SENIOR CITIZENS' SATISFACTION WITH THEIR HIGH-RISE BUILDINGS

Ken McDowell
Department of Psychology
University of Saskatchewan
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

I would like to thank the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation for the funding which made this study possible. A special note of appreciation is also extended to my research assistants, Pam Britton and Patti Ostertag, who not only persued the collection of good quality data, but who also communicated to the residents who took part in this study a sensitivity and awareness for the needs and interests of the elderly far beyond even their collective ages. I would also like to thank Janey Lindsey of the Saskatoon Housing Authority and Ollie Miller of the administrative staff of Luther Tower. Both were immensely helpful in providing the background information about the buildings dealt with in this study, and in facilitating our interactions with the residents and Tenants Associations.

Finally, I would like to thank the 225 senior citizens who took part in this study. Their willingness to not only answer the multitude of questions put to them, but to offer a considerable number of extremely helpful comments suggested to us that their and our interest in their housing situation needs to be studied and communicated. We hope this document facilitates the achievement of those goals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....1

THE SETTINGS.....4

MCNAUGHTON PLACE.....4

MCASKILL PLACE.....4

SCOTT-FORGET.....5

LUTHER TOWER.....6

COMPARISON OF BUILDINGS.....7

LUTHER TOWER.....7

FORGET.....7

SCOTT.....8

MCNAUGHTON.....8

MCASKILL.....8

QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS.....10

INTRODUCTION.....10.

PREVIOUS LIVING ENVIRONMENT 11

PRESENT LIVING ENVIRONMENT 13

FUTURE ENVIRONMENT.....15

INTERACTION WITH RELATIVES.....16

INTERACTION WITH FRIENDS.....19

GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT LIVING IN THE BUILDING.....22

APPEARANCE OF THE BUILDING & SURROUNDINGS.....24

MANAGEMENT, RULES, AND MAINTENANCE.....28

WAYFINDING.....30

ORGANIZATION OF RECREATION & SOCIAL ACTIVITIES.....31

SAFETY AND SECURITY.....32

GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT HEALTH.....35

OPINIONS ABOUT THE APARTMENT.....37
TEMPERATURE & LIGHTING.....38
HUMIDITY & VENTILATION.....39
NOISE.....41
LAYOUT.....42
STORAGE & FURNISHING.....43
SATISFACTION WITH COMPONENTS.....44
INFORMATION ABOUT THE RESPONDENTS.....46
REMARKS ABOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE.....48
PSYCHOLOGICAL & SOCIOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES.....49
ARCHITECTURAL DIFFERENCES.....50
CONCLUSION.....51

INTRODUCTION

This survey of senior citizens' satisfaction with their high-rise buildings was conducted in late June and during July, 1983 in Saskatoon.

Five buildings were sampled: McAskill Place, McNaughton Place, Scott, Forget, and Luther Tower. The method of approaching senior citizens in each of the five buildings was somewhat different, but basically involved an initial contact with the managers of the building, followed by a discussion of the study with the president and directors of the tenants association for a particular building, after which the residents were either approached on a door-to-door basis or a written request for volunteers was circulated throughout a building.

In spite of the differing approaches to getting a copy of the questionnaire to potential respondents, the response rate across the five buildings was almost identical. Response rates were categorized as either accept (in which the dweller filled out or filled out with the assistance of the researcher or others the questionnaire); reject (in which the dweller indicated that they did not wish to participate); or unable to participate (the reasons for being unable to participate included being deaf, away on holidays, language problems, or being too ill). The various percentages for type of participation across the five buildings are as follows:

Building	Accept	Reject	Unable to Participate
McAskill	56%	27%	17%
McNaughton	50%	25%	25%
Scott	50%	16%	34%
Forget	65%	18%	18%
Luther	53%	24%	24%
average	55%	22%	24%

Forty-three questionnaires were completed and the results analyzed from residents at McAskill, 59 at McNaughton, 25 at Scott, 51 at Forget, and 47 at Luther for a total of 225 completed and analyzed questionnaires. While this number is far below the number of potential respondents in the buildings, the 55% acceptance rate indicates a rather uniform and positive acceptance of the questionnaire and the goals of the study. In addition, the fact that the majority of respondents in the building that were physically able (either because of being present at the time the survey was being conducted or feeling physically able to answer the questions) to complete the questionnaire did so, suggests that their views are representative of all of the residents in a particular building.

Two female , senior undergraduate students (psychology majors) from the University of Saskatchewan were hired on a full-time basis to administer the questionnaires, interview the residents, and place the data into a computer file. The research assistants were given a two-day training period in the conducting of a research survey with senior citizens, with a specific focus on the administration of the questionnaire and conducting an interview. It should be noted that the response to them by the residents was, on the whole, very positive. Those residents who agreed to take part in the study were extremely helpful and very communicative. There were, however, two barriers to free and open communication: acceptance of the rationale for the study and the perceived personal nature of some of the items in the questionnaire. With respect to the former, acceptance or rejection for taking part in the study was a function of perceived sponsorship of the study. Many of the residents who were approached on an individual basis assumed that the study was government or agency oriented (i.e, that either the Saskatoon Housing Authority or the Saskatchewan Housing Corporation was conducting the study). For many of these residents, they only agreed to participate when it was made clear that it was not government sponsored. As noted in the discussion section of this report, even under these conditions a number of the respondents in McAskill indicated one opinion on paper and another during face-to-face communication with the research assistants because of a fear that a negative evaluation would have undesirable outcomes for them. In the latter case, repeated assurances to respondents that they were free to answer or not answer any questions (and/or freedom to not indicate why they had not anwered a question) facilitated a more positive communication between respondents and research assistants.

The questionnaires were given to apartment dwellers and two days later the researchers returned to the apartment to pick up the completed questionnaire. The researchers then went over the questionnaire with the respondent, making inquiries if items were left blank or if a response to a later item was inconsistent with a response to an earlier item. Sixty-nine percent of the questionnaires were administered and prepared for entry into a computer data file in this manner. In 16% of the cases respondents were interviewed by the researchers (asked the questions orally). The remaining 15% of the questionnaires were completed by a collaborative effort on the part of the respondent and researcher or respondent and a friend or relative in situations in which the respondent was unable to complete the questionnaire: for example, due to visual impairment, where they indicated they preferred to be interviewed, when the respondent had difficulty interpreting a question, or where the first language of the respondent was not English. There was no significant differences across the five buildings as a function of the method of administration of the questionnaire, or preferred method of responding.

In order to understand the overall opinion of the respondents toward high-rise buildings in Saskatoon, it is important to view those results within the context of the questionnaire items, and how those items were ordered, interpreted and responded to, as well as understanding the settings in which the respondents reside. To provide that context in the most efficient manner I have, in what immediately follows, presented a brief description of each building, followed by a reporting of the results of the analysis when the buildings were compared with each other vis-a-vis the questionnaire items and interview comments, followed by a item-by-item presentation of the questionnaire items and the results of the analysis with respect to that questionnaire item.

As indicated above, the research assistants were instructed to inquire regarding inconsistencies. In addition, when they were putting the data into a computer file they were instructed to use a numerical category of "questionable response" when it was clear that the respondent had misinterpreted the question, or when the researcher assistants thought that this situation had occurred. It should be born in mind that while there is no "scientific" justification for changing a response of someone that has filled out a questionnaire, the research assistants had, in many cases, spent over two hours talking to a respondent about their living environment, and came away from that situation with a good idea of how a person felt. This technique has two effects on the data: (1) it reduces on the average by 1% the analyzable data, and (2) it ensures that the data which is analyzed is data which has a large element of the ambiguity removed. The reader will note, therefore, that for each item of the questionnaire the percentage and number of responses of a questionable nature and also the percentage and number of responses in which the respondents choose not to answer the question is included. Both kinds of responses were treated as missing data and not included in the analysis. It should be noted, however, that the percentages reported for each of the alternatives are relative and not adjusted. The reason for this is that in some cases the percentage of "missing" data is noteworthy: that is, respondents were responding to items and communicating how they felt about the content of the item by not answering it.

THE SETTINGS

Saskatoon in 1983 had 8 senior citizen high-rise buildings, seven of which are sponsored by the public sector and one is sponsored by a private non-profit group. The 8 buildings have a total population of approximately 1000 senior citizens. Two (Shepherd and McNaughton) are located within three block of the downtown area, three (the buildings at Ave. P & 29th Street, Ave. W & 20th Street, and Ave B & 19th Street) are located on the fringe between the commerical and residential areas, and three (Scott, Forget, & Luther Tower) are located in residential areas. From the eight buildings, five were chosen for the purposes of conducting the survey: McNaughton, McAskill (at Ave. W & 20th St.), Scott, Forget, and Luther Tower.

MCNAUGHTON PLACE

McNaughton was the first senior citizen's high-rise building to be built in Saskatoon (1974). It is 14 stories, has 119 units (71, one bedroom and 1, two bedroom), and a total population of 121 residents. It is managed by the Saskatoon Housing Authority, has a resident caretaker, and as indicated above, is within four blocks of shopping and services. The building is located within one block of a bus stop and there is a large park within one block from the building.

The contact approach was door-to-door throughout the building, following the prior consent of the Tenant's Association. Perhaps because of that consent being granted over the phone, many of the residents had, upon being contacted, not heard of the study. Thus, there was some initial hestitancy - part of which was due to the facts that this building was a trend setter for other senior citizens' high-rises and the residents had participated in numerous studies in the past addressing their satisfaction with their housing - and partly because the residents did not wish to participate in what they initially thought was another government sponsored survey. Upon being told that the University was conducting the study, there was an increased acceptance and participation, however, partly due to the declining health of some of the residents who have been in the building for the nine years, and partly because of having participated in other housing surveys, there was more of a sense of apathy toward the goals of the survey than was demonstrated by the residents in the other buildings.

MCASKILL PLACE

The funding approval for the creation of McAskill came in 1977, and occupation came some three-four year later. It has 5 stories, 80 units (78, one bedroom and 2, two bedroom units), and a total population of 82 residents. It is managed by the Saskatoon Housing Authority, did not have at the time of the survey a resident caretaker or Tenants Association, and is located on the fringe of the commerical and residential area on the West side of Saskatoon some 24 blocks from the downtown area. There is a bus stop at the corner of the building, the nearest

large shopping centre is located some 12 blocks and there is a small park 2 blocks from the building.

