autres variables influe sur le désir de quitter des répondants. Environ 88 % (42) des répondants qui veulent déménager ont 64 ans ou moins. Près de 43 % (42) des répondants âgés de 64 ans ou moins veulent déménager, par rapport à 7 % (6) pour les aînés.
5. Les répondants âgés de 22 à 42 ans sont particulièrement intéressés à déménager. Approximativement 69 % (20) des répondants âgés de 22 à 42 ans souhaitent trouver un autre logement. De plus, les répondants vivant dans des immeubles d'appartements de faible hauteur ont davantage tendance à vouloir déménager que les répondants occupant d'autres types d'habitation. Sur les 6 répondants âgés de 22 à 42 ans habitant dans un petit immeuble d'appartements, 5 veulent partir.
6. L'accessibilité à l'intérieur et à l'extérieur du logement et l'état de ce dernier constituent d'importants facteurs incitant les occupants à déménager.
7. Les répondants désireux de déménager donnent plusieurs raisons pour ne pas avoir changé de logement, notamment :

- inexistence de logements appropriés [78 % (45)]
- impossibilité de trouver un autre logement [59 % (34)]
- déménagement trop coûteux [57 % (33)]

La plupart des répondants souhaitant déménager disent avoir besoin d'aide pour le faire, surtout pour trouver un nouveau logement.

8. Parmi les 58 répondants qui souhaitent déménager ou qui ne sont pas sûrs de vouloir déménager, les logements préférés sont les suivants : maison individuelle isolée [60 % (35)], appartement [21 % (12)] et maison en rangée [10 % (6)]. Sur les 12 répondants préférant un appartement, 8 personnes ont entre 22 et 42 ans. Parmi les 20 personnes âgées entre 22 et 42 ans qui souhaitent déménager, 40 % (8) préfèrent un appartement.
9. Sur l'ensemble des 183 répondants, le style d'habitation préféré est déterminé par le fait que la personne a moins de 65 ans ou est âgée de 65 ans et plus. Ainsi, 74 % (72) des non-aînés et 35 % (30) des aînés préfèrent les maisons individuelles isolées. Un pourcentage élevé de personnes âgées affirment que l'appartement [42 % (36)] est leur logement de prédilection.
10. Sur les 24 répondants habitant en établissement, la plupart sont satisfaits de leurs modalités de vie. Cinq répondants souhaitent déménager, dont quatre sont âgés entre 45 et 52 ans, l'autre ayant 67 ans. Deux répondants préfèrent une maison individuelle isolée. Deux préfèrent un appartement. L'autre rechercherait plutôt une habitation avec éléments de soutien pour personnes handicapées.

L'étude a permis de constater que l'âge est une variable qui doit être examinée attentivement lorsqu'on cherche à combler les besoins des personnes handicapées en matière de logement. Il existe des différences substantielles entre les aînés et les non-aînés quant à leur niveau de satisfaction relativement à leurs modalités de vie actuelles, quant à leur désir de trouver un autre logement et quant au type d'habitation qu'ils préfèrent. On recommande d'étudier plus à fond cette constatation lors des prochaines étapes de cette étude et à l'occasion de recherches subséquentes. L'étude a aussi fait ressortir qu'un pourcentage substantiel de répondants habitent un logement qui, selon eux, imposent certaines restrictions. Bon nombre de ces répondants, toutefois, indiquent ne pas avoir l'intention de chercher un nouveau logement pour y emménager. De plus amples recherches, comme la consultation de la population, pourraient contribuer à expliquer cette découverte. De plus, les résultats de l'étude laissent entrevoir qu'il faudrait mettre à la disposition des gens de l'information et des ressources comme des répertoires, des conseils et des manuels sur les logements accessibles afin d'aider ces personnes dans leur recherche de logements convenables et dans leurs efforts pour procéder à des modifications. Enfin, on recommande que ces constatations soient transmises aux parties touchées de manière que les personnes handicapées puissent ajouter des éléments à ces résultats et, surtout, faire partie intégrante du processus de planification.

En conclusion, l'étude propose que les programmes et les possibilités d'action suivants soient envisagés :

1. améliorer le Programme d'aide à la remise en état des logements pour les personnes handicapées;
2. offrir une structure fiscale plus souple pour tenir compte des frais supplémentaires inhérents aux déficiences;
3. mieux financer les organismes communautaires afin de les aider à fournir des renseignements appropriés sur les logements accessibles d'une collectivité et à rendre les logements accessibles;
4. élaborer un train de mesures à la suite d'une consultation auprès des personnes handicapées.



AU COEUR DE L'HABITATION

Canada

Puisqu'on prévoit une demande restreinte pour ce document de recherche, seul le résumé a été traduit.

La SCHL fera traduire le document si la demande le justifie.

Pour nous aider à déterminer si la demande justifie que ce rapport soit traduit en français, veuillez remplir la partie ci-dessous et la retourner à l'adresse suivante :

Centre canadien de documentation sur l'habitation
Société canadienne d'hypothèques et de logement
700, chemin Montréal, bureau CI-200
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0P7

Titre du rapport: _____

Je préférerais que ce rapport soit disponible en français.

NOM _____

ADRESSE _____

rue

App.

ville

province

Code postal

No de téléphone () _____

An Examination of the Housing Choices of Individuals with Disabilities

Purpose of the Study

Many individuals with disabilities are concerned about the limited types of housing options available for persons with disabilities. However, information on the living arrangements and housing preferences of persons with disabilities is limited. To understand the situation better, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) awarded the City of Regina, with assistance from the Department of Sociology and Social Studies, University of Regina, an External Research Program grant to undertake a survey research study regarding the housing needs of persons with mobility and/or agility disabilities. The Advisory Committee on Access, a Committee made up of individuals with disabilities and mandated to undertake initiatives related to access, assisted with the study.

The survey research study is an exploratory study. Its objectives are:

- to describe the current living arrangements of persons with disabilities living in Regina;
- to determine if there are individuals with disabilities living in Regina that could benefit from more accessible housing;
- to explain what the term “more accessible housing” means in Regina; and
- to develop a profile of those people that could benefit from more accessible housing.

It is expected that the findings will be of interest to developers, governments and other affected parties prepared to consider the housing needs of a growing sector of the population. For example, in a multi-unit project the need and demand for the type of housing project being proposed must be well documented. The developer must identify the market they are addressing and demonstrate clearly that the current supply of housing does not meet the demand for units of the proposed type. The developer must know the number of prospective residents, the special characteristics of their prospective residents, the level of rent prospective residents are willing or able to pay and the amenities required in the housing project such as parking, food services and support services. These issues are considered in this report.

To begin addressing the housing needs of individuals with disabilities, it is recommended that the findings from this study be used as a starting point for discussion. Community consultations and forums with individuals with disabilities, their families and support networks are recommended as next steps in strengthening and enhancing these initial findings.

The Questionnaire, Sample Design, Data Collection and other Methodological Issues

a) The Questionnaire

The content of the questionnaire was developed through comprehensive consultations with the Advisory Committee on Access Housing Subcommittee, persons with disabilities, representatives of organizations that provide services to people with disabilities and developers interested in considering the housing needs of persons with disabilities. Additionally, other

disability studies, including the Health and Activity Limitation Study (Statistics Canada) were used as guidance.

The questionnaire used by respondents living in institutions was similar to the questionnaire for respondents living in households, but reduced in scope to reflect the institutional environment. The following summarizes the questions and the rationale behind the questions on the household questionnaire, the longer of the two questionnaires. Section A was screening questions. The questions in this section were used to determine if respondents were limited in their day-to-day activities because of a mobility or agility disability, health problem or condition that has lasted or is expected to last six months or longer. The respondents were asked to indicate whether they had problems performing certain activities, even when using mobility assistive devices. The subsequent sections of the questionnaire were completed only if the respondent reported having a mobility or agility disability, condition or health problem. Section B dealt with technical aids and services. The purpose of this section was to identify technical aids used or needed by respondents to help them get around and to do things on their own. Section C dealt with everyday activities and supports. The purpose of this section was to obtain information on how the respondent's health problem or disability affected their ability to carry out everyday household activities such as preparing meals, shopping, doing light and heavy household chores and personal care. The responses to these questions determined how much support is needed by the respondent to live independently. Section D asked the respondents a few questions about themselves and their background. Section E asked the respondent questions about their current housing situation. It asked questions about special features the respondent used or needed for entering, leaving and moving about inside and outside the residence. It also asked questions about their level of satisfaction with their current living arrangements. Section F was about housing preferences. The purpose of this section was to obtain information on the type of dwelling, and features and amenities that a respondent would like to have in or near their home. It asked the respondent questions about the types of assisted living services important to them, about their desire to move and about their reasons for not moving.

b) Sample Design, Data Collection and other Methodological Issues

The Department of Sociology and Social Studies, University of Regina was contracted to develop the sample for the study. The target population was all persons, living in Regina, aged 15 and over years with mobility and/or agility disabilities. Comprehensive lists of individuals with mobility and or agility disabilities living in Regina are not readily available. The Health and Activity Limitation Survey (HALS) was designed to identify individuals with disabilities, and to collect data for a national database on disability. However, the HALS list and its information are outdated. HALS was first administered after the 1986 Census of Population. It was repeated after the 1991 Census. Individuals with recent disabilities would be excluded from the 1991 HALS, and consequently would have no chance of being selected in the sample. Additionally, the HALS list includes individuals no longer having a disability and people who moved or are deceased.

