



Veterans Affairs
Canada

Anciens Combattants
Canada

Measuring Veteran Well-Being

Teresa Pound

Research Directorate
Veterans Affairs Canada
Charlottetown PE Canada
E-mail: vac.research-recherche.acc@canada.ca
October 15th, 2019

VAC Research Directorate Data Report

Canada 

© Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2019.

ISBN: 978-0-660-33967-2
Cat. No. V32-426/2020E-PDF

Published by:
Veterans Affairs Canada
161 Grafton Street
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island
C1A 8M9
Email: vac.research-recherche.acc@canada.ca

Citation: Pound, T. Measuring Veteran Well-Being. Charlottetown PE: Research Directorate, Veterans Affairs Canada. Research Directorate Data Report. 8 April, 2019.

Acknowledgements: The author would like to thank Jason Buss, Jill Sweet, Mary Beth MacLean, Linda Van Til, Alain Poirier, and Alexandra Ralling for their contributions to the initial development and review of this report.

Executive Summary

Introduction

In 2016, the Canadian Veteran population was estimated to be 670,100 and was comprised of approximately 90% Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) Veterans released since 1954 and 10% War Service (WS) Veterans released prior to 1954 [Veterans Affairs Canada (VAC) Statistics Directorate, 2016]. The goal of this report is to create a profile of the CAF Veteran population based on the well-being surveillance framework recently developed at VAC.

Methods

Based on the Veteran well-being surveillance framework, 21 high level indicators were examined which represented the following seven domains of well-being: health, purpose, finances, life skills, social integration, housing and physical environment, and culture and social environment. Veteran results were analysed by sex, age group at time of survey, rank group, and branch. The majority of data used to measure Veteran well-being was collected from the three cycles of the Life After Service Studies (LASS) conducted in 2010, 2013 and 2016. Comparisons were made, where possible, to the Canadian population using comparators that were age-sex adjusted to the Veteran population. Throughout this report, unless otherwise stated, “Veteran” refers to CAF regular force Veterans, released from 1998 to 2015.

Results

Female Veterans in the oldest age group, junior NCMs, army Veterans, and Veterans in the youngest age group had lower well-being in a number of domains. Officers had the highest well-being in all domains. For most domains, Veteran well-being was similar to that of Canadians of comparable age and sex. However, Veterans were more financially secure but not as healthy as comparable Canadians.

Conclusion

The well-being of Veterans differed by sex, age group at time of survey, rank group at release, and branch at release. The findings in this report demonstrate the complexity of measuring well-being and highlight the need for policy development that responds to areas of need and a strategic departmental direction aimed at those struggling with their well-being.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Introduction	4
Background	4
Methods	5
Indicators of Well-Being by Domain	6
Health	6
Purpose	13
Finances	21
Social Integration	25
Life Skills	29
Housing and Physical Environment	37
Culture and Social Environment	38
Summary	39
Limitations	42
Policy Considerations/Implications	42
Conclusion	44
References	45
Appendix A – Descriptions	47
Appendix B - Well-Being Indicator Summary Tables	48
Annex 1 – Veteran Demographics	55

Introduction

The mandate of Veterans Affairs Canada is to “support the well-being of Veterans and their families, and to promote recognition and remembrance of the achievements and sacrifices of those who served Canada in times of war, military conflict and peace.” (VAC, 2018). Historically, there had been some difficulty in measuring well-being, as there was no accepted definition of well-being within the Department.

Background

VAC adopted a Well-being Surveillance Framework (VAC, 2017) that was organized by a set of seven domains: health, purpose, finances, social integration, life skills, housing and physical environment, and culture and social environment.

The seven domains of Veteran well-being were aligned with the Public Health Agency of Canada (PHAC) Determinants of Health. The 12 key determinants identified by the PHAC included Income and social status, Employment and working conditions, Education and literacy, Gender, Culture, Physical environments, Social supports and coping skills, Healthy behaviours, Biology and genetic endowment, Childhood experiences, and Access to health services (PHAC, 2019). All but the last three determinants were reflected in VAC’s Well-being Framework.

VAC’s Well-being Surveillance Framework has identified an accepted set of 21 high level indicators to initiate the monitoring process (see Table 1; Veterans Affairs Canada, 2017). Many of the indicators chosen are widely used in Canadian health monitoring and are typically captured for all Canadians, allowing for comparison between the Veteran population and the general population.

TABLE 1 – WELL-BEING DOMAIN DESCRIPTIONS AND INDICATORS

DOMAIN	DESCRIPTION	INDICATORS
Health	Health is a state of physical, mental, social and spiritual functioning, broader than the absence of disease.	Self-Rated Health Self-Rated Mental Health Activity Limitation Need for assistance with Activities of Daily Living (ADL)
Purpose	Purpose is the sense of meaning attained by participation in fulfilling activities, such as employment.	Employment Rate Satisfaction with Main Activity Satisfaction with Life
Finances	Finances includes household income and financial security.	Rate of Low Income Satisfaction with Finances
Social Integration	Social integration is engagement in mutually supportive relationships (friends, family & community).	Sense of Belonging Social Support Scale Adjustment to Civilian Life
Life Skills	Life skills enable management of life and contribute to resilience; they include personal health practices, coping skills and education.	Education Level Daily Smoking Heavy Drinking Obesity Mastery
Housing and Physical Environment	Physical environment includes the built environment (e.g., housing) as well as the natural environment (e.g., water & air quality).	Rate of Veterans among Canadian Homeless
Culture and Social Environment	The dominant values, beliefs and attitudes of society, which impact one's well-being.	Canadians' attitudes towards Veterans Employers' attitudes towards Veterans

Methods

The majority (18 out of 21) of the indicators used to measure the well-being of Veterans were sourced from the three cycles of LASS (2010, 2013, & 2016). Statistics Canada conducted all three cycles of LASS via computer-assisted telephone interview surveys. The LASS 2010 survey had a sample of n=3,154 from a population of N=36,638 regular force Veterans who released between 1998 and 2007 (Thompson et al, 2011). The LASS 2013 survey had a sample of n=2,622 from a population of N=56,129 regular force Veterans who released between 1998 and 2012 (VanTil et al, 2014). The LASS 2016 survey had a sample of n=2,755 from a population of N=56,419 regular force Veterans who released between 1998 and 2015 (VanTil et al, 2017). This most recent cycle examined regular force Veterans who released at ranks other than the entry ranks (Cadet, Private, Recruit). For comparisons between cycles, the same exclusion of entry ranks was applied to LASS 2010 and LASS 2013 (VanTil et al, 2017). As data on daily smoking and mastery were not captured in LASS 2016, data from LASS 2013 was used to measure these indicators.

The remaining three indicators measuring the well-being of Veterans were sourced from surveys other than LASS. The indicator, rate of Veterans among Canadian homeless, was sourced from a report on the findings of a survey conducted by Employment and

Social Development Canada (ESDC) in 2014 that counted Canadians who accessed homeless shelters and who identified as Veterans (Segaert et al, 2015). Under the culture and social environment domain, the measures for the indicator, Canadians attitudes toward Veterans, were sourced from the findings of the two cycles of public opinion research surveys conducted for VAC (Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc., 2012 & 2014). The measures for the other indicator, employers' attitudes toward Veterans, were sourced from the findings of an employer survey (True Patriot Love Foundation, 2017).

When making comparisons to the Veteran population, data from the following Statistics Canada surveys were used to derive the Canadian comparators: the 2011-12 and 2013-14 cycles of the Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS), the 2016 cycle of the Labor Force Survey (LFS), and the 2011 cycle of the Survey of Labour & Income Dynamics (SLID). This data was age-sex adjusted to the Veteran population, as the Veteran population is predominately younger and male.

In this report, 95% confidence intervals were used to determine statistically significant differences between groups. "A confidence interval reflects the level of uncertainty in an estimate and indicates the expected range of values that an estimate might have. This allows for the determination of whether two estimates are significantly (statistically) different from each other. The smaller the sample size the larger the confidence interval, essentially reflecting the level of uncertainty of the estimate." (MacLean et al, 2018) Between groups, differences in estimates were determined to be statistically significant when confidence intervals had not overlapped. Only statistically significant differences were reported in this report. Where the sample sizes were too small (<30 individuals) to provide reliable estimates, the estimates and the corresponding confidence intervals were suppressed and noted with an "F".

To determine if differences existed among groups of Veterans, analysis of the well-being of Veterans was conducted by sex (male or female); age at time of survey [youngest (under 35), middle (35 to 54) and oldest (55 & over)]; rank at release (officers, senior NCMs & junior NCMs); and branch at release (Army, Navy & Air Force).

Throughout this report, unless otherwise stated, "Veteran" refers to CAF regular force Veterans.

Indicators of Well-Being by Domain

Health

Health is a state of physical, mental, social and spiritual functioning broader than the absence of disease. The desired outcome for this domain is that Veterans are functioning well physically, mentally, socially and spiritually. Veteran well-being in this domain was measured using four indicators that were available from LASS data: self-rated health, self-rated mental health, activity limitation, and need for assistance with ADL.

Both self-rated health and self-rated mental health used the following ratings: very good or excellent, good, and fair or poor. Activity limitation measured health-related reduction of activity in life domains of home, school/work, or other activities such as transportation or leisure. The possible ratings for it were no limitation, sometimes restricted activity, and often restricted activity. Need for assistance with ADL measured the need for assistance with activities such as personal care, indoor mobility, meals, errands, housework, or bill payment.

Self-Rated Health

From 2010 to 2016, self-rated very good or excellent health decreased from 52% to 46%. Veterans had lower self-rated very good or excellent health than Canadians [46% vs 58% (see Appendix B, Table 82)].

TABLE 2 - SELF-RATED HEALTH, LASS

	2010	2013	2016
Very Good or Excellent	52.0% (50.1, 53.9)	48.9% (46.4, 51.4)	45.5% (43.0, 48.0)
Good	28.1% (26.4, 29.9)	31.0% (28.7, 33.4)	31.4% (29.1, 33.8)
Fair or Poor	19.9% (18.5, 21.3)	20.1% (18.2, 22.2)	23.1% (21.2, 25.6)

Veterans in the youngest age group had lower rates of self-rated fair or poor health than those in the middle and oldest age groups (13%, 26%, & 24% respectively).

TABLE 3 - SELF-RATED HEALTH BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Very Good or Excellent	51.9% (44.9, 58.9)	43.3% (39.6, 47.0)	45.4% (41.8, 49.0)
Good	35.1% (28.4, 42.5)	30.6% (27.3, 34.1)	30.6% (27.5, 34.0)
Fair or Poor	12.9% (9.6, 17.1)	26.1% (23.1, 29.4)	23.9% (20.9, 27.2)

Females in the oldest age group had lower rates of self-rated very good or excellent health than their male counterparts (29% vs 47%).