Contact with residents was on a door-to-door basis. As mentioned, one of the outstanding problems being experienced by the residents at the time of the survey was the lack of a caretaker. The tenants were very disturbed by the fact that this position had been left vacant for a lengthy period, and a large measure of their frustration was directly at the Saskatoon Housing Authority. Many of the residents believed that directly or indirectly the survey was sponsored by the Authority, but, as indicated below made some differentiation with respect to that sponsorship as a function of filling out the questionnaire as opposed to being interviewed (when the research assistants had more opportunity to communicate that they were university students). Contact with residents occurred in late June, which for many of the residents is lease-renewal time. Lease-renewal, among other things, requires that the tenant take their uncashed monthly pension cheque to the Saskatoon Housing Authority to be photocopied. Needless to say, the questionnaire item pertaining to income reinforced the belief that the survey was being conducted by the Saskatoon Housing Authority. A large Ukrainian-speaking population within the building contributed significantly to the rejection rate because a number could not speak English (a number of these residents who did participate got a neighbour or relative to translate), neither of the research assistants spoke Ukrainian, and within the building there was dissention among Ukrainian and non-Ukrainian speaking people and among those who had supported the previous caretakers and those who helped to oust them. These problems are reflected in the results with respect to questionnaire items dealing with satisfaction with neighbours.

SCOTT-FORGET

Scott and Forget are high-rises joined by a common entrance and lounge area. Scott was first occupied in late 1980, is 11 stories, has 96 units (93, one bedroom and 3, two bedroom) and a total population of 99 senior citizens. Forget was first occupied in late 1981, is 16 stories, has 152 units (137, one bedroom and 15, two bedroom units), and a total population of 167 residents. The Scott-Forget complex is managed by the Saskatoon Housing Authority. It is located in a residental area on the East side of Sasktoon, some 5 kilometers from the downtown area. It is one block from a major shopping centre, two blocks from a large park, and there is a bus stop outside the front entrance of the complex. At the time of the study, because of the possibility of doing another study of satisfaction with housing with the residents of this complex, only the residents living on the even-numbered floors were contacted (133 residents).

The contact approach was initially at a meeting of the Tenants' Association. This was followed up by a distribution of 25% of the questionnaires at this meeting. The remainder of the questionnaires were distributed on a door-to-door basis. Distributing some of the questionnaires at the meeting became problematical. Those tenants attending the meeting discussed the

questionnaire with non-attenders. A rumour spread throughout the buildings regarding the "excessive personal questions" contained within the questionnaire. Thus, a large percentage of the tenants received a bias view of the questionnaire before the research assistants could introduce it to them. This resulted in a high rejection rate: unanswered doors and hostile rejection at the door. Those tenants who tended to not mix with the crowd were much more positive in their attitude toward the questionnaire, and there was less hostility as more people were contacted and they were told that they free to not answer any questions that they felt were too personal. The results of the survey with reference to this complex are treated separately. While the buildings were physically similar in most respects (both were designed by the same architectural firm) differences in sizes of the apartments and the one year difference in when the building were occupied, produced results that strongly suggested that each building be treated as a separate unit.

LUTHER TOWER

Luther Tower is sponsored by the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada and was constructed by Lutheran Sunset Home. There are 22 floors and 197 one bedroom units. The total population is 217 residents. There are 10 units on each floor and three basic floor plans. Health care is available to residents through the staff of the ajoining Sunset Home. Luther Tower is positioned on the lot at 45 degree to the typical north-south axis (unlike the other buildings surveyed), is located on the East side of the city in a residental area approximately 12 blocks from the downtown area, and while there is a small grocery store, pharmacy, confectionary, and park within one block of the building, most residents depend upon a special bus service that shuttles them to the downtown area to do shopping. Residents have their supper meal provided in the restaurant located on the top floor of the building.

The contact approach used for this building involved contacting the administrative staff for approval. This approval and an announcement at the evening meal (see below) was followed by a letter that was sent to each of the residents asking for volunteers to take part in the study. The more advanced age of the residents lead to the prediction by the staff that about 25% of the residents would be unable to respond to the questionnaire due to their being very sick and/or very elderly. Given, also, that the survey was conducted in July meant that many of the residents that were in good health would be away on holiday, meant that those residents who participated were in better health on the average and somewhat younger (even though, as noted later, their average age was significantly different from the residents in the other buildings). The reader should also note that the method of soliciting volunteers through the mail and the announcement (and support) of the study by the staff may account for much of the statistically different satisfaction scores as communicated by these residents.

COMPARISON OF BUILDINGS

LUTHER TOWER

Residents in Luther Tower are significantly older; have a higher income; believe that they have in common with their neighbors more similar backgrounds, beliefs, education levels, and interests; see their neighbors as more polite than the people living in McAskill or McNaughton; indicate they like the people in their building more, that they are more likely to recognize people from their building, and that they have neighbors who are more likely to keep an eye on each other's apartment.

They are significantly more pleased with their view than the people living in McAskill, are more likely to agree with the statement that their building is the most attractive in Saskatoon (people in Forget disagree with that statement), that their building is more sturdy looking, less drab looking, is more colorful appearing and has more colorful material on the outside, that it has more colorful wall colors in the apartments; that is is a place where one is more likely to use the outdoor sitting area in good weather; and they see their building as being more attractive and located in a more attractive neighborhood.

They are more satisfied with the rules about what one can and cannot do in their apartment, they see the managers as being more efficient, more friendly, and quicker to react to complaints.

They are significantly less satisfied with storage space in the kitchen, entry, living room and bedroom.

FORGET

Forget residents view their building as the newest looking, but, as noted above, don't think it is the most attractive in Saskatoon. In part,this is because of the color of the building: both Scott and Forget residents see their buildings as being significantly less attractive. Residents in Forget rate their building as being closer to grocery shopping, a pharmacy, a park, one's bank, a bus stop, and a post office.

Apartments in Forget are rated as being larger. The larger perceived size means that it is also perceived as allowing the residents to arrange the furniture in a more attractive manner; that it is easier to work in the kitchen and keep it clean; and that the amount of counter space is adequate or more than adequate (these latter two findings are also reported at Scott). While it was reported above that Luther Tower residents report an inadequate amount of storage space, residents in Forget indicated that their storage space is adequate. In summary, it would appear that at Forget some attention has been paid to the layout in apartments with respect to spatial needs.

SCOTT

In addition to the points made above about apartment designs, residents at Scott rate the grounds around the building as being more beautiful and more heavily planted, and as having a more attractive parking area. Scott residents feel that the people who manage the building are quicker to react to complaints, and make both emergency and normal repairs of such things as broken windows or leaking faucets faster. With respect to ventilation in the building, Scott residents indicate more of a need to leave their apartment door open to get fresh air, and that there is more of a problem of cooking odors in their building. Scott residents are more dissatisfied with the appearance of their building than are the residents of Luther Tower.

MCNAUGHTON

Residents in McNaughton are in general somewhat neutral with respect to most aspects of their building. They are more likely to agree that their apartments are too small, and that door and window locations make arranging furniture more difficult. In addition, they are more likely to miss having their own outdoor space, and more dissatisfied with their perceived lack of freedom to make changes to the grounds of their building (for example, to plant flowers). Like residents in McAskill, the neighborhood setting around McNaughton leads to concerns about safety & security. Specifically, McNaughton residents indicate that fear of crime keeps them from leaving the building at night and to worry about their safety. It should be pointed out that McNaughton residents are the most satisfied with security arrangements in their building.

MCASKILL

There is less of a sense of overall satisfaction expressed about McAskill by the residents. McAskill residents are less satisfied with the grounds around their building, seeing it as less heavily planted and more drab, as having a less attractive parking area, and as having less satisfactory garbage facilities.

With respect to internal aspects of the building, residents express less satisfaction with the rules as to what they can and cannot do in their apartments; that the management is less efficient; that the kitchen is less easy to work in and keep clean; that the air is too stale in the bedroom and in the kitchen; and that there is more dissatisfaction with the management and fellow residents. With respect to concerns about management,it should be noted that at the time of the survey the residents of McAskill were without the services of a caretaker, which probably accounts for most or all their concerns with respect to management's rules, efficiency and resident's overall satisfaction with the management. It also appears that residents of McAskill have a much larger diversity of backgrounds, making it more difficult for a Tenants Association (which had been dissolved at the time

of the survey) to satisfy everyone's concerns, interests, and needs.

The biggest concern at McAskill lies in the location of the building, both with respect to its being located at the corner of a busy intersection and its being on the fringe of both an urban and a surburan setting. For example, the building is seen as being more distant from a park, a post office, and a library. In addition, residents of McAskill see it as being less safe outdoors; that they are less safe in their apartments from being the possible victim of a crime; and that their possessions are only safe (not very safe as in the other buildings). They are also more likely to agree that there are unsafe places in the neighborhood around their building; that they would feel safer with stronger locks on their door; and that they are more dissatisfied with security arrangements in the building - a problem which would be changed with the presence of a caretaker. It should also be noted that residents of McAskill reported feeling less safe in their previous home.

QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS

SENIOR CITIZENS' EVALUATION OF THEIR HOUSING: SASKATOON HIGH-RISE BUILDINGS

"This questionnaire asks senior citizens living in high-rise buildings in Saskatoon to evaluate their housing. The results of this survey will be compared with the results of similar surveys which have recently been carried out in Sydney, Australia and in the Midwest in the United States. While it is fairly clear that most senior citizens in a variety of places in the world are satisfied with their housing, it is by no means clear which aspects of their housing produce the most and the least amount of satisfaction. That, basically, is what this questionnaire is looking at. Hopefully the results of this survey will lead to the production of housing for senior citizens that is safe, secure, comfortable, and highly satisfactory with respect to all of those aspects."

FIRST, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT WHERE YOU LIVED, BEFORE YOU MOVED HERE.

Please check the appropriate response

1. How long have you lived in Saskatoon?

___less than one year ___1-5 years ___6-10 years
___11-15 years ___16-20 years ___more than 20 years

RESULTS: 2.2% - LESS THAN ONE YEAR; 16% - 1-5 YEARS; 10.7% - 6-10 YEARS; 7.6% - 11-15 YEARS; 10.7% - 16-20 YEARS; 52% - MORE THAN 20 YEARS; .9% - MISSING RESPONSES.

2. Where did you live <u>just</u> <u>before</u> you moved to this apartment?

In or near this area of Saskatoon.....( )
Another area of this city.....( )
Another city or town in Saskatchewan.....( )
Another city or town in another province...( )
A farm.....( )

RESULTS: 36.4%, 41.8%, 12%, 5.3%, AND 2.7% RESPECTIVELY. .4% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 1.3% MISSING RESPONSES.

3. What type of dwelling did you live in <u>just</u> <u>before</u> you moved to this apartment?

A single family house.....( )
A duplex.....( )
An apartment.....( )
A room in a private hotel or boarding house...( )
Other (please specify).....( )

RESULTS: 26.2%, 3.6%, 54.7%, 0.4%, AND 14.7% RESPECTIVELY. .4% - MISSING RESPONSES.

4. With whom did you live?

Alone.....( )
With spouse.....( )
With children.....( )
With other relative(s).....( )
With friend(s).....( )

RESULTS: 66.7%, 20.9%, 4.9%, 2.7%, AND 2.7% RESPECTIVELY. .9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 1.3% - MISSING RESPONSES.