It is difficult to develop a comprehensive list of individuals with disabilities using traditional methods of sampling. For example, randomly phoning households to locate individuals with mobility and/or agility disabilities would be expensive, time-consuming and most likely

ineffective. In exploratory research studies, the goal being to obtain valuable insights, which may lead to testable hypotheses, probability sampling may be either too expensive or lead to fewer insights (1972. Blalock. p.527). Given the limited resources and the exploratory nature of the study, cases were located through a non-probability sampling technique called purposive sampling. Purposive sampling was selected over other sampling designs because it has the capacity to reach members of a difficult-to-reach population, better than other sampling designs. With purposive sampling, the goal is to obtain as many cases as possible (1997. Neuman. p. 206). The researcher uses many different methods in order to identify the maximum number of cases.¹

The following methods were used to advise the community of the survey research study and to locate cases:

- Information on the CMHC survey research study and the objectives of the study were shared with over 100 organizations in Regina, including community-based organizations, government and developers.
- Organizations delivering services to persons with disabilities contacted their membership, consumers and clients by mail to notify them of the study and to encourage them to participate. Approximately 4,000 individuals received correspondence. Some individuals were invited on more than one occasion to participate.
- Organizations delivering services to persons with disabilities reported on the study in their organizational newsletters and publications.
- *The Leader-Post* newspaper, with an average daily circulation of approximately 89,000, reported on the study. They advised readers to contact the City of Regina or the University of Regina if they wished to be interviewed.
- CBC Radio reported on the study on two consecutive days. They interviewed individuals with disabilities about the need for the study.
- The researchers attended public events to distribute information on the study to individuals with disabilities.
- Information on the study was distributed to residents of institutions.

Purposive sampling is an acceptable kind of sampling for special situations. It selects cases with a specific purpose in mind. However, with purposive sampling, the researcher never knows whether the selected cases represent the population. The major disadvantage of purposive sampling and of other non-probability sampling techniques is that they do not use randomization in the selection of their sample elements. It is impossible to determine sampling errors and to estimate confidence levels around the sample statistics. The sample has bias, but the researcher is unable to measure it. Consequently, statistical inference is not legitimate with purposive sampling and other non-probability sampling techniques. Statistical inference was not used in this study.

Fourteen individuals were hired to interview respondents and/or to code the questionnaire. Most of these individuals were recommended by organizations providing employment services to

¹ For further discussion on purposive sampling, see Grosf and Sardy (1985: 172-173); Singleton et al. (1988: 153-154, 306); Bailey (1987: 94-95) described dimensional sampling which is a variation of purposive sampling, and Hessler (1992: 131).

persons with disabilities. The other individuals were students enrolled in 200, 400, and 800 level methodology classes with the Department of Sociology and Social Studies, University of Regina. Those hired participated in a three-hour training session.

Participation in the survey was voluntary. Interviews were completed in-person at the time and location of the respondent's choice. Almost all interviews were completed at the respondent's home. On average, interviews took about sixty to ninety minutes to complete.

Section A of the questionnaire represents a set of activities that measure the impact of disability on the lives of the respondent. If a respondent answered "yes" to a question in Section A, they became part of the sample. It should be noted that the answers to these questions represent the respondent's perception of their situation and are therefore subjective. The researcher did not consider barriers and the effect they have upon the disability.

The data was analyzed with the assistance of SPSS-9.0 (a comprehensive and integrated software system for statistical analysis).

Respondents

Close to 300 individuals contacted the City of Regina or the University of Regina to inquire about the study or to be interviewed. During an initial screening process completed over the telephone, individuals not having a mobility or agility disability were screened out. In the end, 215 individuals were interviewed, of which 191 individuals were living in households and 24 individuals were living in institutions. Eight individuals living in households were screened out during the interview. Consequently, 183 individuals completed all sections of the households questionnaire.

Among the 183 individuals living in households², 36% (65) were male and 66% (118) were female. Respondents ranged in age from 6 to 97 years.³ Approximately 46% (85) were seniors (aged 65 years and over) and 54% (98) were non-seniors (aged 64 years and under).

² The findings of the institutions survey are presented separately from the households survey.

³ The target population consisted of all persons aged 15 years and over with mobility and agility disabilities. However, approximately 5% of the respondents were under aged 15 years. Questionnaires for these respondents were completed by or with the assistance of family members or primary caregivers.

Percentage* of Respondents in each Age Category	
Age	Percentage
21 or less years	9% (16)
22 to 42 years	16% (29)
43 to 64 years	29% (53)
65 or more years**	46% (85)
<p>Notes:</p> <p>*The percentages in this table are rounded and therefore may not add up to 100%.</p> <p>**Among the 85 respondents aged 65 or more years there were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30 respondents aged 65 to 72 years; • 35 respondents aged 73 to 82 years; and • 20 respondents aged 83 to 97 years. <p>In the Health and Activity Limitation Households Survey, 1991 (HALS) it is indicated that in Saskatchewan approximately 11% of the population aged 15 to 34 years have disabilities; 18% of the population aged 35 to 54 years have disabilities; 32% of the population aged 55 to 64 years have disabilities, and that 42% of the population aged 65 and over years have disabilities. With both the survey research study population and HALS, the percentage of people with disabilities in each category increased with age.</p>	

Respondents' 1999 total household income from all sources ranged from less than \$5,000 to \$75,000 or more. Over 26% of the respondents had 1999 household incomes of less than \$15,000. The percentage of respondents in each income category is shown in the table that follows.

Percentage of Respondents in each 1999 Household Income Category

Income	Percentage of Respondents
less than \$35,000	71% (111)
\$35,000 to less than \$55,000	15% (24)
\$55,000 or more	14% (21)

There was some association between sex and household income. Males had higher income than females. Close to 80% (78) of the females had total household incomes of less than \$35,000. This percentage compares to approximately 57% among male respondents. Approximately 21% (12) of the male respondents had household incomes of \$55,000 or more. This compares to approximately 9% (9) among female respondents. Total household income was influenced somewhat more by sex than by age and marital status.

Pensions were the main income source for the largest number of respondents [46% (84)]. Other main sources of income were:

- wages, salaries, self-employment income [21% (38)];
- social assistance [9% (17)];
- disability insurance [8% (14)];
- other, including farmland, estate, support from family, scholarships, etc [7% (13)]; and
- investments/savings [4% (8)].

The majority of the respondents were married [35% (66)] or single/never married [31% (59)]. Other respondents were widowed [17% (33)], separated [13% (24)] or common law [.5% (1)]. There was strong association between sex and marital status. The majority of male respondents were married. There was also a large percentage of single/never-married males [39% (25)]. Among females, 27% (32) were married; 27% (32) were widowed and 29% (34) were single/never married. There was some association (but not a strong one) between income and current marital status.

The education level of the respondents ranged from incomplete grade school to a Masters, Ph.D. and professional degrees. Close to 32% (61) of the respondents had incomplete high school or less education. Approximately 14% (27) had high school. Over 31% (59) had a trade certificate or some university. Over 16% (31) had a Bachelors degree or more education.

Most of the respondents were long-time residents of Regina, with over 98% of the respondents living in Regina for 5 years or longer. Close to 67% of the respondents lived in Regina for 20 or more years.

Among the 24 respondents living in institutions, 25% (6) were male and 75% (18) were female. Respondents ranged in age from 22 to 99 years. The majority of respondents [67% (18)] were seniors (aged 65 or more years). The highest level of education for 25% (6) of the respondents was complete grade school. The highest level of education for 63% (15) of the respondents was complete high school. Fifty percent of the respondents had a 1999 total household income from all sources of less than \$25,000. For most respondents [67% (16)], their main income source was pensions. Over 50% (13) of the respondents had lived in their current accommodations for 5 years or more. Four respondents had lived in their current accommodations for less than one year.