TABLE 4 - SELF-RATED HEALTH BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over	Overall
Very Good or Excellent	Male	52.1% (44.6, 59.5)	42.9% (38.9, 46.9)	46.9% (43.2, 50.7)	45.9% (43.2, 48.5)
	Female	F	45.7% (36.2, 55.4)	28.9% (20.1, 39.6)	42.6% (35.6, 50.0)
Good	Male	35.8% (28.6, 43.7)	31.6% (28.0, 35.5)	29.8% (26.6, 33.3)	31.7% (29.3, 34.3)
	Female	F	25.1% (17.7, 34.3)	39.7% (28.5, 52.0)	29.0% (22.9, 35.8)
Fair or Poor	Male	12.1% (8.8, 16.5)	25.6% (22.3, 29.0)	23.3% (20.2, 26.7)	22.4% (20.4, 24.6)
	Female	F	29.2% (21.4, 38.6)	F	28.4% (22.4, 35.3)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Officers had higher self-rated very good or excellent health than senior and junior NCMs (62%, 38%, & 44% respectively) and lower self-rated fair or poor health (12%, 27%, & 24% respectively) than senior and junior NCMs.

TABLE 5 - SELF-RATED HEALTH BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Very Good or Excellent	62.2% (58.4, 65.8)	38.2% (34.9, 41.6)	44.2% (40.0, 48.4)
Good	25.4% (22.2, 28.8)	34.8% (31.6, 38.1)	31.4% (27.6, 35.5)
Fair or Poor	12.4% (10.2, 15.1)	27.0% (24.2, 30.1)	24.4% (21.2, 28.0)

Self-Rated Mental Health

From 2010 to 2016, self-rated very good or excellent mental health decreased from 65% to 56%. Over the same period, self-rated fair or poor mental health increased from 15% to 21%. Veterans had lower self-rated very good or excellent mental health than Canadians [56% vs 71% (see Appendix B, Table 82)].

TABLE 6 - SELF-RATED MENTAL HEALTH, LASS

	2010	2013	2016
Very Good or Excellent	64.9% (63.0, 66.7)	59.9% (57.4, 62.4)	55.6% (53.1, 58.1)
Good	19.8% (18.3, 21.5)	23.1% (21.0, 25.3)	23.3% (21.2, 25.6)
Fair or Poor	15.3% (14.1, 16.6)	17.0% (15.2, 19.0)	21.1% (19.2, 23.2)

Veterans in the oldest age group had higher rates of self-rated very good or excellent mental health than those in the youngest and middle age groups (64%, 53% & 51%,

respectively). Veterans in the middle age group had higher rates of self-rated fair or poor mental health than those in the oldest age group (26% vs 15%).

TABLE 7 - SELF-RATED MENTAL HEALTH BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Very Good or Excellent	52.8% (45.8, 59.7)	51.1% (47.4, 54.8)	64.1% (60.6, 67.5)
Good	28.6% (22.5, 35.6)	23.2% (20.1, 26.6)	20.7% (17.9, 23.7)
Fair or Poor	18.6% (13.9, 24.5)	25.7% (22.7, 29.0)	15.2% (12.7, 18.0)

Females in the oldest age group had lower rates of self-rated very good or excellent mental health than their male counterparts (40% vs 66%). Males in the middle age group had higher rates of self-rated fair or poor mental health compared to their counterparts in the oldest age group (25% vs 14%).

TABLE 8 - SELF-RATED MENTAL HEALTH BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over	Overall
Very Good or Excellent	Male	52.3% (44.8, 59.7)	51.0% (46.9, 55.0)	66.3% (62.7, 69.8)	56.4% (53.7, 59.0)
	Female	F	51.8% (42.1, 61.3)	40.0% (29.0, 52.0)	50.0% (42.7, 57.2)
Good	Male	29.3% (22.8, 36.8)	24.0% (20.6, 27.7)	19.8% (17.0, 23.0)	23.5% (21.2, 26.0)
	Female	F	19.0% (12.7, 27.5)	F	21.9% (16.6, 28.4)
Fair or Poor	Male	18.4% (13.4, 24.7)	25.1% (21.9, 28.6)	13.8% (11.4, 16.7)	20.1% (18.1, 22.3)
	Female	F	29.2% (21.2, 38.9)	F	28.1% (22.0, 35.1)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Officers had higher rates of self-rated very good or excellent mental health than senior and junior NCMs (74%, 55%, & 50%, respectively). Officers had lower rates of self-rated fair or poor mental health than senior and junior NCMs (10%, 22%, & 24%, respectively).

TABLE 9 - SELF-RATED MENTAL HEALTH BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Very Good or Excellent	74.1% (70.7, 77.3)	54.9% (51.5, 58.3)	49.8% (45.6, 54.0)
Good	16.1% (13.5, 19.0)	23.2% (20.4, 26.2)	25.8% (22.3, 29.7)
Fair or Poor	9.9% (7.9, 12.3)	21.9% (19.2, 24.8)	24.4% (21.1, 28.0)

Senior NCMs in the oldest age group had higher rates of self-rated very good or excellent mental health than those in the middle age group (59% vs 50%) while those in the middle age group had higher rates of self-rated fair or poor mental health than those in the oldest age group (28% vs 17%). Senior NCMs in both the middle and oldest age groups had higher rates of fair or poor mental health than officers in these age groups (28% vs 12% for 35 to 54 & 17% & 9% for 55 & over).

TABLE 10 - SELF-RATED MENTAL HEALTH BY RANK GROUP AND AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

		Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Very Good or Excellent	Under 35	F	F	51.6% (44.3, 58.9)
	35 to 54	69.4% (63.5, 74.7)	49.6% (44.4, 54.7)	47.3% (41.6, 53.1)
	55 & Over	77.8% (73.4, 81.6)	59.4% (54.9, 63.8)	56.2% (44.5, 67.5)
Good	Under 35	F	F	28.8% (22.5, 36.2)
	35 to 54	18.3% (14.0, 23.7)	22.5% (18.5, 27.1)	24.7% (20.1, 30.1)
	55 & Over	13.6% (10.7, 17.1)	23.8% (20.1, 27.9)	F
Fair or Poor	Under 35	F	F	19.6% (14.6, 25.7)
	35 to 54	12.3% (9.1, 16.5)	27.9% (23.6, 32.7)	27.9% (23.3, 33.1)
	55 & Over	8.7% (6.2, 12.1)	16.8% (13.7, 20.4)	F

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Activity Limitations

In 2016, the majority of Veterans (59%) reported having activity limitations (restricted activities either sometimes or often) while 41% reported no activity limitations at all. When comparing the three years of LASS data, there were no differences in the rates of those reporting no activity limitations, nor were there differences in the rates of those reporting activity limitations. Veterans had lower rates of having no activity limitations (41% vs 74%) and higher rates of having activity limitations (59% vs 26%) than Canadians (see Appendix B, Table 82 for Canadian comparators)].

TABLE 11 - ACTIVITY LIMITATIONS, LASS

	2010	2013	2016
No Activity Limitation	44.7% (42.9, 46.6)	44.7% (42.2, 47.2)	41.1% (38.6, 43.6)
Sometimes Restricted	28.1% (26.3, 29.9)	28.2% (26.0, 30.4)	30.1% (27.8, 32.5)
Often Restricted	27.2% (25.8, 28.7)	27.1% (25.0, 29.4)	28.8% (26.7, 31.0)

Veterans in the youngest age group had higher rates of having no activity limitations than Veterans in the middle and oldest age groups (61%, 36% & 39%, respectively). They also had lower rates of having often restricted activity than Veterans in the middle and oldest age groups (15%, 33% & 29%, respectively).

TABLE 12 - ACTIVITY LIMITATIONS BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
No Activity Limitation	61.3% (54.5, 67.8)	35.8% (32.2, 39.5)	38.7% (35.2, 42.2)
Sometimes Restricted	23.5% (18.1, 29.9)	31.1% (27.8, 34.7)	32.0% (28.7, 35.6)
Often Restricted	15.2% (11.3, 20.1)	33.1% (29.8, 36.5)	29.3% (26.2, 32.6)

Males in the youngest age group had lower rates of activity limitations than their counterparts in the middle and oldest age groups (37%, 64% & 60%, respectively). Females in the oldest age group had higher rates of activity limitations than their male counterparts (78% vs 60%).

TABLE 13 - ACTIVITY LIMITATIONS BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over	Overall
No Activity Limitation	Male	63.1% (55.8, 69.8)	35.8% (32.0, 39.9)	40.1% (36.5, 43.9)	42.1% (39.4, 44.8)
	Female	F	35.4% (26.7, 45.1)	F	34.0% (27.5, 41.2)
Sometimes or Often Restricted	Male	36.9% (30.2, 44.3)	64.2% (60.1, 68.1)	59.9% (56.1, 63.5)	57.9% (55.2, 60.6)
	Female	F	64.6% (54.9, 73.3)	77.6% (67.8, 85.1)	66.0% (58.8, 72.5)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Senior NCMs had lower rates of having no activity limitations than junior NCMs and officers (33%, 43% & 50%, respectively). Officers had lower rates of having activity limitations “often” than senior and junior NCMs (21%, 34%, & 28%, respectively).

TABLE 14 - ACTIVITY LIMITATIONS BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
No Activity Limitation	50.3% (46.4, 54.1)	33.3% (30.1, 36.6)	42.6% (38.4, 46.9)
Sometimes Restricted	28.4% (25.1, 32.0)	32.5% (29.4, 35.9)	29.3% (25.5, 33.3)
Often Restricted	21.3% (18.5, 24.5)	34.2% (31.1, 37.4)	28.1% (24.7, 31.8)

Need for Assistance with Activities of Daily Living (ADL)

In 2016, 20% of Veterans needed help with ADL. They had higher rates of needing help than Canadians (20% vs 7%, see Appendix B, Table 82 for Canadian comparators).

TABLE 15 - NEEDS HELP WITH AT LEAST ONE ADL, LASS

	2010	2013	2016
Needs help	19.3% (18.0, 20.5)	23.0% (21.0, 25.2)	20.3% (18.4, 22.3)
Does not need help	80.8% (79.5, 82.0)	77.0% (74.8, 79.0)	79.7% (77.7, 81.6)

Females had higher rates of needing help with ADL than males (31% vs 19%).

TABLE 16 - NEEDS HELP WITH AT LEAST ONE ADL BY SEX, LASS 2016

	Male	Female
Needs help	18.8% (16.9, 20.8)	31.2% (25.2, 38.0)
Does not need help	81.2% (79.2, 83.1)	68.8% (62.0, 74.8)

Veterans in the youngest age group had lower rates of needing help with ADL than their counterparts in the middle and oldest age groups (6%, 26%, & 20%, respectively).

TABLE 17 - NEEDS HELP WITH AT LEAST ONE ADL BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Needs help	5.6% (3.9, 7.9)	25.7% (22.7, 28.9)	19.7% (16.9, 22.8)
Does not need help	94.4% (92.1, 96.1)	74.3% (71.1, 77.3)	80.3% (77.2, 83.1)

Officers had lower rates of needing help with ADL than senior and junior NCMs (14%, 23%, & 21%, respectively).