5. How satisfied were you with that home?

Very satisfied.....( )
Satisfied.....( )
Neither satisfied nore dissatisfied.....( )
Dissatisfied.....( )
Very dissatisfied.....( )

RESULTS: 30.2%, 36.9%, 12.4%, 16%, AND 3.6% RESPECTIVELY. .9% - MISSING RESPONSES. MEAN = 2.25 WHERE 2 = SATISFIED AND 3 = NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED. STANDARD DEVIATION = 1.16 AND VARIANCE = 1.34.

6. How many bedrooms did you have in that dwelling?

___ Number of bedrooms

RESULTS: MEAN = 1.57; STANDARD DEVIATION = 1.13; VARIANCE = 1.29. THERE WERE 14 MISSING CASES.

SUMMARIZATION OF THE RESULTS FOR THIS SECTION: The majority of the respondents had lived in Saskatoon for more than 20 years; had lived alone, in a one-bedroom apartment in the same or another area of the city; and were satisfied with those living accomodations.

NEXT, WE HAVE SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT WHERE YOU ARE LIVING NOW.

7. How long have you lived in <u>this</u> apartment? ___years ___months

RESULTS: MEAN = 3.43; STANDARD DEVIATION = 2.55; VARIANCE = 6.52; MAXIMUM = 9 YEARS.

8. At the time you moved here, how many other apartment buildings did you have to choose from?

___Number of other places

RESULTS: MEAN = 0.75; STANDARD DEVIATION = 1.37; VARIANCE = 1.89; MISSING RESPONSES = 57 (25.3%)

9. Was that enough choice? ___Yes ___No

RESULTS: YES = 52%; NO = 19.1%; MISSING RESPONSES = 65 (28.9%)

10. How much choice would you have if you were to look for another place <u>NOW?</u>

___ Places besides this building

RESULTS: MEAN = 1.78; STANDARD DEVIATION = 2.37; VARIANCE = 5.63; MISSING RESPONSES = 139 (61.8%)

11. Is that enough choice? ___Yes ___No

RESULTS: YES = 29.3%; NO = 18.7%; .9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES; MISSING RESPONSES = 115 (51.1%)

12. If you had your choice, which one would you most prefer out of the following?

A private hotel room.....( )
An apartment with meals and help with housework provided...( )
An apartment without meals or help with housework provided.( )
A retirement village.....( )
A small single family detached house.....( )
The place you are living in now.....( )

RESULTS: 0%, 7.1%, 4.4%, 3.1%, 8.9%, AND 70.2% RESPECTIVELY. .4% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES; 5.8% - MISSING RESPONSES.

13. Are there any apartments in this building that you think are more desirable than yours?

___Yes ___No

Please explain_____

_____

RESULTS: YES = 20%; NO = 70.2%; 9.8% - MISSING RESPONSES.

SUMMARIZATION OF THE RESULTS FOR THIS SECTION: Both the results above and the interview comments strongly suggest that the concept of choice had no bearing upon their decision with respect to where they resided. In fact most, due to income, were happy to have a place at all and they were concerned , due to changes in health, about having to go into a nursing home. The 20% who indicated a preference for another apartment in the building explained that preference with respect to getting away from the direct rays of the sun.

NOW PLEASE PLACE A CHECK AFTER THE WORDS THAT BEST DESCRIBE YOUR FEELINGS ABOUT THE FOLLOWING:

14. How long do you want to continue living here?
    As long as possible.....( )
    Would like to stay for the time being.....( )
    Doesn't matter if I stay or go.....( )
    Would like to go fairly soon.....( )
    No longer than I have to.....( )

RESULTS: 83.1%, 12%, 1.8%, 0.9%, AND 1.3% RESPECTIVELY. .9% - MISSING RESPONSES.

15. If you move again, would you like to live in another place like this?

    Would be very happy to.....( )
    Happy to.....( )
    Doesn't really matter.....( )
    Unhappy to.....( )
    Would be very unhappy to.....( )

RESULTS: 40.4%, 32.9%, 10.7%, 3.1%, AND 2.2% RESPECTIVELY. 3.6% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES; 7.1% - MISSING RESPONSES. MEAN = 1.81 WHERE 1 = WOULD BE VERY HAPPY TO, AND 2 = HAPPY TO; STANDARD DEVIATION = .95 AND VARIANCE = .90.

16. Would you recommend this place to one of your friends if they were looking for a place to live?

    I definitely would.....( )
    I probably would.....( )
    I don't know.....( )
    I probably would not.....( )
    I definitely would not.....( )

RESULTS: 65.3%, 23.6%, 6.2%, 1.8%, AND 1.8% RESPECTIVELY. .4% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND .9% - MISSING RESPONSES. MEAN = 1.49 WHERE 1 = I DEFINITELY WOULD AND 2 = I PROBABLY WOULD. STANDARD DEVIATION = .84 AND VARIANCE = .70.

SUMMARIZATION OF THE RESULTS FOR THIS SECTION: Interview comments reinforced the notion of satisfaction (vis-a-vis recommendations). In addition, continuation of one's present accomodation was with reference to perceived state of health: being able to stay in the present dwelling meant that one's health was sufficient to maintain one's self in that accomodation. "Moving to another place like this one" was treated as a totally hypothetical and unlikely possibility: most saw there next move as being to a nursing home, so "another place like this one" was only with respect to general aspects of that place - a feeling of it being home-like.

NOW, WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR RELATIVES AND FRIENDS IN THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS.

17. How many of your relatives live in the following locations?

	10 or more	7-9	4-6	1-3	0
On the same floor as you	---	---	---	---	---
In this building, but not on your floor	---	---	---	---	---
Nearby in the neighborhood	---	---	---	---	---
In another area of Saskatoon	---	---	---	---	---
Outside of Saskatoon	---	---	---	---	---

RESULTS

SAME FLOOR: 7-9 = .9%; 1-3 = .9%; 0 = 58.2%; .9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSE AND 39.1% MISSING RESPONSES.
SAME BUILDING: 10 OR MORE = .9%; 1-3 = 4%; 0 = 50.7%; 2.2% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 42.2% MISSING RESPONSES.
NEIGHBOURHOOD: 10 OR MORE = 1.3%; 7-9 = 1.8%; 4-6 = 5.8%; 1-3 = 10.7%; 0 = 36.9%; 2.2% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 41.3% - MISSING RESPONSES.
CITY: 10 OR MORE = 19.1%; 7-9 = 4.4%; 4-6 = 18.7%; 1-3 = 24.9%; 0 = 10.2%; 1.3% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 21.3% - MISSING RESPONSES.
OUTSIDE OF CITY: 10 OR MORE = 28.9%; 7-9 = 5.3%; 4-6 = 9.8%; 0 = 8%; 1.7% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 30.2% - MISSING RESPONSES.

18. How often do you go to visit your relatives who live in the following locations?

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Less than once a month	No relatives there
On the same floor as you	---	---	---	---	---
In this building, but not on your floor	---	---	---	---	---
Nearby in the neighborhood	---	---	---	---	---
In another area of Saskatoon	---	---	---	---	---
Outside of Saskatoon	---	---	---	---	---

RESULTS

SAME FLOOR: WEEKLY = 2.2%; MONTHLY = .9%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 1.8%; NO RELATIVES THERE = 56.4%; .4% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 38.2% - MISSING RESPONSES.
SAME BUILDING: DAILY = 2.2%; WEEKLY = 1.3%; MONTHLY = 1.3%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = .4%; NO RELATIVES THERE = 56.4%; .9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 41.8% - MISSING RESPONSES.
NEIGHBOURHOOD: DAILY = 2.2%; WEEKLY = 8%; MONTHLY = 3.6%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 5.3%; NO RELATIVES THERE = 36.4%; 1.8% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 42.7% - MISSING RESPONSES.
CITY: DAILY = 4.4%; WEEKLY = 26.7%; MONTHLY = 13.8%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 20.9%; NO RELATIVES THERE = 9.8%; 2.2% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 22.2% - MISSING RESPONSES.

OUTSIDE OF CITY: WEEKLY = 1.8%; MONTHLY = 8.4%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 48%; NO RELATIVES THERE = 8%; 1.3% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 32.4% - MISSING RESPONSES.

19. How often are you visited here by your relatives who live in the following locations?

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Less than once a month	No relatives there
On the same floor as you	---	---	---	---	---
In this building, but not on your floor	---	---	----	---	---
Nearby in the neighborhood	---	---	---	---	---
In another area of Saskatoon	---	---	---	---	---
Outside of Saskatoon	---	---	---	---	---

RESULTS

SAME FLOOR: DAILY = .4% WEEKLY = 1.8%; NO RELATIVES THERE = 55.1%; 1.3% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 41.3% - MISSING RESPONSES.
SAME BUILDING: DAILY = 1.3%; WEEKLY = 1.3%; MONTHLY = 1.3%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 1.3%; NO RELATIVES THERE = 50.7%; .9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 43.1% - MISSING RESPONSES.
NEIGHBOURHOOD: DAILY = 1.3%; WEEKLY = 8.8%; MONTHLY = 5.3%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 3.6%; NO RELATIVES THERE = 33.8%; 2.2% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 44.9% - MISSING RESPONSES.
CITY: DAILY = 4.0%; WEEKLY = 28.4%; MONTHLY = 13.8%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 22.2%; NO RELATIVES THERE = 8.9%; 1.8% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 20.9% - MISSING RESPONSES.
OUTSIDE OF CITY: DAILY = .4%; WEEKLY = 4.0%; MONTHLY = 8.4%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 44.9%; NO RELATIVES THERE = 6.7%; 1.8% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 33.8% - MISSING RESPONSES.

SUMMARIZATION OF THE RESULTS FOR THIS SECTION: Few have relatives on the same floor, in the building, or in the neighbourhood. For those with relatives in the city, their visiting occurs on a weekly or less than monthly basis. Visiting with relatives outside the city typically occurs on a less than monthly basis. A similiar frequency pattern occurs with respect to being visited by relatives.

20. If you needed a bit of help with something, whom would you ask?

Next door neighbor.....( )
Another neighbor on your floor.....( )
A friend or relative in this building.....( )
A friend or relative not in this building....( )
The manager.....( )

RESULTS: 15.1%, 13.8%, 9.8%, 39.1%, AND 17.3% RESPECTIVELY. 1.8% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 3.1% MISSING RESPONSES. Most of the respondents interpreted "a bit of help" as involving things which they were physically unable to do, but which they felt were idiosyncratic to their needs (for example, installing a light above the kitchen sink). Typically sons-in-law were asked to do this when they visited the respondents.