Respondents - Assistive Devices and Technical Aids

Among the 183 respondents living in households, 87% (159) used assistive devices or technical aids to move about. The following assistive devices or technical aids were indicated most frequently (ranked from highest to lowest):

- manual wheelchair [54% (86)];
- cane [46% (73)];
- walker [37% (59)];
- back or leg brace [23% (37)];
- orthopedic footwear [21% (33)];

- scooter [15% (24)]; and
- motorized wheelchair [18% (28)].

Among the 24 respondents living in institutions, 23 (96%) used mobility assistive devices or technical aids to move about. The following assistive devices or technical aids were indicated most frequently (ranked from highest to lowest):

- scooter [100% (23)];
- manual wheelchair [70% (16)];
- cane [39% (9)];
- walker [39% (9)];
- motorized wheelchair [30% (7)];
- back or leg brace [17% (4)]; and
- orthopedic footwear [17% (4)].

Current Living Arrangements

Over 51% (98) of the household respondents were living in single family detached dwellings. Other respondents were living in high-rise or low-rise apartments [25% (48)]; non-profit or subsidized housing [5% (10)]; row houses or town houses [4% (7)], and in other dwelling types such as foster homes, cooperatives, assisted living care home and retirement complexes [9% (17)]. Approximately 17% (32) of the respondents indicated that they were living in seniors only housing.

Over 31% (60) of the respondents rented their dwelling from the private sector. Rents ranged from nothing to \$2,450. The majority [75% (62)] had rents of \$700 or less. Close to 40% had rents of under \$400 per month. Most of the respondents living in single family detached dwellings owned their dwelling. The assessed value of the dwellings ranged from \$9,000 to \$170,000. Close to 30% (24) reported that the assessed value of their dwelling was \$65,900 or less.⁴ Over 56% (46) indicated that the assessed value of their dwelling was \$90,000 or less. Seventy-two percent (58) indicated that the assessed value of their dwelling was \$100,000 or less.

The type of dwelling lived in was influenced somewhat by age. Non-seniors (aged 64 or less years) were more likely than seniors to live in single family detached dwellings. Sixty-four percent of non-seniors lived in single family detached dwellings. This compares to 41% (35) among seniors. Higher percentages of seniors (31%) than non-seniors (21%) were living in apartments. Additionally, as the age of the senior increased, the percentage living in apartments increased.

⁴ In Regina, the average price of a single family detached dwelling in 1999 was \$90,321 (2001. Federation of Canadian Municipalities. p.67).

Percentage of Respondents in each Age Category by Type of Dwelling				
Type of Dwelling	64 or Less Years	65 to 72 Years	73 to 82 Years	83 or more Years
single family detached dwelling	64% (63)	57% (17)	40% (14)	20% (4)
low-rise apartment	14% (14)	13% (4)	11% (4)	20% (4)
high-rise apartment	7% (7)	13% (4)	17% (6)	25% (5)
other*	3% (3)	7% (2)	9% (3)	20% (4)
Notes: *Other includes living arrangements such as retirement living complexes, cooperative housing and foster homes.				

Sex and income did not strongly influence the type of dwelling that the respondent lived in. Respondents in all income categories generally lived in all types of dwellings. However, the percentage of respondents living in single family dwellings increased steadily as income increased. In addition, all of the respondents living in non-profit or subsidized housing had total family incomes of less than \$35,000.

The type of dwelling that a respondent lived in was not influenced strongly by whether the respondent used/did not use a mobility assistive device or technical aid to move about. Among the 159 respondents using mobility assistive devices and technical aids to move, the majority [54% (85)] lived in single family detached dwellings. Other respondents using mobility assistive devices lived in low-rise apartments [13% (21)] or in high-rises [13% (20)]. All respondents living in non-profit public or subsidized housing, and all respondents living in assisted care homes were respondents using mobility assistive devices or technical aids.

Additionally, the type of technical aid a respondent used did not strongly influence the type of dwelling the respondent lived in⁵. However, using/not using a manual wheelchair influenced the type of dwelling a respondent lived in more than other types of mobility assistive devices and technical aids.

⁵ The types of technical aids considered were: cane, walker, scooter, manual wheelchair and motorized wheelchair.

Percentage of Respondents using/not using a Manual Wheelchair by Type of Dwelling		
Type of Dwelling	Uses a Manual Wheelchair	Does not Use a Manual Wheelchair
single family detached dwelling	65% (56)	40% (29)
high-rise apartment	11% (9)	15% (11)
low-rise apartment	9% (8)	18% (13)
non-profit or subsidized housing	8% (7)	4% (3)
other	2% (2)	12% (9)
Total	82	65
Notes: The percentages in this table are rounded and may not necessarily add up to 100%. In addition, not all types of dwellings are shown.		

Features and Amenities to Enter and Leave the Dwelling

Respondents used a number of features and amenities to enter and to leave their dwelling. For example, approximately 62% (113) used accessible drop-off or pick-up zones, 59% (107) used accessible parking, 54% (98) used ramps or street-level entrances, and 33% (61) used widened hallways or doorways. However, 37% (67) of the respondents indicated that there were features or amenities that they needed but did not have to enter and leave their dwelling. The features and amenities were:

- ramps [13% (23)]
- automatic easy to open doors [13% (23)]
- widened doorways and hallways [9% (16)]
- elevator or lift device [7% (13)]
- lever door handles [6% (10)]
- accessible drop-off or pick-up zone [4% (8)]
- railing [4% (7)]
- accessible parking [2% (4)]

Some respondents needed more than one feature or amenity. . For example, 6 respondents needed ramps and automatic easy to open doors. Nine respondents needed ramps and widened hallways/doorways. Three respondents needed ramps, automatic easy to open doors and widened hallways/doorways.

Among the 67 respondents indicating that they needed additional features to enter and leave their dwelling, close to 93% (62) were respondents using mobility assistive devices or technical aids to move about. Income did not strongly influence whether the respondent needed/did not need

additional specialized features to enter or leave their dwelling. Age, however, played a role. As the age of the respondent increased the percentage of respondents needing additional specialized features to enter and leave their dwelling decreased.

Percentage of Respondents in each Age Category Needing Additional Features or Amenities to Enter or Leave their Dwelling

Age	Percentage of Respondents
21 or less years	56% (9)
22 to 42 years	45% (13)
43 to 64 years	47% (25)
65 or more years	23% (19)
Total	36% (66)

Features and Amenities Inside their Home

Approximately 51% (94) of the respondents used specialized features or amenities in their home. The specialized features used inside the home were:

- grab bars [72% (68)]
- widened doorways [44% (41)]
- lever door handles [39% (37)]
- widened hallways [31% (29)]
- emergency call system [27% (28)]
- lowered light switch [25% (23)]
- automatic or easy to open door [20% (19)]
- elevator [20% (19)]
- lowered counters/sinks [18% (17)]

Approximately 53% (97) of the respondents reported that there were features inside their home that they needed, but did not have. Among these features were:

- inside grab bars [16% (30)]
- lowered counters, sinks, switches [15% (27)]
- widened doorways [14% (25)]
- beds or bath lifts [14% (25)]
- elevator or lift device [10% (19)]
- automatic or easy to open doors [9% (17)]
- emergency call system [7% (12)]
- lever door handles [6% (10)]

Additionally, respondents reported that they had difficulty using the following amenities inside their dwelling:

- bathroom tub or shower [55% (100)]
- kitchen cabinets [50% (92)]
- kitchen stove [35% (64)]
- washer and dryer [33% (60)]
- kitchen sinks and counters [28% (52)]
- bathroom toilet [23% (42)]
- bathroom sink [20% (37)]
- refrigerator [19% (34)]
- electronic equipment [15% (27)]

Because of their disability, respondents had modified some of the features inside their dwelling. For example, 43% (78) had modified their bathroom tub and shower, 21% (38) had modified their bathroom toilet, 14% (26) had modified their bathroom sink, and 12% (21) had modified their kitchen sinks and counters. Among the 65 respondents modifying their bathroom tub and shower, and reporting their income, the percentage of respondents modifying their bathroom tub and shower increased as total family income increased. Close to 37% of the respondents having incomes of less than \$35,000 modified their bathroom tub and shower. This compares to 50% of respondents having incomes of \$35,000 to less than \$55,000, and to 57% among respondents having incomes of \$55,000 or more.