TABLE 18 - NEEDS HELP WITH AT LEAST ONE ADL BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Needs help	14.1% (11.7, 16.8)	23.4% (20.7, 26.3)	20.5% (17.5, 23.9)
Does not need help	85.9% (83.2, 88.3)	76.6% (73.7, 79.3)	79.5% (76.1, 82.5)

Male officers were more likely not to need help with ADL than their female counterparts (88% vs 74%) while female senior NCMs were more likely to need help with ADL than their male counterparts (39% vs 22%). Male officers were less likely to need help with ADL than male senior and junior NCMs (12%, 22%, & 19%, respectively).

TABLE 19 - NEEDS HELP WITH AT LEAST ONE ADL BY RANK GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Needs Help	Male	12.4% (10.1, 15.2)	21.8% (19.0, 24.8)	19.1% (16.0, 22.7)
	Female	F	38.9% (29.0, 49.8)	29.6% (21.0, 40.1)
Does Not Need Help	Male	87.6% (84.8, 89.9)	78.3% (75.2, 81.0)	80.9% (77.3, 84.0)
	Female	74.0% (63.4, 82.3)	61.1% (50.2, 71.0)	70.4% (59.9, 79.1)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

A lower percentage of female Veterans in both the youngest and oldest age groups did not need help with ADL when compared to their male counterparts in these age groups (86% vs 95% for under 35 & 62% vs 82% for 55 & over). A higher percentage of female Veterans in the oldest age group needed help with ADL than their male counterparts (39% vs 18%).

Male Veterans in the youngest age group were more likely not to need help with ADL than their male counterparts in the middle and oldest age groups (95%, 76%, & 82%, respectively). Male Veterans in the middle age group were more likely to need help than male Veterans in the youngest and oldest age groups (24%, 5%, & 18%, respectively).

TABLE 20 - NEEDS HELP WITH AT LEAST ONE ADL BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Needs Help	Male	4.6% (3.1, 6.8)	24.4% (21.3, 27.9)	18.0% (15.2, 21.1)
	Female	F	32.6% (24.5, 41.8)	38.5% (27.1, 51.2)
Does Not Need Help	Male	95.4% (93.2, 96.9)	75.6% (72.1, 78.8)	82.0% (78.9, 84.8)
	Female	85.6% (72.5, 93.0)	67.5% (58.2, 75.5)	61.5% (48.8, 72.9)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Purpose

Purpose is the sense of meaning attained by participating in fulfilling activities, such as employment. The desired outcome for this domain is that Veterans are engaged in activities that are beneficial and meaningful to them. Veteran well-being in this domain was measured using three indicators that were available from LASS data: employment rate, satisfaction with main activity and satisfaction with life.

Employment rate was used to measure the percentage of Veterans who were currently employed at the time of survey and included individuals who had a job, whether they were currently working or absent from work at the time of survey. Satisfaction with main activity rated the Veteran's satisfaction with their main activity in the 12 months

previous to the survey. Possible main activities on which the Veteran rated their satisfaction were: worked at a job or ran a business, retired and not looking for work, attended school or training, looked for work, cared or nurtured a family member or partner, or was disabled or on disability. Satisfaction with finances rated the Veteran's satisfaction with their financial situation in the 12 months previous to the survey. Possible responses for both satisfaction with main activity and satisfaction with life were: very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither, satisfied and very satisfied.

Employment Rate

The employment rate for Veterans decreased from between 2010 and 2016 from 73% to 65%. Over the same period, the percentage of Veterans not in the workforce increased from 22% to 29%. Veterans had a lower employment rate (65% vs 74%) but a higher percentage of not being in the workforce (29% vs 20%) than Canadians (see Appendix B, Table 82 for Canadian comparators).

TABLE 21 - LABOUR FORCE STATUS, LASS

	2010	2013	2016
Employed	72.8% (71.0, 74.5)	69.3% (67.0, 71.6)	65.3% (63.0, 67.5)
Unemployed	5.4% (4.6, 6.5)	4.6% (3.6, 5.8)	6.0% (4.9, 7.3)
Not in Workforce	21.8% (20.3, 23.4)	26.1% (24.0, 28.3)	28.7% (26.7, 30.9)

Females had a higher percentage not in the workforce (39% vs 27%) and a lower employment rate (52% vs 67%) than males.

TABLE 22 - LABOUR FORCE STATUS BY SEX, LASS 2016

	Male	Female
Employed	67.2% (64.8, 69.5)	51.7% (44.5, 58.9)
Unemployed	5.6% (4.5, 6.8)	9.1% (5.4, 14.9)
Not in Workforce	27.3% (25.2, 29.5)	39.2% (32.4, 46.3)

Males Veterans had higher employment rates than their female counterparts in both the middle and oldest age groups (74% vs 54% for 35 to 54 & 53% vs 33% for 55 & over). Female Veterans had higher percentages not in the workforce than their male counterparts in the middle and oldest age groups (36% vs 22% for 35 to 54 & 60% vs 43% for 55 & over). Overall, when compared to males, females were more likely to be on disability (16% vs 7%) and less likely to report that their main activity was working (51% vs 69%) (see Table 31).

TABLE 23 – LABOUR FORCE STATUS BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Employed	Male	76.7% (70.5, 81.9)	73.5% (70.1, 76.7)	53.0% (49.2, 56.7)
	Female	F	54.1% (44.4, 63.5)	33.2% (23.1, 45.2)
Unemployed	Male	12.6% (8.6, 18.0)	4.1% (2.9, 5.6)	4.1% (2.9, 5.7)
	Female	F	F	F
Not in Workforce	Male	10.7% (7.5, 15.0)	22.4% (19.4, 25.8)	43.0% (40.0, 46.7)
	Female	F	36.2% (27.5, 46.0)	59.6% (47.3, 70.8)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Veterans in the youngest age group were more likely to be in the workforce than those in the middle and oldest age groups (88%, 76%, & 56%, respectively).

TABLE 24 - LABOUR FORCE STATUS GROUP BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
In Workforce	88.3% (84.3, 91.3)	75.5% (72.3, 78.4)	55.7% (52.1, 59.1)
Not in Workforce	11.8% (8.7, 15.8)	24.5% (21.6, 27.7)	44.4% (40.9, 47.9)

Veterans in the youngest age group had the highest percentage unemployed when compared to the middle and oldest age groups (12%, 5%, & 4%, respectively). Veterans in the oldest age group had the lowest percentage employed (51%, 76%, & 71%, respectively) and the highest percentage not in the workforce (44%, 12%, & 25%, respectively) when compared to those in the youngest and middle age groups.

TABLE 25 - LABOUR FORCE STATUS BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Employed	76.0% (70.3, 80.9)	70.5% (67.2, 73.7)	51.3% (47.7, 54.9)
Unemployed	12.3% (8.6, 17.2)	4.9% (3.6, 6.7)	4.3% (3.1, 6.0)
Not in Workforce	11.8% (8.7, 15.8)	24.5% (21.6, 27.7)	44.4% (40.9, 47.9)

Senior NCMs had the highest percentage not in the workforce (38%, 31% & 22%, respectively) as well as the lowest employment rate (57%, 64% & 70%, respectively) when compared to officers and junior NCMs.

TABLE 26 – LABOUR FORCE STATUS BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Employed	64.4% (60.8, 67.9)	57.3% (53.9, 60.6)	70.3% (66.5, 73.7)
Unemployed	F	4.6% (3.4, 6.3)	7.3% (5.5, 9.6)
Not in Workforce	31.2% (27.9, 34.7)	38.1% (34.9, 41.4)	22.4% (19.4, 25.9)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

A higher percentage of female junior NCMs were not in the workforce than their male counterparts (39% vs 20%). Male junior NCMs were more likely to be employed than male officers and senior NCMs (74%, 65%, & 58%, respectively).

TABLE 27 - LABOUR FORCE STATUS BY RANK GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Employed	Male	64.5% (60.7, 68.2)	58.0% (54.4, 61.5)	73.7% (69.8, 77.2)
	Female	63.6% (52.5, 73.4)	50.9% (40.1, 61.5)	48.6% (37.8, 59.6)
Unemployed	Male	4.3% (3.0, 6.1)	4.7% (3.3, 6.5)	6.5% (4.8, 8.8)
	Female	F	F	F
Not in Workforce	Male	31.2% (27.7, 34.9)	37.4% (34.0, 40.9)	19.8% (16.7, 23.3)
	Female	31.4% (22.3, 42.1)	44.7% (34.3, 55.5)	39.2% (29.2, 50.2)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

While the employment rates for both officers and senior NCMs decreased significantly between the middle and oldest age groups (88% vs 46% for officers & 68% vs 48% for senior NCMs), junior NCMs as both age groups reported identical employment rates (68%). Officers in the middle age group had the highest employment rate (88%, 68%, & 68%, respectively) and the lowest percentage not in the workforce (9%, 26%, & 28%, respectively) when compared to senior and junior NCMs in that age group.

TABLE 28 - LABOUR FORCE STATUS BY RANK GROUP AND AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

		Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Employed	Under 35	F	F	76.2% (70.2, 81.4)
	35 to 54	87.9% (84.1, 90.9)	68.1% (63.2, 72.6)	67.5% (62.2, 72.4)
	55 & Over	46.2% (41.2, 51.2)	47.7% (43.1, 52.3)	67.7% (56.6, 77.1)
Unemployed	Under 35	F	F	12.2% (8.3, 17.4)
	35 to 54	F	5.6% (3.7, 8.4)	5.0% (3.2, 8.0)
	55 & Over	F	F	F
Not in Workforce	Under 35	F	F	11.6% (8.4, 15.8)
	35 to 54	9.0% (6.5, 12.2)	26.3% (22.2, 31.0)	27.5% (22.9, 32.6)
	55 & Over	49.4% (44.4, 54.4)	48.5% (43.9, 53.0)	27.0% (18.4, 37.9)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Satisfaction with Main Activity

In the 12 months before the survey, the main activities of Veterans were working at a job/running a business (66%), retired and not looking for work (16%), disabled/on disability (8%), and attending school/training (5%). Junior NCMs had the highest rates of working (72%, 64%, & 59%, respectively) and attending school/training (7%, 2%, & 3%, respectively), and had the lowest rate of being retired (6%, 27%, & 28%) than officers and senior NCMs. Officers had lower rates of being on disability than senior and junior NCMs (3%, 7% & 11%, respectively).