NOW, PLEASE TELL US ABOUT YOUR FRIENDS IN EACH OF THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS

21. How many of your friends live in the following locations?

	All	Many	Some	Few	None
On the same floor as you	---	---	---	---	---
In this building, but not on your floor	---	---	---	---	---
Nearby in the neighborhood	---	---	---	---	---
In another area of Saskatoon	---	---	---	---	---
Outside of Saskatoon	---	---	---	---	---

RESULTS

SAME FLOOR: ALL = 7.6%; MANY = 6.7%; SOME = 18.2%; FEW = 14.2%; NONE = 19.1%; 1.3% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 32.4% - MISSING RESPONSES.
SAME BUILDING: ALL = 2.2%; MANY = 18.2%; SOME = 20.4%; FEW = 15.6%; NONE = 13.8%; .9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 28.9% - MISSING RESPONSES.
NEIGHBOURHOOD: ALL = 1.3%; MANY = 5.3%; SOME = 15.1%; FEW = 11.6%; NONE = 25.3%; 1.3% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 40% - MISSING RESPONSES.
CITY: ALL = 4%; MANY = 15.1%; SOME = 31.6%; FEW = 18.7%; NONE = 8.4%; .9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 21.3% - MISSING RESPONSES.
OUTSIDE OF CITY: ALL = 1.8%; MANY = 20.9%; SOME = 18.2%; FEW = 11.1%; NONE = 11.1%; 1.3% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 35.6% - MISSING RESPONSES.

22. How often do you go to visit your friends who live in the following locations?

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Less than once a month	No relatives there
On the same floor as you	---	---	---	---	---
In this building, but not on your floor	---	---	---	---	---
Nearby in the neighborhood	---	---	---	---	---
In another area of Saskatoon	---	---	---	---	---
Outside of Saskatoon	---	---	---	---	---

RESULTS

SAME FLOOR: DAILY = 16.4% WEEKLY = 13.3%; MONTHLY = 6.2%; NO FRIENDS THERE = 15.1%; 4.9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 35.6% - MISSING RESPONSES.
SAME BUILDING: DAILY = 14.2%; WEEKLY = 21.8%; MONTHLY = 6.2%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 10.2% NO FRIENDS THERE = 10.7%; 4.9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 32% - MISSING RESPONSES.
NEIGHBOURHOOD: DAILY = 1.3%; WEEKLY = 7.6%; MONTHLY = 8%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 11.6%; NO FRIENDS THERE = 21.8%; 6.2% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 43.6% - MISSING RESPONSES.
CITY: DAILY = 0.9%; WEEKLY = 14.2%; MONTHLY = 17.3%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 24%; NO FRIENDS THERE = 8%; 7.6% - QUESTIONABLE

RESPONSES AND 28% - MISSING RESPONSES.
OUTSIDE OF CITY: DAILY = 0.4%; WEEKLY = 0.4%; MONTHLY = 8.4%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 35.1%; NO FRIENDS THERE = 11.1%; 7.1% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 37.3% - MISSING RESPONSES.

23. How often are you visited here by friends who live in the following locations?

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Less than once a month	No friends there
On the same floor as you	___	___	___	___	___
In this building, but not on your floor	___	___	___	___	___
Nearby in the neighborhood	___	___	___	___	___
In another area of Saskatoon	___	___	___	___	___
Outside of Saskatoon	___	___	___	___	___

RESULTS

SAME FLOOR: DAILY = 17.3% WEEKLY = 14.2%; MONTHLY = 6.7%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 4.9% NO FRIENDS THERE = 14.2%; 4.4% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 38.2% - MISSING RESPONSES.
SAME BUILDING: DAILY = 10.7%; WEEKLY = 19.6%; MONTHLY = 7.1%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 10.2% NO FRIENDS THERE = 9.3%; 4.9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 38.2% - MISSING RESPONSES.
NEIGHBOURHOOD: DAILY = 0.4%; WEEKLY = 9.8%; MONTHLY = 6.7%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 11.1%; NO FRIENDS THERE = 20.9%; 4.4% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 46.7% - MISSING RESPONSES.
CITY: DAILY = 0.9%; WEEKLY = 11.1%; MONTHLY = 19.1%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 24.4%; NO FRIENDS THERE = 7.1%; 5.8% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 31.6% - MISSING RESPONSES.
OUTSIDE OF CITY: WEEKLY = 0.4%; MONTHLY = 8.9%; LESS THAN MONTHLY = 33.8%; NO FRIENDS THERE = 12%; 5.3% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 36.9% - MISSING RESPONSES.

SUMMARIZATION OF THE RESULTS FOR THIS SECTION: For those respondents who chose to fill out this portion of the questionaire, closeness (in terms of physical proximity) was not linearly related to friendship patterns. That is most friends were either on the same floor or in the same building and/or in the city or outside the city. A similar curvilinear pattern exists with respect to being visited by and visiting friends. One overriding factor to note with respect to these results and the results with respect to relatives (number and visiting behavior) is the high frequency of missing responses. A majority of respondents felt that (a) these questions were an invasion of their privacy, and (b) the questions had no obvious or nonobvious bearing on their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their housing. For those who overcame these reservations and decided to answer the question, there was a noticeable sense of anxiety: the questions arouse considerable psychological reactance, both in terms of reactivation of awareness that many relatives and

friends have died, and that one <u>should have</u> (to appear psychologically healthy) more friends than one, in fact, has. Many respondents also remarked about the lack of response categories dealing with communication with friends and relatives on the telephone. Only a few chose to include within the concept of visiting the talking on the telephone. The remainder were frustrated by the implications of minimal contact when in fact due to their physical condition and/or climatic conditions they were engaging in considerably more contact but had no way of communicating that vis-a-vis the questionnaire.

BELOW ARE SOME MORE GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT LIVING IN THIS BUILDING

24. Please place a check on the line that best describes whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	YES	NO	I'DONT KNOW
Most people living in this building have similar interests to mine	---	---	---
Most people here have much the same education as I have	---	---	---
Most people here have the same beliefs as I have about what is right and wrong	---	---	---
I have the same housekeeping standards as most people in this building	---	---	---
I would like this building to have a mix of both elderly and non-elderly residents	---	---	---
Parking is close and convenient to my apartment	---	---	---
There is adequate lighting outside this building at night	---	---	---
There are suitable recreation areas and recreation equipment in this building	---	---	---

RESULTS

ITEM	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
SIMILAR INTEREST	20.9%	22.2%	45.8%
SAME EDUCATION	18.2%	13.8%	56.9%
SAME BELIEFS	40.9%	7.6%	42.2%
SAME HOUSEKEEPING STANDARDS	54.7%	6.7%	31.6%
LIKE A MIX	32.4%	38.7%	13.8%
PARKING CLOSE & CONVENIENT	59.6%	10.7%	5.8%
ADEQUATE LIGHTING OUTSIDE	86.7%	6.7%	3.1%
SUITABLE RECREATION AREAS	87.6%	4.4%	2.7%

AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = .4% AND AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 10.4%. THE RESULTS WITH RESPECT TO INTERESTS, EDUCATION, BELIEFS AND HOUSEKEEPING STANDARDS WERE IN PART DISCUSSED EARLIER WITH RESPECT TO LUTHER TOWER. CONSIDERABLE CAUTION SHOULD BE USED IN INTERPRETING THE RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION CONCERNING MIX OF ELDERLY AND NON-ELDERLY. FOR MANY OF THE RESPONDENTS, NON-ELDERLY IS 65-75 YEARS OF AGE. THUS, IN THEIR BUILDING A MIX ALREADY EXISTED OR, AS IN THE CASE OF THE RESIDENCES OF LUTHER TOWER, A MIX (I.E., HAVING MORE OF THESE "NON-ELDERLY") IN THEIR BUILDING WOULD BE PREFERED. FOR THIS QUESTION, IN COMPARING KNOWLEDGE OF PEOPLE VS KNOWLEDGE OF THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT, IT IS OBVIOUSLY THAT EVALUATION AND KNOWLEDGE IS MOST DEFINITIVE WITH RESPECT TO PHYSICAL ATTRIBUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

Please place a check on the line that best describes how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	strongly disagree	disagree	neither agree nor disagree	agree	strongly agree
The amount of sunshine in my apartment is satisfactory	___	___	___	___	___
The view from my apartment is pleasing	___	___	___	___	___
My neighbors are often polite and considerate	___	___	___	___	___
This building looks like an office building	___	___	___	___	___
This building looks like a hospital	___	___	___	___	___
This building is the most attractive apartment building in Saskatoon	___	___	___	___	___

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
AMOUNT OF SUNSHINE	3.96*	.75	.57
VIEW FROM APARTMENT	4.05	.86	.74
NEIGHBOURS CONSIDERATE	4.01	.79	.62
LOOKS LIKE AN OFFICE BLDG.	2.18	.73	.53
LOOKS LIKE A HOSPITAL	1.97	.67	.44
MOST ATTRACTIVE IN SASK.	2.97	1.04	1.07

* 1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE; 2 = DISAGREE; 3 = NEITHER; 4 = AGREE; AND 5 = STRONGLY AGREE. AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES FOR THIS QUESTION = .3% AND AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 7.8%

NOW WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THE APPEARANCE OF THIS BUILDING AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

25. Please place a check over the phrase in each line which best describes the <u>building</u> <u>overall.</u>

_____ very beautiful	_____ beautiful	_____ neither beautiful nor ugly	_____ ugly	_____ very ugly
_____ very new looking	_____ new looking	_____ neither new nor old	_____ old looking	_____ very old looking
_____ very flimsy and weak looking	_____ flimsy and weak looking	_____ neither flimsy nor sturdy looking	_____ sturdy looking	_____ very sturdy looking
_____ very cheap looking	_____ cheap looking	_____ neither cheap nor expensive	_____ expensive looking	_____ very expensive looking
_____ very drab	_____ drab	_____ neither drab nor colorful	_____ colorful	_____ very colorful

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
BEAUTIFUL	2.48*	.66	.43
NEW LOOKING	2.18	.59	.35
STURDY LOOKING	2.04	.69	.48
EXPENSIVE LOOKING	2.59	.71	.51
COLORFUL	2.60	.68	.47

* WHERE 1 = THE MOST POSITIVE RESPONSE AND 5 = MOST NEGATIVE
AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = .4% AND AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 12%.

26. Please place a check over the phrase in each line which best describes the grounds around the building(s) here.

_____ very beautiful	_____ beautiful	_____ neither beautiful nor ugly	_____ ugly	_____ very ugly

very spacious	spacious	neither spacious nor crowded	crowded	very crowded
sheltered	somewhat sheltered from winds	neither sheltered from nor exposed to winds	somewhat exposed to winds	very exposed to winds
heavily planted	moderately planted	neither heavily nor sparsely planted	sparsely planted	very sparsely planted
very drab	drab	neither drab colorful	colorful	very colorful

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
BEAUTIFUL	2.34*	.59	.35
SPACIOUS	2.50	.68	.46
SHELTERED	3.50	.99	.98
HEAVILY PLANTED	2.62	.86	.75
COLORFUL	2.62	.66	.43

* WHERE 1 = MOST POSITIVE RESPONSE AND 5 = MOST NEGATIVE
AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = .4% AND AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 15%.