Respondents were asked about their level of satisfaction with their current living arrangements. The vast majority of respondents were either “very” or “somewhat” satisfied. The percentage of respondents very or somewhat satisfied with various features or amenities of their current living arrangements is as follows (the list is ranked from highest to lowest):

1. level of privacy 93% (170)
2. the neighbourhood 92% (169)
2. the location of the dwelling 92% (169)
4. the amount of living space 85% (166)
5. condition of the dwelling 84% (154)
6. the room design 79% (144)
7. the support services 78% (50)*
8. the inside accessibility 75% (138)**
9. the outside accessibility 73% (133)***

Notes:

*Over 62% of the respondents indicated that they did not use support services. The non-applicable responses were removed from the analysis.

**The responses for “satisfaction with inside accessibility” were:

- very satisfied 42% (77)
- somewhat satisfied 33% (61)
- somewhat dissatisfied 14% (26)
- very dissatisfied 9% (18)
- don’t know .5% (1)

***The responses for “satisfaction with outside accessibility” were:

- very satisfied 50% (91)
- somewhat satisfied 23% (42)
- somewhat dissatisfied 14% (26)
- very dissatisfied 13% (23)
- n/a .5% (1)

Comments

The respondents’ level of satisfaction with certain features and amenities of their current living arrangement influenced their response to the question: “Would you like to move?” The following variables, ranked from strongest to weakest influence, influenced the response to the question on moving:

1. the satisfaction with the condition of the dwelling*;
2. the satisfaction with the “outside accessibility”**;
3. the satisfaction with the room design;
4. the satisfaction with the privacy;
5. the satisfaction with the “inside accessibility”;
6. the satisfaction with the neighbourhood;
7. the satisfaction with the living space; and
8. the satisfaction with the location.

Notes:

*Among the 12 respondents very dissatisfied with the condition of their dwelling, 92% (11) wanted to move, and 8% (1) did not want to move. In comparison, among the 97 respondents very satisfied with the condition of their dwelling, 12% (12) wanted to move; 80% (78) did not want to move, and 7% (7) were not sure.

**Among the 23 respondents very dissatisfied with the outside accessibility, 74% (17) wanted to move, 22% (5) did not want to move and 4% (1) were not sure. In comparison, among the 91 respondents very satisfied with the outside accessibility, 13% (12) wanted to move; 79% (72) did not want to move and 8% (7) were not sure.

Respondents were asked: “Is there anything about your current living arrangement that you are particularly satisfied with? (**Record up to three.**)” The features or amenities identified most often are presented in the table that follows.

Ten Features or Amenities* Identified Most Often by Respondents** as Something about their Current Living Arrangement that they are Satisfied with (Ranked from Highest to Lowest)				
Feature or Amenity	Percentage of Respondents that Identified this Feature/Amenity as the Most Important Feature/Amenity	Percentage of Respondents that Identified this Feature/Amenity as the Second Most Important Feature/Amenity	Percentage of Respondents that Identified this Feature/Amenity as the Third Most Important Feature/Amenity	Total
dwelling has been modified/dwelling is accessible	8.7% (16)	5.2% (7)	1.4% (1)	(24)
privacy/noise/quiet issues	8.7% (16)	4.5% (6)	2.9% (2)	(24)
independence/able to maintain independence	7.7% (14)	3% (4)	2.9% (2)	(20)
everything/happy with everything	7.7% (4)	3.7% (5)	0% (0)	(9)
easy access to services	6.6% (12)	11.9% (16)	14.3% (10)	(38)
feeling of safety and security	5.5% (10)	4.5% (6)	5.7% (4)	(20)
satisfied with the area/neighbourhood/ community	5.5% (10)	3.0% (4)	1.4% (1)	(15)
assisted living services are available/has help/caretaker	4.4% (8)	8.2% (11)	8.6% (6)	(25)
no stairs/main level	3.8% (7)	0% (0)	1.4% (1)	(8)

floor plan/design spacious/size/décor	3.3% (6)	2.2% (3)	2.9% (2)	(11)
Total	61.9% (103)	46.2% (62)	41.5% (29)	(194)
Notes: *The features and amenities are explained in the comments that follow. **183 respondents identified the most important feature 143 respondents identified the second most important feature 70 respondents identified the third most important feature				

Comments

1. Dwelling has been Modified/Dwelling is Accessible

House has been modified for easy access and to get around in

Accessibility

Specifically designed for persons with disabilities

House was modified to accommodate a person with a disability

Made the whole main floor wheelchair accessible

Were able to just complete major renovations so the house is accessible

There is room for a wheelchair to move through

Enlarged doorways, wide hallways

Own home-The respondent had say in the design. Everything is accessible for a person who uses a wheelchair

Haven't seen anything where we'd be as comfortable (ex. walk in showers, sunken rooms, no stairs)

Able to move around, done necessary renovations

Landlord is very sensitive to needs

Housing has been remodeled

The house is designed for person who use a wheelchair

Wide hallways

Basic accessibility

Generally easy to get around in

2. Privacy/Noise/Quiet Issues

Able to do whatever I want, have privacy, and don't have to account to anybody

Privacy

Own private entrance

"Can turn heat up when I need it" - "house is comfortable"

It's quiet

The quietness, no noise

Quiet neighbourhood

Has own space where you can do what you like

The level of privacy (nobody interferes with them)

Quiet: very quiet

Lots of privacy
Good sound proofing
Quiet and nice
Quiet
Not bothered by other people
Quiet neighbourhood
Enjoy having time alone, feel comfortable and safe
The neighbours keep to themselves
Quiet, no neighbours, noise

3. Independence/Able to Maintain Independence

Being alone, staying in own house, don't want to be in a nursing home
Nice to be in your own place (house) independence, doesn't like apartment
Good sense of independence
Because I'm in my own home and am able to stay here with the help of my daughter and grandson
Being on own
Good neighbours
Independence
Lives with sibling, independence
Independence
Independence: two phone lines
Still independent
Having own house, being independent

4. Easy Access to Services

Location: close to Safeway, banks and restaurants
Essential medical services are in close proximity
Close to medical services
Close to services: particularly in summer
The location I'm close to work and to my family and friends and to trees
Close to doctor, Safeway, shopping centre, church
Close to church
Location: right across from the mall; just down the road from Albert Street
Location: mall close enough that one can go to on a scooter, services close by
Close to school
Location: close to the bank, mall, stores
Location: close to mall (Doctor, bank, and groceries)
Closeness to shopping centre
Closeness to bus service
Like being downtown, easy to get to the mall, stores, Vets club, casino
The school the kids go to is wonderfully supportive
Close to services such as groceries, etc.
Easy to get to almost every point in city from here
Easy access to shopping, medical, banking, etc.

Don't have too far to go to downtown, can get bus if I need, can use my scooter to go down town

Stores close by

Location: convenient to all services

Location: close to major stores

Location readily accessible to grocery shopping, pharmacy, parks, seniors, Education centre, library

Close to Wascana Hospital

Park near by

5. Feelings of Safety and Security

Security 24 hours, 7 days a week

Security

24 hour security person

Good security guards in building

Security features: intercom security door

Feeling of safety and security/ familiarity

Never been afraid to be around here

Excellent feeling of safety and security

Safe and secure

Safe neighbourhood

Neighbourhood safer, better reputation, easy to get to/ from the Lewvan

Quiet safe location

Area: safe, secure

Neighbourhood is safe

Low crime rate in area

Feel safe in neighbourhood

6. Assisted Living Services are Available

Meals all supplied

Care providers very good

Food is very good

Landlords have made high level of accommodation (i.e. making sure snow is removed properly)

Having a caretaker to look after the ground and cleaning and maintenance of the building

Enjoys services offered such as meals, light housekeeping, bus service (free, free washer and dryer

General maintenance excellent

A caretaker really keeps the place clean inside and outside

Clean, well maintained new appliances

The care that she receives is most excellent

The meals are very good

Cleaning and laundry services

Meals provided

Very clean building

Help with everyday activities

Individualized programming
 Home care service twice weekly
 Services available to residents
 Good on site managers
 Neighbours very helpful cut lawn, shovel snow, concerned

Respondents were asked: “And is there anything about your current living arrangement that you are particularly dissatisfied with? **(Record up to three.)**”

Ten Features or Amenities* Identified Most Often by a Respondent** as Something about their Current Living Arrangement that they are Particularly Dissatisfied With (Ranked from Highest to Lowest)				
Feature or Amenity	Percentage of Respondents that Identified this Feature/Amenity as the Most Important Feature/Amenity	Percentage of Respondents that Identified this Feature/Amenity as the Second Most Important Feature/Amenity	Percentage of Respondents that Identified this Feature/Amenity as the Third Most Important Feature/Amenity	Total
nothing	31.7% (58)	0% (0)	0% (0)	(58)
stairs	6.6% (12)	3.9% (3)	2.4% (1)	(16)
problems with the bathroom	6.6% (12)	10.4% (8)	4.9% (2)	(22)
entrance/doorways/hallways	4.9% (9)	11.7% (9)	17.1% (7)	(25)
not accessible/lack of accessibility	4.9% (9)	7.8% (6)	0% (0)	(15)
the cost/not affordable	3.8% (7)	2.6% (2)	0% (0)	(9)
problems with the kitchen	3.3% (6)	5.2% (4)	7.3% (3)	(13)
lack of services	3.3% (6)	6.5% (5)	2.4% (1)	(12)

upkeep of dwelling is difficult	2.7% (5)	6.5% (5)	4.9% (2)	12)
poor maintenance service/trouble with management	2.7% (5)	2.6% (2)	0% (0)	(7)
Total	70.5% (129)	57.2% (44)	39% (16)	(189)

Notes:

*Some of the features and amenities are explained in the comments that follow.