TABLE 29 – MAIN ACTIVITY BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs	Overall
Worked	63.8% (60.2, 67.3)	58.5% (55.2, 61.8)	71.9% (68.2, 75.3)	66.4% (64.2, 68.6)
Retired	26.9% (23.8, 30.3)	27.5% (24.6, 30.6)	6.3% (4.6, 8.5)	16.3% (14.9, 17.9)
On disability	3.4% (2.4, 4.9)	7.0% (5.5, 8.8)	10.6% (8.5, 13.0)	8.2% (7.0, 9.6)
Training	1.9% (1.2, 2.9)	2.7% (1.9, 3.8)	6.6% (5.0, 8.7)	4.6% (3.7, 5.7)

Veterans in the oldest age group were less likely to work than those in the youngest and middle age groups (53%, 78%, & 71%, respectively) and they were also more likely to be retired than those in the middle age group (36% vs 9%). Veterans in the youngest age group had a higher rate of being in training than those in the middle age group (11% vs 5%).

TABLE 30 - MAIN ACTIVITY BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Worked	77.7% (72.3, 82.3)	71.3% (68.0, 74.4)	52.7% (49.1, 56.3)
Retired	F	8.8% (7.0, 11.0)	36.4% (33.2, 39.8)
On disability	6.3% (3.9, 10.1)	9.7% (7.9, 11.9)	6.9% (5.2, 9.1)
Training	11.1% (7.9, 15.3)	4.9% (3.6, 6.7)	F

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Males in the oldest age group were less likely to be working (54% vs 75%) and more likely to be retired (37% vs 8%) than males in the middle age group. Females in the middle and oldest age groups were less likely to be working than males in the same age groups (52% vs 75% for 35 to 54 & 36% vs 54% for 55 & over). Males in the youngest age group were more likely to be in training than those in the middle age group (11% vs 4%). Overall, females were less likely to be working (51% vs 69%) and more likely to be on disability (16% vs 7%) than males.

TABLE 31 - MAIN ACTIVITY BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over	Overall
Worked	Male	78.9% (73.1, 83.7)	74.8% (71.4, 77.9)	54.2% (50.5, 57.9)	68.6% (66.3, 70.8)
	Female	F	52.1% (42.5, 61.6)	35.7% (25.1, 47.9)	50.7% (43.4, 57.9)
Retired	Male	F	8.3% (6.4, 10.6)	36.6% (33.2, 40.1)	16.4% (14.9, 18.1)
	Female	F	F	34.4% (24.2, 46.2)	15.4% (11.3, 20.7)
On disability	Male	F	8.5% (6.8, 10.6)	5.8% (4.2, 7.8)	7.2% (6.0, 8.5)
	Female	F	16.6% (10.5, 25.3)	F	15.8% (11.0, 22.0)
Training	Male	10.7% (7.3, 15.4)	4.2% (2.9, 6.0)	F	4.1% (3.2, 5.3)
	Female	F	F	F	7.9% (4.9, 12.6)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

In 2016, 74% of Veterans were satisfied or very satisfied with their main activity, 12% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 14% were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Percentages within each of these categories have not changed significantly since 2010.

TABLE 32 - SATISFACTION WITH MAIN ACTIVITY, LASS

	2010	2013	2016
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	75.5% (73.7, 77.1)	75.4% (73.1, 77.5)	74.0% (71.7, 76.1)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	10.4% (9.2, 11.7)	11.3% (9.7, 13.1)	12.0% (10.4, 13.7)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	14.2% (12.9, 15.5)	13.3% (11.7, 15.2)	14.1% (12.5, 15.9)

Veterans is the youngest age group were less satisfied with their main activity than those in the oldest age group (67% vs 79%).

TABLE 33 - SATISFACTION WITH MAIN ACTIVITY BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	66.8% (60.2, 72.8)	73.1% (69.7, 76.2)	79.2% (76.0, 82.1)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	16.8% (12.4, 22.4)	11.4% (9.3, 14.1)	10.2% (8.1, 12.7)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	16.5% (12.3, 21.7)	15.5% (13.1, 18.2)	10.6% (8.5, 13.2)

A lower percentage of females in the oldest age group were satisfied or very satisfied with their main activity than their male counterparts (64% vs 81%). A higher percentage of males in the oldest age group were satisfied or very satisfied with their main activity than males in the middle and youngest age groups (81%, 73% & 67%, respectively).

TABLE 34 - SATISFACTION WITH MAIN ACTIVITY BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over	Overall
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	Male	67.2% (60.1, 73.6)	72.5% (68.8, 76.0)	80.6% (77.3, 83.5)	74.3% (71.9, 76.6)
	Female	F	76.1% (67.6, 82.9)	63.8% (50.3, 75.4)	71.5% (64.8, 77.3)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Male	15.7% (11.1, 21.6)	12.4% (9.9, 15.4)	10.2% (8.1, 12.8)	12.2% (10.5, 14.1)
	Female	F	F	F	10.0% (6.6, 14.8)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	Male	17.1% (12.6, 22.9)	15.1% (12.5, 18.1)	9.2% (7.2, 11.7)	13.5% (11.8, 15.4)
	Female	F	17.7% (11.8, 25.6)	F	18.5% (13.8, 24.5)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Officers had the highest rates of satisfaction with their main activity when compared to junior and senior NCMs (85%, 68%, & 77%, respectively). Junior NCMs had the highest

rates of dissatisfaction with their main activity when compared to senior NCMs and officers (18%, 11%, & 9%, respectively).

TABLE 35 - SATISFACTION WITH MAIN ACTIVITY BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	85.4% (82.6, 87.9)	77.1% (74.2, 79.8)	68.3% (64.4, 72.0)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	5.9% (4.3, 8.0)	11.5% (9.5, 13.9)	14.3% (11.6, 17.3)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	8.7% (6.8, 11.1)	11.4% (9.5, 13.6)	17.5% (14.7, 20.6)

Veterans who released from the Air Force had higher rates of satisfaction with their main activity than those who released from the Army (78% vs 70%).

TABLE 36 - SATISFACTION WITH MAIN ACTIVITY BY BRANCH, LASS 2016

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	70.2% (66.8, 73.5)	78.1% (73.2, 82.3)	77.9% (74.1, 81.2)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	13.2% (10.8, 15.9)	10.5% (7.6, 14.5)	10.7% (8.4, 13.7)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	16.6% (14.1, 19.4)	11.4% (8.4, 15.3)	11.4% (9.0, 14.4)

Satisfaction with Life

In 2016, 84% of Veterans were satisfied or very satisfied with life, 8% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, and 8% were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Percentages within each of these categories have not changed significantly since 2010. Veterans had a lower satisfaction with life than the comparable Canadian population (84% vs 91%, see Appendix B, Table 82 for Canadian comparators).

TABLE 37 - SATISFACTION WITH LIFE, LASS

	2010	2013	2016
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	83.9% (82.5, 85.3)	85.1% (83.2, 86.9)	84.1% (82.2, 85.9)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	8.6% (7.6, 9.6)	7.3% (6.1, 8.8)	7.7% (6.5, 9.1)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	7.5% (6.6, 8.4)	7.5% (6.3, 9.0)	8.1% (6.9, 9.6)

For males, when looking at each response category individually, there were no differences in life satisfaction among the three age groups. Females in the youngest age group had higher life satisfaction than female Veterans in the middle and oldest age groups (95%, 78%, & 79%, respectively).

TABLE 38 - SATISFACTION WITH LIFE BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	Male	84.2% (78.4, 88.6)	83.6% (80.5, 86.2)	86.4% (83.5, 88.8)
	Female	95.4% (88.5, 98.3)	78.0% (68.4, 85.3)	78.7% (64.4, 88.3)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Male	6.3% (4.2, 9.5)	8.0% (6.1, 10.4)	6.6% (5.0, 8.6)
	Female	F	F	F
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	Male	9.5% (5.8, 15.2)	8.4% (6.6, 10.8)	7.0% (5.2, 9.5)
	Female	F	F	F

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Officers had the highest rates of satisfaction with life when compared to senior and junior NCMs (94%, 84%, & 81%, respectively).

TABLE 39 - SATISFACTION WITH LIFE BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	94.0% (92.1, 95.4)	83.5% (80.9, 85.8)	81.3% (77.9, 84.2)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	2.7% (1.8, 4.1)	9.1% (7.4, 11.1)	8.6% (6.7, 11.1)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	3.3% (2.3, 4.8)	7.4% (5.8, 9.5)	10.1% (8.0, 12.8)

Finances

Finances include household income and financial security. The desired outcome for this domain is that Veterans are financially secure. The well-being of Veterans in this domain was measured using two indicators that were available from LASS data: rate of low income and satisfaction with finances.

A Veteran was deemed to have low income if their household income (before tax) fell below the Low Income Measure (LIM). This was calculated incorporating household size and corresponding LIM thresholds published by Statistics Canada. Possible responses for satisfaction with finances were very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither, satisfied and very satisfied.

Rate of Low Income

In 2016, 4% of Veterans had low income. Veterans were doing better than Canadians as a lower percentage of them had low income (4% vs 15%, see Appendix B, Table 82 for Canadian comparators).

TABLE 40 – RATE OF LOW INCOME, LASS

	2010	2013	2016
Below LIM	5.6% (4.7, 6.7)	4.8% (3.7, 6.1)	4.2% (3.2, 5.4)
Above LIM	94.4% (93.3, 95.3)	95.2% (93.9, 96.3)	95.8% (94.6, 96.8)

A lower percentage of Veterans in the youngest age group were above the LIM than those in the oldest age group (91% vs 98%).

TABLE 41 – RATE OF LOW INCOME BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Below LIM	8.7% (5.6, 13.4)	4.0% (2.7, 5.9)	F
Above LIM	91.3% (86.6, 94.4)	96.0% (94.1, 97.3)	98.0% (96.7, 98.8)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

When comparing by rank group, junior NCMs had a lower percentage of Veterans above the LIM than officers and senior NCMs (94%, 99%, & 98% respectively).

TABLE 42 – RATE OF LOW INCOME BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Below LIM	F	F	6.0% (4.3, 8.3)
Above LIM	98.6% (97.2, 99.3)	97.5% (96.0, 98.4)	94.0% (91.7, 95.7)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Satisfaction with Finances

From 2010 to 2016, the percentage of Veterans who were satisfied or very satisfied with finances decreased from 75% to 69%. In 2016, 14% of Veterans were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and 18% were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

TABLE 43 - SATISFACTION WITH FINANCES, LASS

	2010	2013	2016
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	74.5% (72.6, 76.2)	73.8% (71.5, 76.1)	68.7% (66.3, 71.0)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	11.2% (10.0, 12.6)	10.7% (9.2, 12.4)	13.7% (12.1, 15.5)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	14.3% (13.0, 15.8)	15.5% (13.6, 17.5)	17.6% (15.7, 19.7)

A higher percentage of the oldest Veterans were satisfied or very satisfied with their finances than the middle and youngest age groups (79%, 68%, & 53%, respectively). A

lower percentage of the oldest Veterans were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their finances than the middle and youngest age groups (10%, 19%, & 29%, respectively). Overall, as age increased, satisfaction with finances increased and dissatisfaction with finances decreased.