27. Please place a check on the line to indicate how attractive each of the following are to you.

	very attractive	attractive	neither attractive nor unattractive	unattractive	very unattractive
The color on the outside of this building	____	____	____	____	____
The materials on the outside of this building	____	____	____	____	___
The wall colors in your apartment	____	____	____	____	____
Landscaping around the building	____	____	____	____	____
The neighborhood around this building	____	____	____	____	____
The lounge areas in this building	____	____	____	____	____

Your apartment	----	----	----	----	----
The parking area	----	----	----	----	----

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
COLOR	2.56*	.76	.57
MATERIALS	2.45	.73	.53
WALL COLOR	2.32	.70	.49
LANDSCAPING	2.13	.60	.36
NEIGHBOURHOOD	2.31	.74	.55
LOUNGE AREAS	1.98	.64	.40
APARTMENT	2.10	.57	.33
PARKING AREA	2.56	.80	.65

* WHERE 1 = VERY ATTRACTIVE; 2 = ATTRACTIVE; 3 = NEITHER ATTRACTIVE NOR UNATTRACTIVE; 4 = UNATTRACTIVE; AND 5 = VERY UNATTRACTIVE.
AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = .9% AND AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 9%

28. Please place a check on the line that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	strongly disagree	disagree	neither agree nor disagree	agree	strongly agree
My apartment is too small	---	---	---	---	---
Glare from daylight coming in my windows bothers me	---	---	---	---	---
During the WINTER, my apartment is warm and comfortable	---	---	---	---	---
During the SPRING and AUTUMN the temperature in my apartment is comfortable	---	---	---	---	---
During the SUMMER, my apartment is cool and comfortable	---	---	---	---	---
The windows allow good ventilation in my apartment	---	---	---	---	---
I can easily open and close the windows in my apartment	---	---	---	---	---
There is adequate fire protection in this building	---	---	---	---	---

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
APARTMENT TOO SMALL	2.51*	.96	.93
GLARE BOTHERSOME	2.31	.83	.69
UNCOMFORTABLE IN WINTER	2.03	.69	.48
UNCOMFORTABLE IN SPRING/AUTUMN	2.10	.71	.50
UNCOMFORTABLE IN SUMMER	2.73	1.06	1.17
POOR VENTILATION FROM WINDOWS	2.34	.85	.72
HARD TO OPEN & CLOSE WINDOWS	2.24	.82	.68
INADEQUATE FIRE PROTECTION	2.06	.77	.59

* WHERE 1 = STRONGLY DISAGREE; 2 = DISAGREE; 3 = NEITHER DISAGREE NOR AGREE; 4 = AGREE; AND 5 = STRONGLY AGREE.
AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = .5% AND AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 7.4%.

29. Do you find that apartments on one side of this building are more pleasant than the others?

____YES ____NO

RESULTS: YES = 49.8% AND NO = 34.7%

If YES, then which side? ___EAST ___WEST ___NORTH ___SOUTH

RESULTS: EAST = 19.1%; WEST = 8.9%; NORTH = 13.3% AND SOUTH = 5.3%

In what way are they more pleasant?_____
_____

RESULTS: THE MOST FREQUENT RESPONSE WAS WITH REFERENCE TO GETTING AWAY FROM THE AFTERNOON SUN. THE SECOND MOST FREQUENT RESPONSE WAS WITH REFERENCE TO THE VIEW.

SUMMARIZATION OF THE RESULTS FOR THIS SECTION: With respect to appearance, 70 to 80% of the responses are between neutral and attractive. With respect to environmental features around the building, the percentages remain high regarding landscaping, but diminishes to 64% regarding the parking area, and over 50% see the grounds as being somewhat or very exposed to wind. With respect to internal environments, satisfaction is high for all features except summer cooling. Had this study been conducted in the spring, autumn, or winter, these results may vary with respect to perceived comfort.

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS DEAL WITH MANAGEMENT, RULES, AND MAINTENANCE

30. How satisfied are you with the rules about what you can and cannot do in your apartment?

Very satisfied.....( )
Satisfied.....( )
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.....( )
Dissatisfied.....( )
Very dissatisfied.....( )

RESULTS: MEAN = 1.87 WHERE 1 = VERY SATISFIED, 2 = SATISFIED, 3 = NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED, 4 = DISSATISFIED, AND 5 = VERY DISSATISFIED; STANDARD DEVIATION = .70; AND VARIANCE =

31. In terms of enforcing these rules, the management is:

Very strict.....( )
Strict.....( )
Neither strict nor lenient.....( )
Lenient.....( )
Very lenient.....( )

RESULTS: MEAN = 2.83 WHERE 1 = VERY STRICT, 2 = STRICT, 3 = NEITHER STRICT NOR LENIENT, 4 = LENIENT, AND 5 = VERY LENIENT; STANDARD DEVIATION = .86 AND VARIANCE = .74; 1.3% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 8.4% - MISSING RESPONSES.

32. When faced with tenants' problems, the people who manage this building are:

very inefficient	inefficient	neither efficient nor inefficient	efficient	very efficient
very cooperative	cooperative	neither cooperative nor uncooperative	uncooperative	very uncooperative
very friendly	friendly	neither friendly nor unfriendly	unfriendly	very unfriendly
very unavailable to talk to	unavailable to talk to	not available consistently to talk to	available to talk to	very available to talk to
very quick to react to complaints	quick to react to complaints	neither quick nor slow to react	slow to react to complaints	very slow to react to complaints

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
EFFICIENT	3.63*	1.01	1.01
COOPERATIVE	3.96	.79	.62
FRIENDLY	4.04	.68	.46
AVAILABLE TO TALK TO	3.70	.91	.82
REACT TO COMPLAINTS	3.72	.84	.70

* WHERE 1 = MOST NEGATIVE EVALUATION AND 5 = MOST POSITIVE. THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES FOR THIS QUESTION = .6% AND THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 15.8%.

33. Please place a check on the line that indicates how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
Emergency repairs on such things as broken pipes or windows are made quickly enough	____	____	____	____	____
Normal repairs on such things as leaking faucets are made quickly enough	____	____	____	____	____
There is <u>no problem</u> with rats, mice or bugs in my apartment	____	____	____	____	____

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
EMERGENCY REPAIRS	2.01*	.67	.45
NORMAL REPAIRS	1.98	.62	.39
NO PROBLEMS WITH RATS/MICE	1.73	.86	.74

* WHERE 1 = STRONGLY AGREE, 2 = AGREE, 3 = NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, 4 = DISAGREE, AND 5 = STRONGLY DISAGREE. THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES FOR THESE THREE ITEMS = 1.2% AND THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 11.6%.

HERE ARE TWO QUESTIONS ABOUT FINDING ONE'S WAY AROUND THIS BUILDING

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
34. My friends and other people have trouble finding <u>my floor</u> because all the floors look alike	____	____	_____	____	____
35. My friends and other people have trouble finding <u>my apartment</u> because the doors of all the apartments look alike	____	____	_____	____	____

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
FINDING MY FLOOR	3.80*	.78	.60
FINDING MY APARTMENT	3.83	.73	.53

* WHERE 1 = STRONGLY AGREE, 2 = AGREE, 3 = NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, 4 = DISAGREE, AND 5 = STRONGLY DISAGREE.
THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES FOR THESE TWO ITEMS = 7%

36. Please place a check on the line that indicates how easy or difficult it is for you to get to the following places from your apartment.

	very easy	easy	neither easy nor difficult	difficult	very difficult	does not apply
Grocery	____	____	____	____	____	____
Pharmacy	____	____	____	____	____	____
Park	____	____	____	____	____	____
Bank	____	____	____	____	____	____
Doctor's Office	____	____	____	____	____	____
Post Office	____	____	____	____	____	____
Church	____	____	____	____	____	____
Library	____	____	____	____	____	____
Bus Stop	____	____	____	____	____	____

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
GROCERY	1.70*	.98	.97
PHARMACY	1.72	.88	.77
PARK	2.16	1.43	2.04
BANK	2.01	1.04	1.08
DOCTOR	2.22	1.12	1.26
POST OFFICE	1.96	1.18	1.40
CHURCH	2.25	1.36	1.85
BUS STOP	1.56	.93	.87

* WHERE 1 = VERY EASY, 2 = EASY, 3 = NEITHER EASY NOR DIFFICULT, 4 = DIFFICULT, 5 = VERY DIFFICULT, AND 6 = DOES NOT APPLY.
THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES FOR THIS QUESTION = 6.8%.
THE LARGER VARIANCE FOR "PARK,""LIBRARY,"AND "CHURCH" WAS DUE TO HIGHER PERCENTAGES OF DOES NOT APPLY BEING CHECKED OFF. THE LESS POSITIVE EVALUATION FOR LOCATION OF BANK AND DOCTOR WAS DUE TO PREFERENCES TO MAINTAIN BUSINESS WITH PARTICULAR PEOPLE, IRRESPECTIVE OF THEIR PROXIMITY TO ONE'S RESIDENCE.

37. Which people organize recreation and social activities in this building?

Residents only.....( )
Mostly the residents.....( )
Equally shared.....( )
Mostly the management.....( )
Management only.....( )
Tenants Association.....( )

RESULTS: 16.4%, 25.3%, 3.1%, 1.3%, 1.3%, AND 40.9% RESPECTIVELY. 11.6% OF THE RESPONSES WERE MISSING.

38. How involved are you personally in organizing recreation and social activities?

very involved	moderately involved	somewhat involved	hardly involved	not involved at all

RESULTS: MEAN = 3.93 WHERE 1 = VERY INVOLVED AND 5 = NOT INVOLVED AT ALL. STANDARD DEVIATION = 1.19 AND VARIANCE = 1.41; .9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES AND 6.2% - MISSING RESPONSES.

THESE QUESTIONS FOCUS ON HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT SAFETY AND SECURITY

39. Please place a check on the line which best describes how safe you feel.

	very safe	safe	neither	unsafe	very unsafe
How safe are YOU from being the victim of a crime while OUTDOORS near this building during the day	___	___	___	___	___
How safe are YOU from being a victim of a crime while in your APARTMENT	___	___	___	___	___
How safe are your POSSESSIONS from crime or vandalism	___	___	___	___	___

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
OUTDOORS	1.94*	.70	.49
APARTMENT	1.74	.61	.37
POSSESSIONS	1.88	.66	.43

* WHERE 1 = VERY SAFE, 2 = SAFE, 3 = NEITHER, 4 = UNSAFE, AND 5 = VERY UNSAFE; THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES FOR THIS QUESTION = 6.2%.

40. Do you know anyone who lives in this building and who has been the victim of a crime while in this building or on the grounds?