**183 respondents identified the most important dissatisfaction

77 respondents identified the second most important dissatisfaction

41 respondents identified the third most important dissatisfaction

Comments

1. Entrance/Doorways/Hallways

Only one accessible entrance, safety issue

Not accessible, too many steps and long walk to ramp. Having trouble with bringing in scooter (I have to walk all the time)

Front door not accessible

Front entrance, too awkward to go onto ramp

Access into the house, can't enter home without use of stairs

Steps into house: city made them raise steps

Doorways in apartment not wide enough for wheelchair

Probably the exterior access: the outside door is very difficult, heavy

The main thing: only one door is accessible (i.e. it has no step) I'd prefer it if the front door was accessible

Very prohibited stairwell

Want elevator

Outer doors are heavy and hard to open

Needs wider driveway to accommodate wheelchair

Peepholes too high

Don't have ramp, chair lift

Front entrance could be more accessible for wheelchair (ramp)

Wider hallways needed for walker

They need an automatic door opener for walkers, etc.

"I'd like a ramp instead of the electric one (i.e. lift) at the front of the house

Front door and parkade are completely inaccessible. Also mailbox inaccessible

2. Problem with the Bathroom

Bathrooms are small, can't get wheelchair in

Can't access bath tub

Can't use bathtub, no shower
 Bathroom location inconvenient, not near bedroom
 Small washrooms, not accessible for wheelchair
 No bathroom on the first level
 High bathroom toilets
 Bathroom: not accessible (has to be carried in)
 Doorways no accessible
 Bathroom sink not cut out
 Bathroom not on main floor
 Bathroom too small for persons using assistive devices
 No shower downstairs where room is
 Toilets too low
 No grab bars in bathroom
 Bathroom major trouble
 Bath on second level which is a major concern regarding seizures and bathing
 Bath tub: not able to bathe properly (reach her back)
 Bathroom is serious problem: totally in accessible in terms of toiletry and shower needs
 Bathroom: wheelchairs do not fit, need to be carried
 Bathtub and shower are inaccessible
 Bathroom and bedroom accessibility
 In suite bath needs to be renovated as well as kitchen
 Yes, the size of the bathroom for one thing, you cannot get a wheelchair in there properly, if I were to be completely in the wheelchair
 "I'd like a bigger bathroom, bigger (but she says she means wider doorways)

3. Stairs

Stairs
 Too many stairs
 Two-story
 Can't get down into basement because of curves in design of house, lift is very expensive to put in
 The stairs: 4 floors to go down to laundry room, 3 floors to go out
 Well I'd like it if we didn't have to have any stairs inside. There are two steps up from the living room to the rest of the house so we have to have the wheelchair rails. It is certainly better having everything on one level
 No stairs in house, everything on one level
 No stairs
 Stairs at entrance: would like no stairs
 Upstairs house: difficulty to negotiate stairs
 No railing on stairs

More Accessible Housing

Among the 183 household respondents, it was indicated that 26% (48) wanted to move, 68% (125) did not want to move and 6% (10) were not sure. Age more than income influenced a respondent's desire to move. Approximately 88% (42) of the respondents wanting to move were

aged 64 or less years. Close to 43% (42) of the respondents aged 64 or less years wanted to move. This percentage compares to 7% (6) among seniors (65 or more years). The following table indicates that respondents aged 22 to 42 years were particularly interested in moving.

Percentage of Respondents in each Age Category Wanting to Move

Age	Percentage of Respondents
21 or less years	38% (6)
22 to 42 years	69% (20)
43 to 64 years	30% (16)
65 or more years	7% (6)
Total	(48)

Among the 10 respondents not sure about moving, 5 were aged 43 to 64 years and 4 were aged 65 or over years.

The desire to move was not influenced strongly by whether the respondent used/did not use a mobility assistive device. However, using/not using a manual wheelchair more than other mobility assistive devices influenced the respondent's desire to move. Close to 33% (28) of the respondents using a manual wheelchair wanted to move.

The type of dwelling lived in also influenced a respondent's desire to move. Respondents living in low-rise apartments were more likely than respondents living in other types of dwellings to want to move. Among the 26 respondents living in low-rise apartments, close to 39% (10) wanted to move and 12% (3) were not sure. This compares to 28% (27) living in single family detached dwellings, 27% (6) living in high-rises apartments and 10% (1) living in public or subsidized housing. Among the 15 respondents aged 22 to 42 years living in single family dwellings, 67% wanted to move. Among the 6 respondents living in low-rise apartments, 83% (5) wanted to move.

Among the 48 respondents wanting to move and the 10 respondents not sure about wanting to move, most (close to 65%) had total family incomes of less than \$25,000. The following table shows the income of the respondents wanting to move.

Percentage of Respondents Wanting to Move by Income			
Income	Percentage of Respondents Wanting to Move	Percentage of Respondents Not Sure about Wanting to Move	Total
less than \$15,000	31% (15)	10% (5)	42% (20)
\$15,000 to less than \$25,000	21% (10)	2% (1)	23% (11)
\$25,000 to less than \$35,000	17% (8)	0% (0)	17% (8)
\$35,000 to less than \$55,000	6% (3)	4% (2)	10% (5)
\$55,000 to less than \$75,000	2% (1)	2% (1)	4% (2)
\$75,000 or more	2% (2)	0% (0)	4% (2)
Total	82% (39)	18% (9)	100% (48)

Among some of the 58 respondents wanting to move/not sure about moving, the main source of their total family income were:

- pensions 22% (13)
- wages, salaries, self-employment income 26% (15)
- disability insurance 16% (9)
- social assistance 21% (12)
- other sources 12% (7)

Respondents wanting to move/not sure about moving were “somewhat” or very dissatisfied with the outside accessibility of their dwelling [47% (27)], the inside accessibility [40% (23)] and the condition of their dwelling [40% (23)]. In comparison, these respondents were substantially less dissatisfied with the privacy [14% (8)], the neighbourhood [14% (8)] and the location of their dwelling [16% (9)].

Over 53% (31) of the respondents wanting to move/not sure about moving were single, never married. Other respondents were separated/divorced [14% (8)]; widowed [10% (6)] and married [22% (13)]. Among the 58 respondents wanting to move/not sure about wanting to move, 85% (49) used a mobility assistive device:

- 30 used a manual wheelchair;
- 20 used a cane;
- 15 used a walker;
- 9 used a motorized wheelchair; and

- 7 used a scooter.

Respondents were asked a number of questions about their everyday activities and supports. The purpose of the question was to obtain information on how the respondent's disability, condition or health problem affected their ability to carry out everyday household activities such as preparing meals, shopping, doing light and heavy household chores and personal care. The responses to the questions may assist in determining how much support is needed by the respondent to live independently. Among the 58 respondents wanting to move/not sure about wanting to move their responses to the questions were as follows:

1. How do you move about within your residence?

- by yourself 83% (48)
- sometimes by yourself and sometimes with the help of another person 9% (5)
- only with the help of another person 7% (4)

2. Who usually prepares your meals?

- yourself alone 45% (26)
- yourself and someone else 24% (14)*
- someone else 31% (18)*

*Among the 32 respondents receiving help, 29 indicated that they received help because of their disability.

3. Who usually does your shopping for groceries or other necessities?

- yourself alone 26% (26)
- yourself and someone else 43% (25)*
- someone else 31% (18)*

*Among the 43 respondents receiving help, 39 indicated that they received help because of their disability.