TABLE 44 - SATISFACTION WITH FINANCES BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	52.6% (45.6, 59.4)	67.6% (64.0, 70.9)	79.1% (75.8, 82.1)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	18.4% (13.9, 24.0)	13.6% (11.4, 16.2)	11.3% (9.0, 14.2)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	29.0% (23.2, 35.7)	18.8% (16.0, 22.0)	9.6% (7.6, 12.0)

A higher percentage of males in the oldest age group were satisfied or very satisfied with their finances than males in the middle and youngest age groups (79%, 67%, & 54%, respectively). A higher percentage of males in the youngest age group were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with finances than males in the middle and youngest age groups (29%, 19%, & 9%, respectively).

TABLE 45 - SATISFACTION WITH FINANCES BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over	Overall
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	Male	53.7% (46.2, 61.0)	67.4% (63.5, 71.1)	79.4% (75.9, 82.5)	69.0% (66.5, 71.5)
	Female	F	68.5% (59.2, 76.4)	75.8% (62.7, 85.4)	66.3% (59.4, 72.6)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Male	17.5% (12.8, 23.5)	14.0% (11.5, 16.9)	11.4% (8.9, 14.5)	13.7% (12.0, 15.7)
	Female	F	11.5% (7.1, 18.0)	F	13.4% (9.6, 18.4)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	Male	28.8% (22.6, 35.9)	18.6% (15.6, 22.1)	9.2% (7.2, 11.6)	17.2% (15.2, 19.5)
	Female	F	20.1% (13.6, 28.7)	F	20.3% (15.1, 26.7)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Officers had the highest rates of satisfaction with finances (85%, 75%, & 60%, respectively) and the lowest rates of dissatisfaction with finances (7%, 13%, & 24%, respectively) when compared to senior and junior NCMs.

TABLE 46 - SATISFACTION WITH FINANCES BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	84.7% (81.8, 87.3)	75.3% (72.3, 78.1)	59.5% (55.4, 63.5)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	7.9% (6.1, 10.2)	11.3% (9.4, 13.6)	17.0% (14.2, 20.2)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	7.3% (5.5, 9.7)	13.4% (11.2, 15.9)	23.5% (20.2, 27.2)

For both junior NCMs and senior NCMs, the percentage of Veterans who were satisfied or very satisfied with finances increased between the middle and oldest age groups (62% vs 79% for junior NCMs & 71% vs 79% for senior NCMs). Senior NCMs in the oldest age group had a lower rate of dissatisfaction with finances than those in the middle age group (10% vs 18%).

TABLE 47 - SATISFACTION WITH FINANCES BY RANK GROUP AND AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

		Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	Under 35	F	F	51.7% (44.4, 59.0)
	35 to 54	83.4% (78.3, 87.4)	70.5% (65.5, 75.1)	62.3% (56.7, 67.5)
	55 & Over	87.3% (83.4, 90.3)	79.4% (75.7, 82.7)	79.1% (75.8, 82.0)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Under 35	F	F	18.5% (13.8, 24.4)
	35 to 54	8.5% (5.8, 12.3)	11.8% (8.9, 15.5)	15.7% (12.3, 19.9)
	55 & Over	6.7% (4.5, 9.8)	10.9% (8.5, 13.9)	F
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	Under 35	F	F	29.8% (23.6, 36.7)
	35 to 54	8.1% (5.2, 12.5)	17.7% (13.9, 22.2)	22.0% (17.7, 27.1)
	55 & Over	6.0% (4.0, 9.0)	9.7% (7.4, 12.6)	F

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

When compared to Army Veterans, Air Force Veterans had higher rates of satisfaction with finances (77% vs 64%) and lower rates of dissatisfaction (12% vs 21%).

TABLE 48 - SATISFACTION WITH FINANCES BY BRANCH, LASS 2016

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Satisfied or Very Satisfied	64.1% (60.5, 67.6)	68.1% (62.5, 73.3)	76.7% (72.8, 80.2)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	14.6% (12.3, 17.3)	15.5% (11.8, 20.2)	11.1% (8.7, 14.0)
Dissatisfied or Very Dissatisfied	21.3% (18.3, 24.5)	16.4% (12.4, 21.3)	12.2% (9.5, 15.5)

Social Integration

Social integration is engagement in mutually supportive relationships (friends, family & community). The desired outcome for this domain is that Veterans are in mutually supportive relationships and are engaged in their community. Veteran well-being was measured using three indicators that were available from LASS data: sense of belonging, social support scale, and adjustment to civilian life.

Sense of belonging measures a Veteran's sense of belonging to their local community. The social support scale measures social support using a social provisions scale of 10 questions on perceived social support. On the Social Provision Scale (SPS), a score of 30 to 40 (strongly agree or agree) was representative of high social support. Adjustment to civilian life measures the Veterans adjustment to civilian life since release.

Community Belonging

A lower percentage of Veterans reported having a strong sense of community belonging than Canadians (57% vs 65%, see Appendix B, Table 82 for Canadian comparators). In 2016, 43% of Veterans had a weak sense of community belonging.

TABLE 49 - COMMUNITY BELONGING, LASS

	2010	2013	2016
Very or Somewhat Strong	59.0% (56.9, 61.0)	57.6% (55.1, 60.1)	57.4% (54.9, 59.8)
Very or Somewhat Weak	41.1% (39.1, 43.1)	42.4% (39.9, 44.9)	42.6% (40.2, 45.2)

Veterans in the oldest age group had a stronger sense of community belonging than those in the youngest and middle age groups (65%, 54%, & 54%, respectively). A lower percentage of Veterans in the oldest age group reported a very or somewhat weak sense of community belonging than those in the middle and youngest age groups (35%, 46%, & 46%, respectively).

TABLE 50 - COMMUNITY BELONGING BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Very or Somewhat Strong	54.2% (47.2, 61.0)	53.7% (50.0, 57.4)	64.7% (61.1, 68.2)
Very or Somewhat Weak	45.8% (39.0, 52.8)	46.3% (42.6, 50.0)	35.3% (31.8, 38.9)

Officers had the highest rate of a very or somewhat strong sense of community belonging (68%, 61%, & 52%, respectively) and the lowest rate of a very or somewhat weak sense of community belonging (32%, 39%, & 48%, respectively) than senior and junior NCMs .

TABLE 51 - COMMUNITY BELONGING BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Very or Somewhat Strong	68.4% (64.8, 71.9)	60.7% (57.3, 64.0)	51.7% (47.5, 55.9)
Very or Somewhat Weak	31.6% (28.2, 35.2)	39.3% (36.0, 42.7)	48.3% (44.1, 52.5)

Social Support

In 2016, 84% of Veterans had high social support.

TABLE 52 - SOCIAL SUPPORT, LASS

	2013	2016
High Support	83.4% (81.4, 85.2)	83.7% (81.7, 85.6)
Low Support	16.6% (14.8, 18.6)	16.3% (14.5, 18.3)

Officers had the highest rate of high social support when compared to senior and junior NCMs (92%, 84% and 81%, respectively).

TABLE 53 - SOCIAL SUPPORT BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
High Support	91.9% (89.5, 93.7)	84.1% (81.4, 86.5)	80.8% (77.3, 83.9)
Low Support	8.1% (6.3, 10.5)	15.9% (13.5, 18.6)	19.2% (16.2, 22.7)

Male officers had the highest percentage reporting high social support when compared to their female counterparts (93% vs 83%) and the highest percentage reporting high social support when compared to their counterparts who released as senior NCMs and junior NCMs (93%, 84%, & 81%, respectively).

TABLE 54 - SOCIAL SUPPORT BY RANK GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs	Overall
High Support	Male	93.1% (90.8, 94.9)	84.0% (81.1, 86.5)	80.7% (76.9, 84.0)	83.9% (81.8, 85.8)
	Female	83.1% (72.5, 90.1)	85.2% (76.8, 90.9)	81.5% (71.0, 88.8)	82.7% (76.2, 87.6)
Low Support	Male	6.9% (5.1, 9.2)	16.0% (13.5, 18.9)	19.4% (16.1, 23.2)	16.1% (14.2, 18.3)
	Female	F	F	F	17.3% (12.4, 23.8)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Adjustment to Civilian Life

From 2010 to 2016, the percentage of Veterans reporting a difficult transition increased from 28% to 32% and the percentage reporting an easy transition decreased from 60% to 52%.

TABLE 55 - ADJUSTMENT TO CIVILIAN LIFE, LASS

	2010	2013	2016
Very or Moderately Easy	59.5% (57.6, 61.5)	54.3% (51.8, 56.8)	52.4% (49.9, 54.9)
Neither Difficult nor Easy	12.8% (11.5, 14.2)	16.1% (14.3, 18.1)	15.2% (13.5, 17.2)
Very or Moderately Difficult	27.7% (26.0, 29.5)	29.6% (27.3, 32.0)	32.4% (30.1, 34.8)

A higher percentage of Veterans in the oldest age group reported a very or moderately easy adjustment compared to Veterans in the youngest and middle age groups (62%, 41%, & 50%, respectively). A lower percentage of Veterans in the oldest age group reported a very or moderately difficult adjustment compared to those in the youngest and middle age groups (24%, 40%, & 35%, respectively).

TABLE 56 - ADJUSTMENT TO CIVILIAN LIFE BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Very or Moderately Easy	40.5% (33.8, 47.6)	50.1% (46.4, 53.8)	62.3% (58.7, 65.7)
Neither Difficult nor Easy	19.7% (14.5, 26.2)	14.8% (12.2, 17.7)	13.6% (11.4, 16.3)
Very or Moderately Difficult	39.8% (33.2, 46.7)	35.1% (31.7, 38.7)	24.1% (21.1, 27.4)

Officers reported a higher rate of an easy adjustment (69%, 57%, & 44%, respectively) and a lower rate of a difficult adjustment (17%, 29%, & 39%, respectively) than senior and junior NCMs.

TABLE 57 - ADJUSTMENT TO CIVILIAN LIFE BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Very or Moderately Easy	68.8% (65.2, 72.3)	57.0% (53.6, 60.4)	44.2% (40.0, 48.4)
Neither Difficult nor Easy	13.9% (11.4, 16.9)	13.5% (11.4, 16.0)	16.7% (13.7, 20.2)
Very or Moderately Difficult	17.2% (14.6, 20.3)	29.4% (26.4, 32.6)	39.1% (35.2, 43.2)

Male officers reported a higher rate of a very or moderately easy adjustment than their counterparts who released as senior NCMs and junior NCMs (71%, 57%, & 43%, respectively). Male officers also reported a higher rate of a very or moderately easy adjustment than their female counterparts (71% vs 52%). A lower percentage of male officers reported having a very or moderately difficult transition than their counterparts who released as senior NCMs and junior NCMs (16%, 29%, & 39%, respectively).