_____YES _____NO

RESULTS: YES = 24% AND NO = 68.9% (7.1% - MISSING RESPONSES). A WEEK BEFORE THE STUDY HAD BEEN CONDUCTED A RESIDENT OF FORGET HAD BEEN MUGGED SOMEWHERE NEAR THE BUILDING (BUT NOT, WE UNDERSTAND ON THE GROUNDS). IT WAS THIS INSTANCE AS REPORTED TO THE INTERVIEWERS WHICH ACCOUNTS FOR THE 24% OF YES RESPONSES.

41. Please place a check on the line which tells how much you agree or disagree with the following.

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
Fear of crime keeps me from leaving this building at night	___	___	___	___	___
Fear of crime makes me worry about my safety	___	___	___	___	___
There are unsafe places in the NEIGHBORHOOD around this building	___	___	___	___	___

I would feel safer with stronger locks on my doors	___	___	___	___	___
In general I like the people in this building very much	___	___	___	___	___
I recognize most of the people living in this building	___	___	___	___	___
I am as safe and secure here as I was at my previous home	___	___	___	___	___
My living room is dark and gloomy	___	___	___	___	___
The outdoor sitting area near the front entry is a pleasant place to sit	___	___	___	___	___
I often use the outdoor sitting area in good weather	___	___	___	___	___
I would use an outdoor area that was set aside to grow flowers or vegetables	___	___	___	___	___
Growing plants in my apartment or in the solarium is enough gardening for me	___	___	___	___	___
It is more important for outdoor spaces to look nice than to be useful	___	___	___	___	___
Living in this building makes me feel hemmed in and cut-off from the rest of the world	___	___	___	___	___
The elevators in this building work efficiently	___	___	___	___	___

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
LEAVE BUILDING AT NIGHT	3.06*	1.08	1.16
FEAR OF CRIME MAKES ME WORRY	3.39	1.00	1.00
UNSAFE NEIGHBOURHOOD	3.21	.93	.87
SAFER WITH STRONGER LOCKS	3.49	.97	.93
LIKE PEOPLE IN THIS BUILDING	3.99	.56	.31
RECOGNIZE PEOPLE IN THIS BLDG.	3.63	.85	.72
SAFE AS IN PREVIOUS HOME	2.90	.62	.38
LIVING RM DARK & GLOOMY	4.07	.64	.40
OUTDOOR SITTING AREA/PLEASANT	3.66	.86	.73
SITTING AREA/GOOD WEATHER	3.13	1.03	1.06
OUTDOOR AREA/FLOWERS	2.78	1.06	1.13
GROWING PLANTS/APT. OR SOLAR.	3.74	.85	.72
OUTDOOR SPACES-NICE VS USEFUL	3.40	.92	.85
HEMMED IN & CUT OFF IN BLDG.	3.71	.93	.87
ELEVATORS WORK EFFICIENTLY	3.65	.85	.73

* WHERE 1 = STRONGLY AGREE, 2 = AGREE, 3 = NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, 4 = DISAGREE, AND 5 = STRONGLY DISAGREE; THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES FOR THIS QUESTION = 1% AND THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 10%.

42. Please place a check on the line that best describes how often you do the following.

	almost always	usually do	some-times	usually do not	never
I lock my doors and windows at night	---	---	---	---	---
I lock my doors and windows when not at home	---	---	---	---	---
Neighbors keep an eye on each others apartments	---	---	---	---	---

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
LOCK DOORS & WINDOWS AT NIGHT	1.22*	.50	.25
LOCK WHEN NOT AT HOME	1.17	.44	.19
NEIGHBOURS KEEP AN EYE	2.17	1.13	1.28

* WHERE 1 = ALMOST ALWAYS, 2 = USUALLY DO, 3 = SOMETIMES, 4 = USUALLY DO NOT, AND 5 = NEVER. THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES FOR THIS QUESTION = 1.3% AND THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 12%. MANY RESPONDENTS REMARKED ABOUT THE DOUBLE BARRELED ASPECTS OF THE FIRST TWO ITEMS (I.E., THEY LOCK THEIR DOORS BUT NOT THE WINDOWS).

43. Please place a check on the line that best describes how satisfied you are with the <u>security arrangments</u> in this building.

---	---	---	---	---
very satisfied	satisfied	neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	dissatisfied	very dissatisfied

RESULTS: MEAN = 2.09, STANDARD DEVIATION = .79, AND VARIANCE = DISSATISFIED. THE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 2.7%.

SUMMARIZATION OF THE RESULTS FOR THIS SECTION: 70 to 80 percent of the respondents feel very safe or safe both in their apartments and outside the building. There is increased concern with respect to leaving the building at night. Note that 87% feel their is adequate lighting around the building, thus the fear is probably associated with social as opposed to physical features of the environment.

THE FOLLOWING ARE SOME GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR HEALTH

44. What activities (if any) do you do for physical exercise? (Please give details):_____
_____

45. How far can you comfortably walk?

Less than one city block.....( )
About one city block.....( )
About two city blocks.....( )
About three city blocks.....( )
Four or more city blocks.....( )

RESULTS: MEAN = 4.04, STANDARD DEVIATION = 1.43, AND VARIANCE = 2.06, WHERE 4 = THREE CITY BLOCKS AND 5 = FOUR OR MORE CITY BLOCKS. THE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = .4% AND MISSING RESPONSES = 7.1%.

46. How often do you have "Meals-on-Wheels" delivered?

Every day.....( )
Frequently.....( )
Occasionally.....( )
Rarely.....( )
Never.....( )

RESULTS: MEAN = 4.90, STANDARD DEVIATION = .47, AND VARIANCE = -.4%; % OF MISSING RESPONSES - 4.4%. NOTE THAT LUTHER TOWER RESIDENTS PAY FOR 25 MEALS A MONTH THAT ARE SERVED IN THE TOP FLOOR RESTAURANT.

47. In previous homes have you ever had a private outdoor space (such as a patio, a balcony or a back yard)?

_____YES _____NO

RESULTS: YES = 70.7%, NO = 22.2%, 7.1% - MISSING RESPONSES.

48. What were your favorite outdoor activities before moving here? (Please list them):
1._____2._____3._____4._____

49. Do you still engage in the activities listed in question #48? (Circle "yes" or "no" for each activity)

Activity #1		Activity #2		Activity #3		Activity #4	
Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No

50. Do you ever sit outdoors here in pleasant weather? ___YES___NO

RESULTS: YES = 61.8%, NO = 29.8%, QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES - .9%; MISSING RESPONSES - 6.7%.

51. How often do you spend time in the solarium?

___some time every day ___at least once a week ___at least once a month

___have never been there ___there is no solarium here

RESULTS: OF THE 5 BUILDINGS, ONLY SCOTT AND FORGET HAVE SOLARIUMS, AND RESIDENTS VARY CONSIDERABLE IN THEIR USAGE OF THIS AREA. LUTHER HAS A GREENHOUSE, BUT THERE IS NO SEATING IN THIS AREA - USAGE IS INFREQUENT.

SUMMARIZATION OF THE RESULTS FOR THIS SECTION: Most of the respondents consider themselves to be in good health for their age, and most engage in some form of physical activity - walking in the neighbourhood or to a nearby shooping centre being the most common forms of activity. A number of the residents of McAskill of Ukrainian background indicated a desire to grow their own vegetables (and expressed frustration at being unable to do so). The majority of the residents of the other buildings expressed little desire to engage in gardening activities as a form of physical activity. Note also that 88% of the respondents indicate that there is suitable recreational equipment and areas in there building.

THIS SET OF QUESTIONS CONCERNS GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR APARTMENT HERE IN THIS BUILDING

52. Please place a check on the line that best describes how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements.

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
It is important for each apartment to have a balcony or patio	---	---	---	---	---
It is important for housing for the elderly to have pleasant outdoor areas for sitting	---	---	---	---	---
I miss having my own outdoor space here	---	---	---	---	---
I am happy with the design of my apartment	---	---	---	---	---
The location of doors and windows make furniture arangements difficult	---	---	---	---	---
This apartment is very cramped with my furniture in it	---	---	---	---	---
My apartment does not allow my furniture to be arranged attractively	---	---	---	---	---
I would rather have a slightly larger apartment than a lounge area on my floor	---	---	---	---	---
I feel safe and comfortable when using the bathroom	---	---	---	---	---
The kitchen is easy to work in and keep clean	---	---	---	---	---

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
BALCONY OR PATIO	2.53*	1.11	1.24
OUTDOOR AREAS FOR SITTING	1.79	.60	.36
MISS OWN OUTDOOR SPACE	2.69	1.10	1.21
HAPPY WITH DESIGN OF APT.	2.01	.64	.41
FURNITURE ARRANGEMENT EASY	2.37	.77	.60
FURNITURE NOT CRAMPED	2.53	.92	.84

FURNITURE ARRANGED ATTRACTIVE	2.45	.87	.75
LARGER APT. VS LOUNGE	2.99	1.11	1.24
SAFE WHEN USING BATHROOM	1.87	.58	.34
KITCHEN EASY TO CLEAN	2.01	.71	.50

* WHERE 1 = STRONGLY AGREE, 2 = AGREE, 3 = NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE, 4 = DISAGREE, AND 5 = STRONGLY DISAGREE. THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES FOR THIS QUESTION = .4% AND THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 10.8%.

53. Please place a check on the line that best describes how you feel about the temperature, light, humidity, and ventilation in your apartment.

TEMPERATURE

	much too cold	too cold	comfortable	too hot	much too hot
The temperature in your living room area	____	____	____	___	___
Temperature in the bedroom area	____	____	____	___	___
Temperature in the kitchen area	____	____	____	___	___

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
LIVING ROOM TEMPERATURE	3.07*	.40	.16
BEDROOM TEMPERATURE	3.10	.43	.18
KITCHEN TEMPERATURE	3.12	.42	.18

* WHERE 3 = COMFORTABLE AND 4 = TOO HOT; THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES - .4%, THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES - 5.8%.

	strongly agree	agree	neither	disagree	strongly disagree
I can easily see the temperature on the thermostat	___	___	___	___	___

RESULTS: MEAN = 2.23, STANDARD DEVIATION = .82, VARIANCE = .67; WHERE 2 = AGREE AND 3 = NEITHER. % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 7.6%.