4. Who usually does your normal everyday housework, such as dusting and tidying up?

- yourself alone 38% (22)
- yourself and someone else 24% (14)*
- someone else 38% (22)*

*Among the 36 respondents receiving help, 33 indicated that they received help because of their disability.

5. Who usually does your heavy household chores such as washing the floor, yard work or snow removal?

- yourself alone 3% (2)
- yourself and someone else 19% (11)*
- someone else 71% (41)*

*Among the 52 respondents receiving help, 48 respondents indicated that they received help because of their disability.

6. Because of your disability or health problem, do you receive help with personal care such as grooming, dressing or eating?
- yes 29% (17)
 - no 71% (41)

The 58 respondents wanting to move/not sure about wanting to move indicated the following reasons for not having moved (the reasons are ranked from those indicated most to least often).

Reason for Not Having Moved	Percentage of Respondents Indicating Reason*
no suitable accommodation	78% (45)
cannot afford other accommodation	59% (34)
too costly to move	57% (33)
difficult to get the support services to live independently	38% (22)
too difficult to move	36% (21)
not ready to move	31% (18)
on a waiting list to move**	19% (11)
don't know	2% (1)

Notes:

*Among the 48 respondents wanting to move, 38 indicated that there was no suitable accommodation, 29 indicated that they could not afford other accommodation, 19 indicated that it was too difficult to get the support services to live independently, 15 were not ready and 11 were on a waiting list.

**Among the 11 respondents on a waiting list, 9 were aged 64 or less years and 2 were aged 65 or more years, 8 were female and 3 were male, 9 used a mobility assistive device or technical aid to move around and 2 did not use a mobility assistive device to move around, and 7 had incomes of less than \$25,000 and one had an income of over \$75,000.

Over 72% (42) of the respondents wanting to move/unsure about wanting to move indicated that they would need assistance finding alternative accommodation. The types of assistance identified most often were (see the comments for further explanation):

- Someone to locate affordable, accessible housing [36% (13)]
- Sources of information on affordable, accessible housing [22% (8)]
- Housing authority or person with knowledge of accessibility issues

Comments

1. Someone to locate affordable, accessible housing
Would need someone to search out available, affordable places
Somebody to help find good location
Advocate to help find housing
Advocate to help find suitable accommodation

- Find locations
- Someone sighted to read newspaper ads
- Regina Housing to find a place
- Knowledgeable person to locate a place
- Need someone to help find affordable accommodation
- Finding accessible houses
- Someone to find a place
- Occupational therapist: someone who is trained in finding alternative accommodations
- Someone to look for an apartment knowing respondents' needs
- Would need someone with mobility to help search for a place
- With the proper contacts, would be willing to be assisted in finding a suitable place to live
- Would want to access an organization involved in "disability housing" and have them help her
- Somebody who know where accessible housing is

2. Sources of information on affordable, accessible housing

- Give her a list of locations of houses; indicate features and prices of housing
- Knowledge of what is available
- Information resource in housing
- Information resource on available and appropriate housing
- Central registry for easy access for what is available
- Information to find out what types of places based on income
- Needs to know where places are located
- Listings for available housing

3. Housing authority or person with knowledge of accessibility

- Knowledgeable person
- Need friends to drive around to look at places. To make a sound decision need others input and also being discriminated against if trying to get an apartment. Landlords must alter the apartment to be accessible and many don't want to
- Family help
- A knowledgeable person to check on suitability
- A knowledgeable person
- Housing authority with knowledge of accessibility

Housing Preferences

Respondents were asked to identify the type of dwelling they would like to live in. The table that follows shows the preferred types of dwelling for all respondents, for respondents not wanting to move, for respondents wanting to move/not sure about wanting to move and for respondents indicating that they wanted to move and were on a waiting list for accommodations.

Preferred Types of Dwelling					
Preferred Types of Dwelling	All Respondents (183)	All Respondents with those Wanting to Move Excluded (125)	Respondents Wanting to Move /Not Sure about Wanting to Move (58)	Respondents Wanting to Move and on a Waiting List for Accommodations (11)	Total
single family detached dwelling	56% (102)	54% (67)	60% (35)	64% (7)	211
apartment	28% (52)	32% (40)	21% (12)	18% (2)	106
row or town house	6% (10)	3% (4)	10% (6)	9% (1)	21
other	10% (19)	11% (14)	9% (5)	9% (1)	39
Total	183	125	58	11	

Among the 58 respondents wanting to move, age did not strongly influence the type of dwelling preferred by the respondent. In all age categories, the majority of respondents preferred a single family detached dwelling. However, the following findings are noteworthy:

- no respondent aged 21 or less years preferred an apartment;
- among the 12 respondents preferring an apartment, 8 were aged 22 to 42 years.
- among the 20 respondents aged 22 to 42 years wanting to move, 40% (8) preferred an apartment; and
- compared to non-seniors [17% (8)] a higher percentage of seniors preferred an apartment [40% (4)].

Respondents in all income categories preferred a single family detached dwelling. However, among the 10 respondents preferring an apartment (and indicating their income), 80% (8) had incomes of less than \$25,000.

Among the 12 respondents wanting to move and preferring an apartment, none received help with personal care (grooming, dressing or eating). Eleven respondents moved by themselves within their dwelling. Six respondents prepared their own meals. Five respondents did their own everyday housework.

Among the 12 respondents wanting to move/not sure about wanting to move and preferring to live in an apartment, the following features and amenities were preferred:

- 75% (9) preferred to live on the main floor
- 75% (9) preferred a dwelling with two bedrooms
- 75% (9) preferred one bathroom only
- Close to 67% (8) indicated that they would need parking spaces. All of the respondents needing parking spots indicated that they needed one spot.
- Close to 60% (7) indicated that the laundry room must be in-suite. Twenty-five percent (3) were prepared to share a laundry room.
- Close to 60% (7) wanted a kitchen eating nook area only (as opposed to a dining room only or a kitchen nook and dining room).
- A private outdoor deck or patio was preferred over other features such as a shared courtyard or sunroom.
- Most of the respondents preferred to rent.

Among the 35 respondents wanting to move/not sure about wanting to move, and preferring to live in a single family detached dwelling, the following features and amenities were preferred:

- Close to 90% (31) preferred a single level floor plan.
- Approximately 40% (14) preferred 3 bedrooms. Close to 26% (9) preferred two bedrooms.
- Close to 70% (24) preferred more than one bathroom (almost all wanted the second bathroom to be near or off the bedroom).
- Close to 57% (20) preferred a kitchen nook and dining area.
- Over 71% (25) preferred to own their dwellings. Over 17% (6) preferred to rent their dwelling. Some respondents had no preference on renting or owning their dwelling.

Among all 183 respondents, the type of dwelling preferred by a respondent was influenced by whether the respondent was aged 64 or less years or aged 65 or more years.

Preferred Type of Dwelling by Age for all Respondents					
Age	Single Family Dwelling	Apartment	Row or Town House	Other	Total
64 or less years	74% (72)	16% (16)	7% (7)	3% (3)	100% (98)
65 or more years	35% (30)	42% (36)	4% (3)	19% (16)	100% (85)
Total	56% (102)	28% (52)	6% (10)	10% (19)	(183)

Among respondents aged 22 to 42 years, there were differences in the preferred type of dwelling between all respondents, all respondents excluding respondents wanting to move, and respondents wanting to move.

- over 24% (7) of all respondents aged 22 to 42 years preferred an apartment;
- over 25% (2) of all respondents (excluding respondents wanting to move) aged 22 to 42 years preferred an apartment;
- 40% (8) of respondents aged 22 to 42 wanting to move preferred an apartment.

Income also influenced the preferred type of type of dwelling. As the income of the respondent increased, the percentage of respondents preferring a single family detached dwelling generally increased and the percentage preferring an apartment generally decreased. The following table shows this pattern for all respondents excluding respondents wanting to move.