TABLE 58 - ADJUSTMENT TO CIVILIAN LIFE BY RANK GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs	Overall
Very or Moderately Easy	Male	71.2% (67.3, 74.7)	57.0% (53.4, 60.5)	43.3% (38.8, 47.9)	52.4% (49.7, 55.1)
	Female	52.0% (40.9, 63.0)	57.6% (46.7, 67.9)	49.9% (39.1, 60.8)	52.2% (44.9, 59.3)
Neither Difficult nor Easy	Male	13.2% (10.6, 16.3)	14.0% (11.7, 16.6)	17.5% (14.2, 21.4)	15.6% (13.7, 17.8)
	Female	F	F	F	12.4% (8.8, 17.2)
Very or Moderately Difficult	Male	15.7% (13.0, 18.8)	29.0% (25.9, 32.4)	39.3% (35.0, 43.7)	32.0% (29.5, 34.5)
	Female	F	33.3% (24.1, 44.0)	38.4% (28.4, 49.5)	35.4% (28.8, 42.7)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Army Veterans had a significantly lower rate of a very or moderately easy adjustment (46%, 58%, & 61%, respectively) and a higher rate of a very/moderately difficult adjustment (38%, 27%, & 26%, respectively) than Navy and Air Force Veterans.

TABLE 59 - ADJUSTMENT TO CIVILIAN LIFE BY BRANCH, LASS 2016

	Army	Navy	Air Force
Very or Moderately Easy	45.6% (42.0, 49.3)	57.6% (51.9, 63.1)	60.7% (56.5, 64.9)
Neither Difficult nor Easy	16.5% (13.7, 19.6)	15.1% (11.5, 19.5)	13.3% (10.7, 16.4)
Very or Moderately Difficult	37.9% (34.5, 41.5)	27.3% (22.6, 32.6)	26.0% (22.3, 30.0)

Life Skills

Life skills enable management of life and contribute to resilience; they include personal health practices, coping skills and education. The desired outcome for this domain is that Veterans are able to adapt, manage, and cope. Veteran well-being in this domain was measured using five indicators that were available from LASS data: education level, daily smoking, heavy drinking, obesity and mastery.

Education level measured the highest attained education, segmented into four categories: less than high school, high school graduation, post-secondary graduation < bachelor's degree, post-secondary graduation ≥ bachelor's degree (i.e. university degree). Personal health practices measured include analysis on daily smoking, heavy drinking and obesity. Daily smoking reported the number of daily smokers among Veterans. Heavy drinking reported the number of heavy drinkers among Veterans. A heavy drinker is defined as someone who consumes more than a certain number of drinks (i.e. 4 for females and 5 for males) at least 12 times a year. Obesity reported the number of Veterans who are identified as obese. Veterans are classified as obese if they have a Body Mass Index (BMI) of 30 or higher. BMI is calculated based on self-reported height and weight. Mastery is a seven-item measure answered with a five-point Likert scale. It is a widely used indicator of the extent to which people see themselves as being in control of forces that affect their lives (Pearlin et al, 1981).

Education Level

The percentage of Veterans with less than high school graduation decreased from 7% in 2010 to 4% in 2016. In 2016, 42% of Veterans had graduated only from high school, 37% had post-secondary graduation with less than a bachelor's degree, and 17% had post-secondary graduation with a bachelor's degree or higher. Veterans had a lower rate of post-secondary graduation (54% vs 65%) and a higher rate of having graduated only from high school (42% vs 20%) than Canadians (see Appendix B, Table 82).

TABLE 60 - HIGHEST EDUCATION, LASS

		2010	2013	2016
Less than High School		6.9% (6.0, 8.0)	5.3% (4.3, 6.6)	4.1% (3.2, 5.2)
High School Graduation		42.2% (40.2, 44.2)	44.5% (42.1, 47.1)	41.7% (39.3, 44.2)
Post-Secondary Graduation	Less than Bachelor's Degree	36.2% (34.3, 38.2)	35.0% (32.6, 37.5)	37.0% (34.5, 39.4)
	Bachelor's Degree or Higher	14.7% (13.2, 16.2)	15.2% (13.8, 16.7)	17.3% (15.9, 18.7)

A higher percentage of females had post-secondary graduation with a bachelor's degree or higher than their male counterparts (24% vs 16%).

TABLE 61 - HIGHEST EDUCATION BY SEX, LASS 2016

		Male	Female
Less than High School		4.2% (3.2, 5.4)	F
High School Graduation		42.8% (40.2, 45.5)	34.0% (27.2, 41.5)
Post-Secondary Graduation	Less than Bachelor's Degree	36.6% (34.0, 39.3)	39.5% (32.7, 46.7)
	Bachelor's Degree or Higher	16.4% (15.0, 18.0)	23.5% (18.5, 29.3)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Females in the middle age group were more likely to graduate post-secondary with a bachelor's degree or higher than their male counterparts (26% vs 17%).

TABLE 62 - HIGHEST EDUCATION BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

			Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Less than High School	Male		F	3.6% (2.3, 5.5)	5.7% (4.2, 7.7)
	Female		F	F	F
High School Graduation	Male		46.9% (39.5, 54.4)	39.4% (35.5, 43.4)	45.6% (41.9, 49.4)
	Female		F	34.5% (25.5, 44.7)	F
Post-Secondary Graduation	Less than Bachelor's Degree	Male	43.5% (36.3, 51.0)	40.4% (36.4, 44.4)	27.5% (24.1, 31.1)
		Female	F	37.4% (28.7, 47.0)	35.4% (24.7, 47.7)
	Bachelor's Degree or Higher	Male	6.6% (3.8, 11.1)	16.6% (14.3, 19.3)	21.2% (18.9, 23.8)
		Female	F	26.4% (19.7, 34.5)	22.0% (15.2, 30.6)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

A higher percentage of female officers had post-secondary graduation with a bachelor's degree or higher than their male counterparts (91% vs 72%).

TABLE 63 - HIGHEST EDUCATION BY RANK GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

			Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Less than High School		Male	F 5.8% (4.3, 7.7)	5.8% (4.3, 7.7)	4.5% (2.9, 6.7)
		Female	F	F	F
High School Graduation		Male	13.7% (11.2, 16.6)	54.8% (51.2, 58.4)	45.3% (40.8, 49.9)
		Female	F	43.7% (33.3, 54.6)	39.1% (28.8, 50.6)
Post-Secondary Graduation	Less than Bachelor's Degree	Male	13.6% (11.1, 16.5)	36.0% (32.6, 39.6)	44.7% (40.3, 49.3)
		Female	F	41.7% (31.6, 52.6)	48.4% (37.6, 59.3)
	Bachelor's Degree or Higher	Male	72.2% (68.5, 75.6)	F	5.5% (3.6, 8.2)
		Female	91.2% (82.9, 95.7)	F	F

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Veterans in the youngest age group were less likely to graduate post-secondary with a bachelor's degree or higher than those in the middle and oldest age groups (7%, 18% & 21%, respectively). Veterans in the oldest age group were less likely to graduate post-secondary with less than bachelor's degree than those in the youngest and middle age groups (28%, 45% & 40%, respectively).

TABLE 64 - HIGHEST EDUCATION, LASS 2016

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over	Overall
Less than High School		F	3.3% (2.2, 5.0)	6.0% (4.4, 8.0)	4.1% (3.2, 5.2)
High School Graduation		45.4% (38.5, 52.5)	38.6% (35.1, 42.3)	44.6% (41.0, 48.2)	41.7% (39.3, 44.2)
Post-Secondary Graduation	Less than Bachelor's Degree	44.7% (37.9, 51.7)	39.9% (36.3, 43.6)	28.1% (24.9, 31.6)	37.0% (34.5, 39.4)
	Bachelor's Degree or Higher	7.2% (4.5, 11.2)	18.1% (15.9, 20.7)	21.3% (19.1, 23.7)	17.3% (15.9, 18.7)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Generally, officers had higher education levels than senior and junior NCMs (75%, 4% & 6%, respectively). Officers had a lower percentage graduating only from high school than senior and junior NCMs (12%, 54% & 45%, respectively). They also had a lower percentage graduating from post-secondary with less than bachelor's degree than senior and junior NCMs (13%, 37% & 45%, respectively). A higher percentage of junior NCMs had post-secondary graduation with less than a bachelor's degree (45% vs 37%) and a lower percentage graduated only from high school (45% vs 54%) than senior NCMs.

TABLE 65 - HIGHEST EDUCATION BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

		Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Less than High School		F	5.7% (4.3, 7.6)	4.3% (2.9, 6.3)
High School Graduation		12.3% (10.1, 15.0)	53.7% (50.3, 57.1)	44.5% (40.3, 48.7)
Post-Secondary Graduation	Less than Bachelor's Degree	12.6% (10.4, 15.3)	36.5% (33.3, 39.9)	45.2% (41.1, 49.5)
	Bachelor's Degree or Higher	74.5% (71.1, 77.6)	4.0% (2.8, 5.7)	6.0% (4.2, 8.6)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

A lower percentage of officers in the oldest age group had post-secondary graduation with a bachelor's degree or higher than officers in the youngest and middle age groups (64%, 89%, & 86%, respectively). A higher percentage of officers in the oldest age group had post-secondary graduation with less than a bachelor's degree than officers in the middle age group (17% vs 8%). A higher percentage of senior NCMs in the oldest age group had graduated only from high school than those in the middle age group (59% vs 48%) and a higher percentage of senior NCMs in the middle age group had post-secondary graduation with less than a bachelor's degree than those in the oldest age group (44% vs 30%).

TABLE 66 - HIGHEST EDUCATION BY RANK GROUP AND AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

			Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Less than High School	Under 35		F	F	F
	35 to 54		F	F	F
	55 & Over		F	7.6% (5.5, 10.4)	F
High School Graduation	Under 35		F	F	46.9% (39.7, 54.3)
	35 to 54		F	47.8% (42.7, 53.0)	42.3% (36.7, 48.0)
	55 & Over		18.0% (14.5, 22.2)	58.6% (54.0, 63.0)	48.2% (36.7, 59.9)
Post-Secondary Graduation	Less than Bachelor's Degree	Under 35	F	F	46.7% (39.5, 54.1)
		35 to 54	7.8% (5.2, 11.5)	43.8% (38.8, 49.1)	45.9% (40.2, 51.6)
		55 & Over	16.9% (13.4, 20.9)	30.4% (26.4, 34.7)	38.8% (28.2, 50.6)
	Bachelor's Degree or Higher	Under 35	88.9% (74.1, 95.7)	F	F
		35 to 54	86.2% (81.7, 89.7)	F	F
		55 & Over	64.4% (59.5, 69.0)	F	F

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

A lower percentage of Army Veterans had post-secondary graduation with a bachelor's degree or higher than those Navy and Air Force Veterans (14%, 20% & 22%, respectively). A higher percentage of Army Veterans had graduated only from high school than Navy Veterans (45% vs 35%).