DAYLIGHT (without turning on the light)

	very good; plenty of light	good	adequate	poor	very poor; not enough light
Daylight lighting in your apartment in general	_____	____	____	____	_____
Daylight lighting in the kitchen area	_____	____	____	____	_____

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
APARTMENT DAYLIGHT LIGHTING	2.05*	.78	.61
KITCHEN DAYLIGHT LIGHTING	3.02	1.17	1.37

* WHERE 2 = GOOD, 3 = ADEQUATE AND 4 = POOR. % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 4.4% AND 5.3% RESPECTIVELY.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING

Electric lighting in your apartment in general	____	____	____	____	____
Electric lighting in the kitchen area	____	____	____	____	____
Electric lighting in the bathroom area	____	____	____	____	____
Electric lighting in the hallway outside your apartment	____	____	____	____	____

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
APARTMENT	2.11*	.75	.57
KITCHEN	2.22	.89	.80
BATHROOM	1.96	.61	.38
HALLWAY OUTSIDE APARTMENT	1.81	.63	.40

* WHERE 1 = PLENTY OF LIGHT, 2 = GOOD, AND 3 = ADEQUATE. AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES - .4%; AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES - 4.8%. DURING THE INTERVIEW A MAJORITY OF RESPONDENTS INDICATED A STRONG DESIRE FOR MORE AND BETTER LIGHTING ABOVE THE KITCHEN SINK AND THE STOVE - IN THE LATTER CASE, CITING THE CONCERNS THEY HAD FOR THEIR SAFETY IN HANDLING HOT PANS.

HUMIDITY

	much too dry	too dry	comfortable	too moist	much too moist
The humidity in your living room area	___	___	___	___	___
The humidity in the bathroom area	___	___	___	___	___
The humdity in the kitchen area	___	___	___	___	___

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
LIVING ROOM HUMIDITY	2.34*	.70	.50
BEDROOM HUMIDITY	2.37	.71	.50
KITCHEN HUMIDITY	2.48	.69	.48

* WHERE 2 = TOO DRY AND 3 = COMFORTABLE; AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = 1% AND AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 7.1%. MOST RESPONDENTS REMARKED DURING THE INTERVIEW ABOUT THE LACK OF A QUESTION CONCERNING HUMIDITY IN THE BATHROOM - AND THAT IT WAS OFTENTIMES TOO MOIST IN THE BATHROOM.

VENTILATION

	much too stale	too stale	comfortable	too drafty	much too drafty
The ventilation in your living room area	---	---	---	---	---
The ventilation in the bedroom area	---	---	---	---	---
The ventilation in the kitchenarea	---	---	---	---	---

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
LIVING ROOM	2.80*	.54	.29
BEDROOM	2.77	.53	.29
KITCHEN	2.74	.57	.33

* WHERE 2 = TOO STALE AND 3 = COMFORTABLE. THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = 1% AND THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 8.6%. HERE AGAIN, MOST RESPONDENT REMARKED DURING THE INTERVIEW ABOUT THE LACK OF A QUESTION CONCERNING VENTILATION IN THE BATHROOM - AND THAT THERE WAS NO VENTILATION IN THE BATHROOM.

	strongly agree	agree	neither	disagree	strongly disagree
I need to leave my apartment door open to get fresh air	----	----	----	----	----
There is a problem of cooking odors in this building	----	----	----	----	----

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
OPEN DOOR TO GET FRESH AIR	3.21*	1.04	1.08
PROBLEM OF COOKING ODORS	3.21	1.02	1.04

* WHERE 3 = NEITHER AND 4 = DISAGREE. THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES - .9% AND THE AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF MISSING RESPONSES - 8.3%.

54. Does noise that you hear while you are in your apartment ever bother you?

No, never.....( )
Seldom.....( )
Sometimes.....( )
Often.....( )
Yes, always.....( )

RESULTS: MEAN = 1.55, WHERE 1 = NO, NEVER & 2 = SELDOM. STANDARD DEVIATION = .87 & VARIANCE = .75. % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES -

For the next two questions, please place a check next to each statement which applies to your situation

55. Does the noise make it hard to:

Talk.....( )
Read or write.....( )
Relax or think.....( )
Sleep.....( )
Watch TV.....( )

RESULTS: TALK = 4.4%; READ OR WRITE = 4.9%; RELAX OR THINK = 7.1%; SLEEP = 11.6%; WATCH TV = 6.2%.

56. What causes most of the noises?

Talking in the hallways.....( )
Talking in nearby apartments.....( )
TV or radio noise in nearby apartments.( )
People moving about in the hallway.....( )
Doors closing.....( )
People in the apartment above.....( )
Plumbing noises in other apartments....( )
Traffic passing nearby.....( )
Other (please explain).....( )

RESULTS: 6.7, 0.4, 3.6, 1.8, 6.2, 4.0, 4.4, 30.2, 1.8, AND 7.1% RESPECTIVELY.

SUMMARIZATION OF THE RESULTS FOR THIS SECTION: There appears to be good internal and external sound barriers in the five buildings. Those who are bothered, are bothered for the most part during sleeping, and the cause is passing traffic. The majority of those bothered by traffic noises live on the street side of McAskill.

57. Please place a check on the line that best decribes how you feel about the following:

	strongly agree	agree	neither agree nor disagree	disagree	strongly disagree
The amount of counter space in the kitchen suits my needs	___	___	___	___	___
The height of the kitchen counter is satisfactory for me	___	___	___	___	___

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
AMOUNT OF COUNTER SPACE	2.47*	.96	.92
HEIGHT OF COUNTER	2.06	.60	.36

WHERE 2 = AGREE AND 3 = NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE. THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = .4%; THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 5.4.

	much too high	too high	just right	too low	much too low
The peephole in my door is:	___	___	___	___	___
The kitchen cupboards are:	___	___	___	___	___

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
PEEPHOLE HEIGHT	2.93*	.43	.18
KITCHEN CUPBOARD HEIGHT	2.94	.36	.13

WHERE 2 = TOO HIGH & 3 = JUST RIGHT. THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = 1.3 & THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 5.6.

58. Please place a check on the line that best describes how often the following are true.

	always	often	sometimes	seldom	never
There is enough space in my apartment to allow me to entertain people in it comfortably	____	___	____	___	___
I use the lounge on my floor (or on the next floor) when I am entertaining	____	___	____	___	___

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
ENTERTAIN IN APARTMENT	2.37*	1.10	1.22
ENTERTAIN IN LOUNGE	4.84	.61	.37

WHERE 2 = OFTEN, 3 = SOMETIMES, 4 = SELDOM, & 5 = NEVER. THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = 1.8 & THE % OF MISSING RESPONSES WAS 4.4 AND 16.4% RESPECTIVELY.

59. How many bedrooms do you have here?

___ONE ___TWO ___BED-SITTING ROOM

RESULTS: 91.1% - ONE BEDROOM, 6.7% TWO BEDROOM, 1.8% MISSING RESPONSES.

60. Is it important to have an apartment where living and sleeping areas are in separate rooms?

_____YES _____NO

RESULTS: YES = 93.3%, NO = 3.6%, .9% - QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES, 2.2% - MISSING RESPONSES.

61. How much storage space is provided in each of the following areas?

	more than enough	plenty	adequate	need more	not nearly enough
Kitchen	---	---	---	---	---
Entry to apartment	---	---	---	---	---
Living room area	---	---	---	---	---
Bedroom area	---	---	---	---	---
Bathroom	---	---	---	---	---

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
KITCHEN	2.84*	.89	.80
ENTRY	2.75	.71	.51
LIVING ROOM	2.82	.71	.51
BEDROOM	2.80	.79	.62
BATHROOM	3.13	.97	.94

WHERE 2 = PLENTY, 3 = ADEQUATE, & 4 = NEED MORE. THE AVERAGE % OF MISSING RESPONSES = 6.9.

62. Did you have to dispose of any furniture when you moved in here? _____YES _____NO

RESULTS: YES = 55.1%, NO = 40.9%, MISSING RESPONSES = 4.0%

If YES, what items were they?_____
_____

63. Did you <u>have to acquire any</u> furniture for this apartment when you moved in? _____YES _____NO

RESULTS: YES = 49.3%, NO = 45.3%, MISSING RESPONSES = 5.3%

If YES, what items were they?_____
_____

64. Please place a check on each of the lines below which best describes how <u>satisfied or dissatisfied</u> you are with various aspects of the following:

	very dis-satisfied	dissatisfied	neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	satisfied	very satisfied
The management	____	____	____	____	____
The other residents that live in this building	____	____	____	____	____
The appearance of your apartment	____	____	____	____	____
The people in the 2 or 3 blocks around This building	____	____	____	____	____
The appearance of this building	____	____	____	____	____
The recreational facilities here	____	____	____	____	____
The protection from crime and vandals that we have in Saskatoon	____	____	____	____	____
The laundry facilities	__	____	____	____	____
The extent to which you feel part of the neighborhood	____	____	____	____	____
The amount of privacy you have from your neighbors	____	____	____	____	____
Garbage facilities	____	____	____	____	____
Your freedom to make changes to the inside of your apartment (like painting or hanging pictures)	____	____	____	____	____

	very dis-satisfied	dissatisfied	neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	satisfied	very satisfied
Your freedom to make changes to the grounds (such as planting flowers)	----	----	----	----	----
The appearance of the grounds of this building in the summer	----	----	----	----	----
Living here	----	----	----	----	----

RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	VARIANCE
THE MANAGEMENT	3.83*	.88	.78
OTHER RESIDENTS	3.81	.68	.46
APPEARANCE OF APARTMENT	4.01	.52	.27
NEIGHBOURS	3.73	.55	.30
APPEARANCE OF BUILDING	3.92	.48	.23
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES	3.79	.73	.53
PROTECTION FROM VANDALS	3.75	.71	.50
LAUNDRY FACILITIES	4.01	.73	.53
FEEL PART OF NEIGHBOURHOOD	3.83	.56	.32
PRIVACY FROM NEIGHBOURS	4.01	.54	.29
GARBAGE FACILITIES	4.19	.58	.33
FREE TO MAKE INTERNAL CHANGES	3.86	.70	.49
FREE TO MAKE EXTERNAL CHANGES	3.51	.73	.53
APPEARANCE OF GROUNDS-SUMMER	3.94	.67	.45
LIVING HERE	4.17	.69	.48

WHERE 3 = NEITHER SATISFIED NOR DISSATISFIED, 4 = SATISFIED, & 5 = VERY SATISFIED. THE AVERAGE % OF QUESTIONABLE RESPONSES = .7 & THE % OF MISSING RESPONSES WAS 7.1, 8.4, 5.8, 20.9, 7.6, 7.6, 8.0, 4.4, 19.1, 4.9, 5.8, 9.8, 24.4, 11.1, AND 7.1 RESPECTIVELY. NOTE THE HIGHER % OF MISSING RESPONSES FOR SATISFACTION WITH PEOPLE IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD AND FREEDOM TO MAKE CHANGES TO THE GROUNDS: IN BOTH CASES THE FREQUENCY WAS HIGHER BECAUSE RESIDENTS HAD NO INVOLVEMENT, THUS NO WAY TO GUAGE SATISFACTION.