Preferred Type of Dwelling by Income for All Respondents Excluding those Wanting to Move					
Income	Single Family Detached Dwelling	Apartment	Row or Town House	Other	Total
less than \$15,000	29% (6)	62% (13)	10% (2)		19% (4)
\$15,000 to less than \$25,000	39% (10)	31% (8)	4% (1)	27% (7)	24% (26)
\$25,000 to less than \$35,000	52% (13)	32% (8)	4% (1)	12% (3)	23% (25)
\$35,000 to less than \$55,000	58% (11)	32% (6)		11% (2)	18% (19)
\$55,000 to less than \$75,000	100% (9)				8% (9)
\$75,000 or more	88% (7)	13%(1)			7% (8)
Total	52% (56)	33% (36)	4% (4)	11% (12)	100% (108)

On most features and amenities, all respondents (183) had similar preferences to respondents wanting to move, in that the largest number of respondents wanting an apartment preferred one bathroom, two bedrooms and a kitchen-eating nook only. Additionally, the largest number of respondents wanting a single family detached dwelling preferred a single level floor plan, three bedrooms, more than one bathroom, and a kitchen nook and dining room. However, there were some noteworthy differences between respondents wanting to move and all respondents.

- 44% of all respondents preferring an apartment indicated that they would be prepared to share the laundry room. This compares to 25% among respondents wanting to move and preferring an apartment;
- over 48% of all respondents preferring an apartment indicated that they would need parking spaces. This compares to 67% among respondents wanting to move and preferring an apartment.

Respondents were read a list of 20 features and amenities intended to make life more pleasant and comfortable. Respondents were asked to rate the features or amenities as very important, somewhat important, not at all important or not sure. The numbers in bold on the right side of the page are the rankings of respondents aged 22 to 42 years who want to move. Comments about the features follow the list.

Percentage of Respondents that Rated the Feature Very Important
(ranked from highest to lowest)

1. easy access to paratransit 78.7% (144)	1
2. easy access to medical services 65.6% (120)	7
3. easy access to public transportation 57.9% (106)	2
4. pharmacy 49.2% (90)	7
5. front door video monitoring and intercom 45.9% (84)	5
6. evening security patrol 43.2% (79)	3
7. banking services 37.2% (68)	10
8. enclosed heated and secured parking 36.1% (66)	3
9. exercise and fitness facility 35% (64)	5
9. convenience store 35% (64)	12
11. games or social room with organized activities 31.7% (58)	16
12. chapel and church services 30.6% (56)	19
13. library 24.6% (45)	14
14. hair salon and barber shop 24% (44)	14
15. tea room or coffee shop 20.2% (37)	7

15. swimming pool 20.2% (37)	12
17. bookstore 12% (22)	19
18. video outlet 8.2% (15)	16
19. car wash facilities 4.4% (8)	10
20. small pub or lounge 3.3% (6)	16

Percentage of Respondents that Rated the Feature Not at All Important
(ranked from highest to lowest)

1. small pub or lounge 77% (141)
2. car wash facilities 74.9% (137)
3. video outlet 66.1% (121)
4. swimming pool 58.5% (107)
5. bookstore 56.6% (104)
6. enclosed heated and secured parking 39.9% (73)
7. hair salon and barber shop 38.8% (71)
8. library 37.7% (69)
9. exercise and fitness facility 37.2% (68)
10. tea room or coffee shop 35.5% (65)
11. chapel and church services 34.4% (63)
12. games or social room with organized activities 29% (53)
13. convenience store 26.2% (48)
13. easy access to public transportation 26.2% (48)
15. evening security patrol 21.3% (39)
16. front door video monitoring and intercom 20.2% (37)

- 17. banking services 19.7% (36)
- 18. pharmacy 14.2% (26)
- 19. easy access to medical services 8.7% (16)
- 20. easy access to paratransit 8.2% (15)

Assisted Living Services

Among the 183 respondents⁶, over 66% (121) indicated that assisted living services were important to them.

The following assisted living services were indicated as being important (ranked from highest to lowest support).

- 1. light house-keeping 55.2% (101)
- 2. medi-call alert service 48.6% (89)
- 3. easy access to 24 hour personal care service 37.2% (68)
- 4. dining room or cafeteria meal service 35.5% (65)
- 5. meals on wheels 25.1% (46)

Respondents were asked: “Right now, what three things would be most important to you when choosing accommodations? **(Record up to three.)**”

The features or amenities identified most often by a respondent as being important when choosing accommodations are presented in the following table.

⁶ The 58 respondents wanting to move ranked the assisted living services in the same order.

Ten Features or Amenities Identified Most Often by All Respondents as being Important when Choosing Accommodations (Ranked from Highest to Lowest)				
Feature or Amenity	Percentage of Respondents that Identified this Feature/Amenity as the Most Important Feature/Amenity	Percentage of Respondents that Identified this Feature/Amenity as the Second Most Important Feature/Amenity*	Percentage of Respondents that Identified this Feature/Amenity as the Third Most Important Feature/Amenity**	Total
accessibility inside the dwelling	13.7% (25)	5.9% (10)	1.6% (2)	37
single level construction	6.6% (12)	3% (6)	0% (0)	18
spacious room design and layout	5.5% (10)	5.3% (9)	6.4% (8)	27
services (meals)	3.3 (6)	1.2% (2)	1.6% (2)	10
easy access to paratransit or public transit	2.7% (5)	5.9% (10)	3.2% (4)	19
better access to enter and leave the dwelling	2.7% (5)	1.8% (3)	1.6% (2)	10
affordable rent	2.2% (4)	1.8% (3)	3.2% (4)	11
services –personal care	2.2% (4)	.6% (1)	2.4% (3)	8
location – close to shopping	1.6% (3)	1.2% (2)	5.6% (7)	12
***accessible bathroom	1.6% (3)	1.2 (2)	1.6% (2)	7

total	77	48	34	159
Notes: *Accessibility inside the dwelling and easy access to paratransit or public transportation were indicated most often as the second most important mention. **Spacious room design and layout was the feature identified most often as the third most important mention. ***1.6% (3) of the respondents also indicated that street level entrances, apartments and location-general were important.				

Respondents were asked to identify which one of the three things was most important to them when choosing accommodations. The features and amenities that follow (ranked from highest to lowest) were identified most often by close to 50% of the respondents.

accessible accommodations 10.4% (19)

single level construction/no stairs 6.0% (11)

heating, cooling, ventilation, pollution-free 4.9% (9)

spacious and good layout 3.8% (7)

the preferred type of dwelling 3.8% (7)

access to services 3.3% (6)

access to transportation 2.7% (5)

security issues, including fire safety 2.7% (5)

access to services – general 2.7% (5)

cost/affordable 2.7% (5)

accessibility when entering and leaving 2.2% (4)

location near shopping 2.2% (4)

services - personal care 2.2% (4)

Comments

Respondents were asked if there were comments they would like to add. Many of the collected comments addressed issues that were underscored throughout the questionnaire, such as the importance of accessibility and of single level dwellings. The need for advice and assistance in locating accommodations and in modifying dwellings was stressed further also. Some comments

related to issues not strongly captured in other parts of the survey, including the need for affordable housing, concerns about the high costs of modifications and the inadequacy of available grants and current programs to assist with renovations. The comments also suggest acceptance of accommodations with limitations or inadequacies. In addition, perhaps because of the City's involvement in this initiative and its mandate to clear and remove snow from city streets, respondents noted problems with snow on streets and sidewalks. The following are a sampling of the comments collected.

- Would like it if there was more information on this topic.
- Funds should be available to allow for modifications of existing residences.
- I would like to stay in my home as long as it is accessible, but if I have to move, I have to move. Make condos less expensive. Condos are appealing because there is little yard work and they are on single levels.
- Regina could use more seniors places that are not so expensive. In-suite laundry is needed.
- I might move if I heard of some new place that had some of the mentioned amenities, but right now we are satisfied with our present living arrangements.
- When I moved from my previous apartment, I had trouble finding a place to meet my needs. This place meets my needs, but it is expensive. I see a need for similar type of housing, but without all of the frills and at a cheaper rate. Would like to see a place where one could stay within the same complex when more care is required.
- A thank you to the City for taking the first step and talking to the people. Street cleaning is extremely important for individuals with disabilities, you can't get around without it.
- Definite shortage of suitable housing. I paid for shares in the Northwest co-operative housing just to stay on the list. After several years still no accommodation is available.
- When building complexes or multi-unit dwellings, must think about having one or two units accessible for those with disabilities. Don't stick people with disabilities in one area and segregate us. Give us some choices.
- Waiting lists for Regina Housing Authority are 3-4 years.
- If I could get a nicer place, which would accommodate a wheelchair, I would.
- Regina needs a publication of trades people and ideas. There is no place to call for advice. No one to call about housing-no book of ideas. I am appalled that there is no one to call about the house and modifications. People with disabilities have no idea what they want when they need the modifications. Even people working in NGOs are not very

knowledgeable about modifications. Accessibility architects and engineers can't get things right.