TABLE 67 - HIGHEST EDUCATION BY BRANCH, LASS 2016

		Army	Navy	Air Force
Less than High School		4.3% (3.0, 6.1)	F	F
High School Graduation		44.9% (41.3, 48.6)	35.1% (29.9, 40.8)	40.1% (36.0, 44.4)
Post-Secondary Graduation	Less than Bachelor's Degree	36.9% (33.4, 40.6)	40.4% (34.8, 46.3)	35.0% (30.9, 39.3)
	Bachelor's Degree or Higher	13.8% (11.9, 16.0)	20.1% (16.7, 23.9)	21.5% (18.6, 24.7)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Daily Smoking

Data on daily smoking was not captured in LASS 2016. Between 2010 and 2013, there was no statistically significant change in the rate of Veterans reporting daily smoking

(18% vs 17%, see Appendix B, Table 83). Veterans had lower rates of daily smoking than Canadians [17% vs 20% (see Appendix B, Table 82 for Canadian comparators)].

A higher percentage of males in the youngest age group reported being daily smokers than those in the oldest age group (23% vs 13%).

TABLE 68 - DAILY SMOKING BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2013

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Daily Smoker	Male	22.6% (16.7, 29.8)	17.1% (14.5, 20.1)	12.9% (10.2, 16.2)
	Female	F	F	F
Not a Daily Smoker	Male	77.5% (70.2, 83.3)	82.9% (79.9, 85.5)	87.1% (83.8, 89.8)
	Female	F	85.7% (78.2, 91.0)	81.6% (67.7, 90.4)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

A higher percentage of officers reported not being a daily smoker when compared to senior and junior NCMs (96%, 83% & 80%, respectively).

TABLE 69 – DAILY SMOKING BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2013

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Daily Smoker	F	17.0% (14.6, 19.7)	20.5% (17.3, 24.0)
Not a Daily Smoker	95.8% (93.8, 97.2)	83.0% (80.3, 85.4)	79.6% (76.0, 82.7)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Heavy Drinking

There was no statistically significant change in the rate of Veterans reporting heavy drinking between 2010 and 2016 (28% vs 27%, see Appendix B, Table 83). Veterans had higher rates of heavy drinking than Canadians [27% vs 24% (see Appendix B, Table 82)]. Overall, females had lower rates of heavy drinking than males (19% vs 29%).

TABLE 70 – HEAVY DRINKING BY SEX, LASS 2016

	Male	Female
Heavy Drinker	28.5% (26.1, 31.0)	18.9% (13.6, 25.7)
Not a Heavy Drinker	71.5% (69.0, 74.0)	81.1% (74.3, 86.4)

Veterans in the oldest age group had a lower rate of heavy drinking than those in the youngest and middle age groups (21%, 34% & 29%, respectively).

TABLE 71 – HEAVY DRINKING BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Heavy Drinker	34.2% (27.8, 41.2)	29.2% (25.9, 32.7)	20.7% (17.8, 23.8)
Not a Heavy Drinker	65.8% (58.8, 72.2)	70.8% (67.3, 74.1)	79.3% (76.2, 82.2)

Males in the oldest age group were less likely to be heavy drinkers than males in the youngest and middle age groups (22%, 33% & 31%, respectively). In the middle age group, females had a lower rate of heavy drinking than males (17% vs 31%).

TABLE 72 – HEAVY DRINKING BY AGE GROUP AND SEX, LASS 2016

		Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Heavy Drinker	Male	33.4% (26.7, 40.9)	31.4% (27.8, 35.3)	21.5% (18.5, 24.9)
	Female	F	16.7% (10.6, 25.3)	F
Not a Heavy Drinker	Male	66.6% (59.1, 73.3)	68.6% (64.7, 72.2)	78.5% (75.1, 81.5)
	Female	59.1% (38.8, 76.8)	83.3% (74.8, 89.4)	88.9% (78.5, 94.6)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Officers had a lower rate of heavy drinking than senior and junior NCMs (19%, 25% & 31%, respectively).

TABLE 73 – HEAVY DRINKING BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Heavy Drinker	18.9% (16.1, 22.0)	25.4% (22.5, 28.5)	31.2% (27.5, 35.3)
Not a Heavy Drinker	81.2% (78.0, 83.9)	74.6% (71.5, 77.5)	68.8% (64.7, 72.5)

Rates of heavy drinking were higher among senior NCMs in the middle age group than their counterparts in the oldest age group (31% vs 20%). Officers in the middle age group had a lower rate of heavy drinking than senior and junior NCMs in that age group (20%, 31% & 31%, respectively).

TABLE 74 – HEAVY DRINKING BY RANK GROUP AND AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

		Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Heavy Drinker	Under 35	F	F	34.8% (28.1, 42.2)
	35 to 54	19.8% (15.4, 25.1)	31.3% (26.7, 36.3)	30.5% (25.4, 36.0)
	55 & Over	17.9% (14.4, 22.0)	20.1% (16.7, 24.1)	F
Not a Heavy Drinker	Under 35	F	F	65.2% (57.9, 71.9)
	35 to 54	80.2% (74.9, 84.6)	68.7% (63.7, 73.3)	69.5% (64.0, 74.6)
	55 & Over	82.1% (78.0, 85.6)	79.9% (76.0, 83.3)	74.1% (62.6, 83.0)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).

Obesity

There was no statistically significant change in the obesity rate for Veterans between 2010 and 2016 [30% vs 29%, see Appendix B, Table 83]. Veterans had higher rates of obesity than Canadians [29% vs 23% (see Appendix B, Table 82)]. Males had higher obesity rates than females (30% vs 20%).

TABLE 75 - OBESITY BY SEX, LASS 2016

	Male	Female
Obese	29.9% (27.5, 32.4)	20.4% (15.1, 26.9)
Not Obese	70.1% (67.6, 72.5)	79.6% (73.1, 84.9)

Veterans in the youngest age group had lower obesity rates than Veterans in the middle and oldest age groups (20%, 31% & 30%, respectively).

TABLE 76 - OBESITY BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 & Over
Obese	20.2% (15.1, 26.5)	31.0% (27.7, 34.5)	29.9% (26.7, 33.4)
Not Obese	79.8% (73.6, 84.9)	69.0% (65.5, 72.3)	70.1% (66.6, 73.3)

Officers had lower rates of obesity than senior NCMs (23% vs 33%).

TABLE 77 - OBESITY BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Obese	23.3% (20.3, 26.6)	32.7% (29.6, 36.0)	28.4% (24.8, 32.3)
Not Obese	76.7% (73.4, 79.7)	67.3% (64.1, 70.4)	71.6% (67.7, 75.3)

Mastery

Data on mastery was not captured in LASS 2016. Between 2010 and 2013, there were no statistically significant changes in the rates of low, medium, and high level mastery [low - 34% vs 32%, medium - 28% vs 32%, high - 38% vs 37% (see Appendix B, Table 83)].

Veterans in the youngest age group had a lower percentage reporting low-level mastery than those in the middle age group (22% vs 35%).

TABLE 78 - MASTERY LEVEL BY AGE GROUP, LASS 2013

	Under 35	35 to 54	55 and Over
Low	21.8% (16.5, 28.4)	34.8% (31.7, 38.1)	31.6% (27.9, 35.6)
Medium	37.1% (30.3, 44.4)	30.4% (27.4, 33.5)	30.1% (26.6, 33.9)
High	41.1% (34.1, 48.4)	34.8% (31.7, 38.0)	38.3% (34.6, 42.1)

Officers had a higher percentage reporting high-level mastery than senior and junior NCMs (53%, 34% & 33%, respectively). Officers had a lower percentage reporting low-level mastery than senior and junior NCMs (18%, 34% & 35%, respectively).

TABLE 79 - MASTERY LEVEL BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2013

	Officers	Senior NCMs	Junior NCMs
Low	17.8% (14.9, 21.1)	33.9% (30.8, 37.2)	34.9% (31.0, 39.0)
Medium	29.1% (25.5, 32.9)	32.5% (29.4, 35.8)	31.8% (28.0, 35.8)
High	53.1% (49.0, 57.2)	33.6% (30.4, 36.9)	33.3% (29.5, 37.5)

Housing and Physical Environment

This domain describes a Veteran's physical environment that includes the built environment (e.g., housing) as well as the natural environment (e.g., water & air quality). The desired outcome for this domain is that Veterans are living in safe, adequate and affordable housing. Veteran well-being in this domain was measured using the indicator, rate of Veterans among Canadian homeless, which is the percentage of Veterans identified in the Canadian shelter population. The source of this data is a report published by Employment and Social Development Canada (Segaert and Bauer,

2015) which presented findings from a study that covered 15% of shelters and 15% of available shelter beds.

Rate of Veterans among Canadian Homeless

In 2014, Veterans comprised 2.7% of annual shelter users. It is important to note that this estimate excluded homeless Canadians who did not access shelters so the rate of Veterans among Canadian homeless could be higher.

Among shelter users who were aged 16 and older, Veterans were older on average than non-Veterans (41.6 vs 37.0 years) were. The percentage of shelter users who were aged 65 and over was higher for Veterans (9.5%) than non-Veterans (3.0%). The percentage of males making up the Veteran shelter population was the same as the percentage of males making up the non-Veteran shelter population.

Individuals who experienced three or more episodes of homelessness during a given year were categorized as episodic shelter users. In 2014, Veterans had a higher rate of episodic shelter use than non-Veterans did.

Culture and Social Environment

Culture and Social Environment is the set of dominant values, beliefs and attitudes of society that impact the well-being of a population. The desired outcome for this domain is that Veterans are supported by the culture and social environment (understood & valued by Canadians). Veteran well-being in this domain was measured using two indicators: Canadians' attitudes toward Veterans and Employers' attitudes toward Veterans.

Canadians' attitudes toward Veterans were measured using the results from the 2012 and 2014 cycles of The Attitudes Towards Remembrance: Survey of Canadians. Employers' attitudes toward Veterans were measured using the results from The True Patriot Love Foundation's 2017 survey of 850 corporate Human Resources departments in Canada that examined employers' perceptions of Veteran hiring.

Canadians' Attitudes toward Veterans

Overall, the attitude toward Veterans was positive. In 2014, the majority of Canadians:

- believed that Veterans should be recognized for their service (93%) and that they made major contributions to the development of Canada (83%);
- were knowledgeable of and proud of the role that the military played in peacekeeping missions and conflicts (69% & 82%, respectively);
- felt that VAC's Remembrance Program effectively honours Veterans and those who died in service, and preserves the memory of their achievements and sacrifices (73%); and

- were satisfied with how VAC recognizes and honours Veterans through the maintenance of memorials, cemeteries and grave markers (62%).