SUMMARIZATION OF THE RESULTS FOR THIS SECTION: With respect to the measurment of satisfaction that senior citizen's have with their high-rise buildings, these last 15 items are the most important part of the questionnaire. With reference to designed aspects of their environment, over 70% are satisfied or very satisfied. There is somewhat less (60%) that are satisfied or very satisfied with social aspects of their environment. By and large, satisfaction with specific designed features - sound barriers, ventilation, humidity, lighting, etc. is also high, except for those aspects which are idiosyncratic to the residents - amount of cooking done, and types of food prepared - or that relate to physical aspects of the residents - need for more lighting in particular areas, as noted above.

WILL YOU PLEASE GIVE US A LITTLE INFORMATION ABOUT YOURSELF?

65. How many people live in your apartment? __ONE __TWO __MORE THAN TWO

RESULTS: ONE = 85.3%, TWO = 9.8%, MORE THAN TWO = 2.2%, MISSING RESPONSES = 2.7%.

66. Where were you born?_____

67. What sex are you? _____MALE _____FEMALE

RESULTS: MALE = 17.8%, FEMALE = 80.9%, MISSING RESPONSES = 1.3%

68. What is your age?

_____50-55	_____56-60	_____61-65	_____66-70
_____71-75	_____76-80	_____81-85	_____86-90
_____91-95	_____96-100		

RESULTS: 50-55 = 0.4%, 56-60 = 2.2%, 61-65 = 7.6%, 66-70 = 20.9%, 71-75 = 24.4%, 76-80 = 19.1%, 81-85 = 16.0%, 86-90 = 4.0%, 91-95 = 0.4%, 2.2% - MISSING RESPONSES, 1 23-YEAR OLD & 1 25-YEAR OLD WHEELCHAIR RESPONDENTS WERE INCLUDED IN THE ANALYSIS (3 WHEELCHAIR APARTMENT DWELLERS LIVE IN MCASKILL AND TOOK PART IN THE SURVEY).

69. Are you now:

_____Married _____Single ___Widowed

RESULTS: MARRIED = 12.4%, SINGLE = 17.8%, WIDOWED = 63.6%. RESPONDENTS DURING THE INTERVIEW NOTED THE LACK OF THE CATEGORY OF SEPARATED OR DIVORCED. 4.9% OF THE RESPONDENTS INDICATED THEY WERE IN THIS CATEGORY.

70. What is your total annual household income?

_____$0-$5,000	_____$6,000-$10,000	_____$11,000-$15,000
_____$16,000-$20,000	_____$21,000-$25,000	_____$26,000-$30,000
_____$31,000-$35,000	_____$36,000-$40,000	_____$41,000-$45,000
_____$46,000-$50,000	_____$51,000-$55,000	_____$56,000-$60,000

RESULTS: 20.9, 44.0, 4.9, 0.9, 1.3, 0.9% RESPECTIVELY FOR THE FIRST FIVE CATEGORIES LISTED. MISSING RESPONSES = 27.1%.

AND FINALLY!!!!

71. Do you drive your own car? _____YES _____NO

RESULTS: YES = 16.9%, NO = 82.2%, 0.9% - MISSING RESPONSES.

SUMMARIZATION OF THE RESULTS FOR THIS SECTION: A majority of the respondents who took part in this survey were widowed females, living alone, between the ages of 66 - 85, with an annual income of less than $10,000.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND PATIENCE
IN ANSWERING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

If you have any additional comments to make regarding this questionnaire, please write them on the back of this page or tell the person who will be coming around to pick up the questionnaire. If you would like to have a copy of the results of this study, please tell the person who gave this questionnaire to you.

Ken McDowell, PhD
Associate Professor
Department of Psychology
University of Saskatchewan
telephone:
343-5709 (Office)
242-1322 (Home)

REMARKS ABOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The high percentage of missing responses for question #9-#12 are because, as reported to the research assistants, respondents do not feel that the choice process (particularly in the abstract as is requested in the question) is relevant to their existence. The high percentage of missing responses for question #17, #18, #21, #22, and #23 was in part due to the questions being perceived as too personal, and in part due to the cognitive perception that the absence of relatives and friends close by (or even in the city) made many of the respondents depressed. Finally, the high percentage of respondents who did not respond to question #70 (total annual income) was because, as many pointed out, it to was too personal a question.

As can be readily seen upon perusal of the responses the respondents are satisfied with their housing environment. A visual inspection of the buildings and their surroundings contributes considerably to the conclusion that the respondents are in fact quite satisfied with the building and that information as conveyed in the data is an accurate reflection of the feelings of a representative sample of the senior citizens living in high-rise buildings in Saskatoon.

The variability of responses across the five or more alternatives for most items and the overall impressions of the two research assistants regarding how people in a particular building felt about their building suggested the comparison of buildings on the questionnaire items would be a worthwhile analysis to undertake. Inasmuch as dwellers are not randomly assigned to buildings, this analysis tends to pick up the unique (or not) "signature" of the interaction of a particular group of people living in a particular building, in a particular neighborhood in a particular part of the city. In addition, that comparison makes that signature relative to the range of alternatives (from a theoretical standpoint) available to respondents. In short, while such an analysis revealed that people who live in one building are more satisfied with, for example, their view than people who live in the other buildings, that is of no particular consequence unless the nature of the responses of the people living in those other buildings suggests that there is a problem (defined as dissatisfaction) with the view from the other buildings. For the following, therefore, the results of the analysis by building are only reported for those significant relationships in which a particular building was evaluated as being deficient. (The other significant relationships include those results where a building was evaluated as being better on some aspect with all the other buildings being rated as good or neutral.) In addition, these findings are broken down into two categories: psychological/sociological and architectural.

PSYCHOLOGICAL & SOCIOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES

Respondents in Luther Tower were more likely to have lived in another city in the province or to have lived outside the province before moving to Luther Tower (question #2).

Respondents in Scott and Forget were more likely to know someone in the building who has been the victim of a crime while in the building or on the grounds (question #40). Scott and Forget are on the same site and share a common lounge, entry and outdoor sitting area. During the process of administering the questionnaire one of the residents (but not one of the respondents) was the victim of a crime on the grounds of the buildings and approximately one-third of the respondents in the two buildings were reporting that incidence on the questionnaire.

Respondents in McAskill were the only group to indicate agreement that they would use an outdoor area that was set aside to grow flowers or vegetables (question #41(k)), and were significantly different from respondents in Forget and Luther Tower in this regard.

Respondents in McNaughton more strongly agree that they miss having their own outdoor space (question #52(c)) than respondents in Luther Tower, who indicate a minor amount of disagreement with that statement.

Respondents in Luther Tower were more likely to have had to dispose of some or all of their furniture before moving to their current residence (question #62). As indicated above, the reason for this is most likely because of moving a greater distance rather than anything to do with the amount of floor space as is implied in the question.

Respondents in Luther Tower were on the average older than respondents in the other buildings.

Respondents in Luther Tower also reported a higher total annual income than respondents in the other buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL DIFFERENCES

There was one question (#24(m)) which asked for a comparative appraisal with other apartment buildings in Saskatoon. Respondents at Forget were significantly different from respondents in Luther Tower in their disagreement that their building is the most attractive apartment building in Saskatoon.

McAskill respondents are more in agreement that fear of crime keeps them from leaving their building at night (question #41(a)) than respondents at Luther Tower or Forget.

McAskill respondents indicate strong agree that there are unsafe places in the neighborhood around their building (question #41(c)) (more so than respondents in Luther Tower or Forget).

Respondents in Scott agree that they need to leave their apartment door open to get fresh air (question #53 - ventilation - (d)). Respondents in all the other buildings indicate disagree in varying degrees with that statement.

Respondents in Scott and McAskill agree that there is a problem of cooking odors in their buildings (question #53 - ventilation - (e)) more than in Luther Tower.

Respondents in Luther Tower indicated a need for more storage space in the kitchen, the entryway, the living room, and in the bedroom (question #61(a,b,c,d)) than respondents in Forget.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the questionnaire results identify or help substantiate the belief that the senior citizen high-rise buildings in Saskatoon are satisfactory environments for those residents. It is interesting to note that across the five buildings the two questionnaire items which operate as summary statements: #16 - would you recommend this place to one of your friends if they were looking for a place to live, and #64(o) - how satisfied they are with living in their building, are the two items with the lowest mean scores (indicating "definitely would" and "very satisfied" respectively) and the lowest variance (indicating a greater degree of homogenity in choosing that, or the next alternative). For those items which deal with behaviors which are under the control of the respondent (walking, asking for help, engaging in favorite outdoor activities, etc.) a measure of salience of the behavior can be obtained from an analysis of intensity of response (as above, in the amount of the mean score) and the homogenity of variance around that mean. Eighty-one percent (n = 183) of the respondents indicated that they lock their doors and windows when not at home. In conjunction with this, respondents indicate that, among those items over which they have no perceived control (such as storage space, humidity, etc) that the salience of safety and security is being established inasmuch as the highest mean score (indicating "very safe") and the greatest amount of homogenity occurs on the item "How safe are you from being a victim of a crime while in your apartment?". In short, it would appear that, for senior citizens living in high-rise buildings in Saskatoon, that safety is a salient attribute of the environment, both with respect to their activities and the design of the environment, and that this contributes to their perceived satisfaction with their living environment. Such a conclusion can, however, only be established following further analysis.

It is on those questionnaire items in which the respondents are more neutral (or neither satisfied nor dissatisfied) that differences among the five buildings emerge. The conclusions that can be drawn from this analysis are three:

(1) senior citizen who live in McAskill are concerned about their security and safety in the neighborhood surrounding the building. Given that the building fronts on to a busy throughfare (58% of those reporting that they are sometimes or seldom bothered by noise live on the front side of McAskill), and thus precluding the possibility of creating a buffer area of a neighborhood setting around the building which exists for the other buildings surveyed.

(2) Residents of Scott and to some extent McAskill suffer the consequences of a lack of air conditioning in their buildings. The problem in Scott is more psychological inasmuch as their companion on the site, Forget, does have air conditioning, so that their is a sense of relative deprivation present for the Scott residence's but not for the

McAskill residents. In addition, the north-south orientation of the apartments (east-west building axis) of the McAskill building makes for a considerable problem for those living on the south side of the building. While most of the residents in McAskill living on the south side of the building would prefer to live on the north side, as indicated earlier, those living on the north side experience more problems with traffic noises.

(3) Finally, as indicated that is a lack of storage space for the residents in Luther Tower. While there is an old cliche that everyone is in need of more storage space, it was only the residents of Luther Tower who communicated this on the questionnaire. Whether this is solely a function of the absolute amount of storage space in the various rooms in the apartment, or is the outcome of a combination of factors (for example, the higher income producing more consumer activity, leading, in turn, to the need for more storage space for those goods) can only be determined through further analysis of these results and the measurement of storage space in Luther Tower and at least one other building where income is held constant.

The comparison of data with that collected in the Midwestern United States and Sydney, Australia is currently under way. The data is being collected and analyzed through the computing facilities at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and it is anticipated at this time that the analysis will be completed early in 1984.