- There is really no one but a private contractor to call upon to get help. The idea is to keep people in their own homes. Need an agency for people to call with modification needs. If no one is willing to put money into RRAP and into modifications, then it won't get done. Private architects and builders often will gut the place and want to start over (for larger sums of money). The level of knowledge about accessibility is limited.
- It is very difficult to find places. We need some kind of rent control. Need to educate landlords about disabilities. Trying to find affordable and accessible housing is extremely difficult; even grants available to make houses accessible are not adequate. Regina Housing needs a disability specialist who visits homes. Need more places built for individuals with disabilities. It is now a crisis situation in Regina. There is a need for single family dwellings and group homes.
- Would like his own home if he could afford proper support, but happy with where he is. Would like to find out about the study results.
- Access modifications come at a high price, which means that you are forced to make do.
- I think my biggest problem with accommodation is the extra cost. You've got to be able to afford the house, and then you've got to be able to afford the extras (i.e. the cost of renovations to make it accessible).
- Frustrated by lack of spaces available in city at reasonable cost. Would like to move before winter as icy streets, sidewalks and steps cause problems. Often unable to get out.
- Everybody should provide input. We've struggled for years without help from anyone. Action needs to be taken quickly. Regina has a lack of good affordable housing. Ideal situation would be rent to own. We would love to own a home "our dream".
- Lots of "pricey" accommodations are available. Need more accommodations for people who have average and lower incomes. Hope these things are acted upon quickly.
- To be able to choose who does your personal services (hates having people not of own choosing in daily life!!!). Would like to access help when it is needed.
- Would like more information on professionals and the trades specializing in modifying existing accommodations.

Institutions Survey

Twenty-four respondents completed the institutions survey. Seventy-five percent (18) of the respondents were female. Twenty-five percent (6) were male. Respondents ranged in age from

22 to 99 years. Close to 67% (16) of the respondents were aged 65 or more years. Over 54% (13) of the respondents were females aged 65 or more years. None of these women wanted to move.⁷

Among the 24 respondents, close to 21% (5) wanted to move. Four of the respondents wanting to move were aged 45 to 52 years. One was aged 67 years. The main sources of income among respondents wanting to move were pensions (1), disability insurance (2) and social assistance (2). All of the respondents wanting to move received help with personal care such as grooming, dressing and eating. Among the 5 respondents wanting to move, 2 preferred a single family detached dwelling, 2 preferred an apartment and 1 preferred accommodations with disability related-supports. None of the respondents wanting to move were on waiting lists for accommodations.

The 5 respondents wanting to move gave the following reasons for not having moved:

1. difficult getting services to live independently (5);
2. no suitable accommodations (5);
3. cannot afford to move (4);
4. too difficult (3); and
5. too costly (3).

Conclusions

The main findings of the analysis were:

1. Over 51% (98) of the households were living in single family detached dwellings. Other respondents were living in high-rise or low-rise apartments [25% (48)]; non-profit or subsidized housing [5% (10)]; row houses or town houses [4% (7)] and in other dwelling types such as foster homes, cooperatives, assisted living care homes and retirement complexes [9% (17)]. Higher percentages of seniors (31%) than non-seniors (21%) were living in apartments. Additionally, as the age of the senior increased, the percentage living in apartments increased substantially.
2. The majority of respondents used specialized features to enter and leave, and inside their dwelling. The features ranged from accessible drop-off or pick-up zones [62% (113)]; accessible parking [59% (107)]; ramps or street-level entrances [54% (98)]; grab bars [72% (68)] and widened doorways [44% (41)] to lowered light switches [25% (23)] and sinks and counters [18% (17)]. However, 53% (97) reported that there were features inside their dwelling that they needed, but did not have. These included things as inexpensive as grab bars [16% (30)] and lever door handles [6% (10)] to more costly modifications such as lowered counters, sinks and switches [15% (27)], and widened doorways [14% (25)].
3. In spite of the need for additional specialized features, the majority of respondents were satisfied (either “very” or “somewhat”) with various features of their current living

⁷ Twelve women did not want to move. One woman did not answer the question.

arrangement, including the level of privacy, the neighbourhood, and the inside and outside accessibility.

4. Among the 183 household respondents, 26% (48) wanted to move, 6% (10) was not sure and 68% (125) did not want to move. Age more so than income and other variables influenced a respondent's desire to move. Approximately 88% (42) of the respondents wanting to move were aged 64 or less years. Close to 43% (42) of respondents aged 64 or less years wanted to move. This compares to 7% (6) among seniors.
5. Respondents aged 22 to 42 years were particularly interested in moving. Approximately 69% (20) of respondents aged 22 to 42 years wanted to move. Additionally, respondents living in low-rise apartments were more likely than respondents living in other types of dwellings to want to move. Among the 6 respondents aged 22 to 42 years living in low-rises, 5 wanted to move.
6. Accessibility inside and outside the dwelling and condition of the dwelling were strong motivators to move.
7. Respondents wanting to move indicated a number of reasons for not having moved. These included:
 - no suitable accommodations [78% (45)];
 - cannot afford other accommodations [59% (34)]; and
 - too costly to move [57% (33)].Most respondents wanting to move indicated that they would need assistance to move, especially help in finding accommodations.
8. Among the 58 respondents wanting to move/not sure about moving, the preferred types of dwellings were: single family detached dwelling [60% (35)], apartment [21% (12)] and row or townhouse [10% (6)]. Among the 12 respondents preferring an apartment, 8 individuals were aged 22 to 42 years. Among the 20 individuals aged 22 to 42 years and wanting to move, 40% (8) preferred an apartment.
9. Among all 183 respondents, the preferred type of dwelling was influenced by whether the respondent was aged 64 or less years, or aged 65 or more years. For example, 74% (72) of non-seniors and 35% (30) of seniors preferred single family detached dwellings. A high percentage of seniors indicated that an apartment [42% (36)] was their preferred dwelling.
10. Among the 24 respondents living in institutions most were satisfied with their current living arrangements. Five respondents wanted to move. Two preferred a single family detached dwelling. Two preferred an apartment. Most respondents wanting to move were aged 45 to 52 years.

The Saskatchewan Council on Disability Issues, in its report Saskatchewan Disability Action Plan, indicates that people with disabilities are “citizens” in the full sense of the term. They have the same rights and responsibilities as other citizens to be included and to participate fully in society (p.15). In spite of this recognition of citizenship, securing housing that is affordable,

accessible and close to desired amenities can be challenging. Many of the existing structures were not designed to be inclusive of persons with disabilities. Furthermore, it may be too costly or impossible to renovate structures with narrow entrances or with multiple stories.

Enhancing the housing options of individuals with disabilities will help towards ensuring that individuals with disabilities have full participation and citizenship in society. Many individuals with disabilities have low income. The difficulties arising from poverty are compounded by the fact that many individuals with disabilities incur higher expenses as a result of their disability (G. Allan Roeher Institute. p.1). Governments should concern themselves with ways to minimize or eliminate the additional expenses individuals face because they have a disability. This may include supplementing an individual's ability to pay the costs associated with modifications, and making changes to the Residential Rehabilitation Assistance Program for Persons with Disabilities so that it can help more people.

It is recommended that there be adequate support for community-based organizations to ensure that they have the skills and necessary funding to develop and to maintain an inventory of accessible housing options available in a community, as well as a listing of community resources, including contractors and trades people with skills and knowledge of disability modifications.

Further research on some issues is needed. The findings suggest that there is a need to closely consider age. The findings clearly indicate that there are differences between seniors and non-seniors in their levels of satisfaction with their current living arrangements, in their desire to locate to other accommodations and in their housing preferences. This finding needs to be considered further in this study's next steps and examined in future research studies. The findings also suggest that there are high percentages of people living in situations with limitations. However, many of these individuals indicate satisfaction with their current living arrangements, and indicate no desire to move. The reasons for these responses are unclear. Further research, and in particular community consultations, might help to explain this finding.

This study is a work in progress. The next step is having individuals with disabilities and other affected parties examine the findings to offer further analysis and to develop a plan of action. Individuals with disabilities and their families want to be an integral part of the planning process and to have more choice and control over the services available to them.

References

- Blalock, Hubert M. (1972). Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. (2001). The FCM Quality of Life Reporting System: Second Report Quality of Life in Canadian Communities.
- G. Allan Roeher Institute. (1990). Poor Places: Disability-Related Residential and Support Services. Downsview: York University.
- Neuman, Lawrence W. (1997). Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Saskatchewan Council on Disability Issues. (June 2001). Saskatchewan's Disability Action Plan.
- Statistics Canada. (1991). Health and Activity Limitation Survey. Ottawa.