TABLE 80 - CANADIANS ATTITUDES TOWARD VETERANS

Indicator	Measure	2012	2014
Canadians' Attitudes Toward Veterans	Knowledgeable about the role that Canada's military has played in peacekeeping missions and conflicts*	73%	69%
	Proud of the role that Canada's military has played in peacekeeping missions and conflicts*	80%	82%
	Canada's Veterans have made major contributions to the development of our country	86%	83%
	Canada's Veterans should be recognized for their service to Canada	91%	93%
	Make effort to demonstrate appreciation to Veterans	66%	66%
	VAC's Remembrance Program effectively honours Veterans and those who died in service, and preserves the memory of their achievements and sacrifices	75%	73%
	Satisfaction with how VAC recognizes and honours Veterans through the maintenance of memorials, cemeteries and grave markers	66%	62%

* includes missions and conflicts such as the World Wars, Korean War and war in Afghanistan

Employers' Attitudes toward Veterans

Measurement using this indicator highlighted the difficulties that Veterans face when seeking employment. Less than half of employers sampled (45%) believed hiring Veterans reflects well on their company and almost three-quarters of employers (73%) possessed no Veteran-specific hiring initiative. Only 13% of HR Departments received training to read military resumes and only 43% of employers believed that Veterans make stable and long-term employees. Thirty-five percent of employers believed that their company did not need to make a special effort to hire Veterans and 46% of employers valued a university degree over military service.

TABLE 81 - EMPLOYERS' ATTITUDES TOWARD VETERANS

Indicator	Measure	2013
Employers' Attitudes Toward Veterans	Hiring Veterans reflects well on their company	45%
	Veterans make stable and long-term employees	43%
	Possess no Veteran-specific hiring initiative	73%
	HR Departments that received training to read military resumes	13%
	Value a university degree over military service	46%
	Company does not need to make special effort to hire Veterans	35%

Summary

The majority of Veterans report an easy adjustment to civilian life.

Comparisons between Veterans and Canadians were made, where possible. Financially, Veterans were more secure than Canadians as a lower percentage of them fell below the LIM threshold. Veterans had lower rates of daily smoking than Canadians. However, for most of the indicators in the domains of health, purpose, social integration, and life skills, Veterans had lower well-being than Canadians did, as they had:

- lower rates of very good or excellent self-rated health;
- lower rates of very good or excellent self-rated mental health;
- lower rates of having no activity limitations;
- higher rates of having activity limitations (sometimes/often restricted);
- higher rates of needing assistance with ADL;
- lower rates of satisfaction with life;
- lower employment rates;
- a weaker sense of community belonging;
- lower rates of completing post-secondary graduation;
- higher rates of heavy drinking; and
- higher rates of obesity.

Veteran results were analysed by sex, age at time of survey, rank group at release, and branch at release. Veterans of the youngest age group, junior NCMs, and Army Veterans had lower well-being. Officers had the best well-being of all ranks groups.

Females were more likely to need help with ADL and to have a university degree. Males were more likely to be employed and, more likely to be heavy drinkers and to be obese.

Veterans in the youngest age group were doing better in the health domain than the other two age groups as they had the:

- lowest self-rated fair or poor health;
- highest percentage with no activity limitations;
- lowest percentage reporting often restricted activity; and
- lowest percentage needing help with at least one ADL.

Veterans in the oldest age group were most likely not to be in the workforce, but for those who were, their employment rate was lower. Financially, the oldest Veterans were doing better than the youngest Veterans as they had higher rates of having income above the LIM threshold. Veterans in the oldest age group were doing better than their counterparts in the younger age groups as they had the:

- highest self-rated very good or excellent mental health;
- highest rates of satisfaction with finances;
- highest rates of very or somewhat strong community belonging;
- highest rates of very or moderately easy adjustment to civilian life;
- lowest rates of heavy drinking.

Female Veterans in the oldest age group were not doing as well as their male counterparts as they had:

- lower self-rated very good or excellent health;
- lower self-rated very good or excellent mental health;
- higher rates of having restricted activity;
- higher rates of needing help with ADL; and
- lower satisfaction with their main activity.

Officers had the highest well-being of all rank groups, with the:

- highest self-rated very good or excellent health;
- highest self-rated very good or excellent mental health;
- lowest rates of often restricted activity;
- lowest rates of needing help with ADL;
- highest satisfaction with main activity;
- highest satisfaction with life;
- highest satisfaction with finances;
- highest rates of very or somewhat strong community belonging;
- highest social support;
- highest rates of very or moderately easy adjustment to civilian life;
- highest rates having university degree;
- lowest rates of heavy drinking; and
- highest rates of having high level mastery.

Junior NCMs had the lowest well-being of all rank groups, being the least:

- satisfied with their main activity;
- satisfied with their finances;
- likely to be above the LIM threshold;
- likely to have a very or somewhat strong community belonging; and
- likely to have a very or moderately easy adjustment to civilian life.

Comparing the two NCM rank groups, well-being was similar in the domains of health, purpose and life skills. However, in the domain of finance, senior NCMs were doing better as they had higher rates of satisfaction with finances despite having lower employment rates. Senior NCMs were also less likely to report that working was their main activity, with a significantly higher percentage of them reporting that they were retired.

The well-being of Veterans by branch depended on the composition of ranks within each branch. For instance, a lower percentage of Army Veterans were officers (13%) and a higher percentage were junior NCMs (62%) compared to the other branches (see Table 90). With respect to their adjustment to civilian life, Army Veterans had the lowest rates

of a very or moderately easy adjustment and the highest rates of a very or moderately difficult adjustment. They also had the lowest rates of having a university degree. Compared to Army Veterans, Air Force Veterans were more likely to be both satisfied with their finances and satisfied with their main activity. There were no differences in the well-being reported by Navy Veterans and Air Force Veterans.

Limitations

Some groups of Veterans were not well described by currently available data. LASS 2016 examined only CAF regular force Veterans who were released from 1998 to 2015 at ranks other than the entry ranks and excluded many reserve force Veterans. The findings of this report are not applicable to these excluded groups.

The indicator that measures well-being in the housing and physical environment domain is not comparable to the other indicators used in this report as it measures the percentage of the Canadian homeless shelter population who are Veterans. This homeless Veteran population is not limited to just CAF regular force Veterans who released from 1998 onward at the post-entry ranks as it includes all Veteran types (i.e. Veterans with any type of service and who released from any rank in any year). Additional indicators are being examined to supplement the measurement of well-being in this domain.

Well-being was difficult to analyse for the following groups of Veterans: female Veterans, Veterans in the youngest age group (under 35), and Veterans who released as officers. The difficulty in measuring well-being for these groups was that individually, each made up a small percentage of the Veteran population, which resulted in too few of them being selected in the survey sample. This creates difficulties when delving into these populations further (i.e. by response categories, sex, age group, etc.). Future surveillance reports will examine other methods to improve descriptions of these smaller populations.

Policy Considerations/Implications

The results of the Well-being Surveillance Framework (VAC, 2017) will be used to inform Veterans Affairs Canada's (VAC) strategic policy agenda/direction moving forward. In the population health approach, sound policy development involves examining the gaps between the current well-being of the target population, as compared to the desired outcomes (or the ideal state of well-being). Policy interventions (i.e. strategies, programs, etc.) are then developed to address the identified gaps or areas of need. Therefore, it was critical for VAC to have a comprehensive, base-line description of the well-being of the Veteran population, as well as a way to monitor changes over time. To address this need, the Veterans Well-being Surveillance Framework (VAC, 2017) was developed by VAC.

As such, it can be said the main drivers of the development of this framework in 2017 were the development of the well-being conceptual framework, the adoption of a population health approach, and an increased focus on results-based performance measurement across the federal public service. This framework is comprised of an accepted set of high level indicators which is being used to paint a picture of how the Veteran population is doing across multiple facets of life, or domains of well-being. Its focus is on monitoring the well-being of the entire Veteran population, not just VAC clients. It supports the work of the Department, allowing priorities to be established in research and policy. Further, it is useful for external partners who work collaboratively with the Department to influence Veteran well-being.

Over time, analysis of the surveillance data will allow decision makers to understand trends, areas where Veterans are facing challenges and where gaps exist. It has been recognized that the well-being of a given population involves multiple factors that go well beyond the scope of traditional health services. Monitoring the well-being of the population is fundamental to this approach to understand and improve the well-being of a population.

Several themes emerge with respect to the way forward and the application of well-being findings in policy development. They include: the aging of the Veteran population, the need for more research to understand trends over time, and the role of prevention and outreach. It is important to note that the Surveillance Framework (VAC, 2017) does not include targets or thresholds. The aim is to address how proposed interventions (i.e. partnerships, new programs, etc.) will contribute to the improvement in well-being.

The Veterans Well-being Surveillance Framework (VAC, 2017) is closely linked to VAC's Departmental Results Framework (DRF). The former is designed to monitor the well-being of a population (which may be influenced by many factors external to VAC), while the latter is designed to measure departmental performance in particular. As VAC's performance measurement continues to shift towards measuring well-being at the population level, VAC will ensure alignment of the DRF with the well-being conceptual framework.

Since the framework was developed, research has been done in the finance domain which has resulted in the VAC confirming that the current indicators being used to measure well-being in this domain are appropriate. In addition, further work has been done in the housing domain to identify additional data sources and indicators that would better measure well-being in this domain. As a result, the "core housing need" indicator has been added to the DRF and it will be considered in the next cycle of this report.

As findings from the inaugural well-being report suggest, the well-being of the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) regular force population varies across all indicators. Certain sub-populations experience poor well-being in some areas while some experience better. These findings could help target policy development initiatives to those most in need.

Conclusion

The well-being of Veterans is multidimensional in nature and can differ for various groups of Veterans. The findings presented in this report have greatly increased VAC's knowledge of Veteran well-being. The Veteran well-being framework will serve as evidence to design strategies, direct resources to areas of greatest need, and to direct research and policy agendas. This will be accomplished through a comprehensive understanding of the well-being of the Veteran population.

References

- MacLean, MB., Clow, B., Ralling, A., Sweet, J., Poirier, A., Buss, J., Pound, T., & Rodd, B. (2018). *Veterans in Canada released since 1998: A Sex-disaggregated Profile*. Charlottetown PE: Research Directorate, Veterans Affairs Canada.
- Pearlin L.I., Liberman M.A., Menaghan E.G., & Mullin J.T. The stress process. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 22, 337–356. 1981.
- Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc. *Attitudes Towards Remembrance and Veterans' Week 2014 Survey of Canadians*. Ottawa (ON): Prepared for Veterans Affairs Canada. December 2014.
- Phoenix Strategic Perspectives Inc. *Attitudes Towards Remembrance and Veterans' Week 2012 Survey of Canadians*. Ottawa (ON): Prepared for Veterans Affairs Canada. December 2012.
- Public Health Agency of Canada. (2018). *Determinants of Health*. Retrieved 11 April, 2019, from <https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/health-promotion/population-health/what-determines-health.html>
- Segaert A., & Bauer A. (2015). *The extent and nature of veteran homelessness*. Ottawa, ON: Employment and Social Development Canada.
- Thompson J., Lockhart W., Roach M., Atuel H., Bélanger S., Black T., et al. (2017). *Veterans' identities and well-being in transition to civilian life – A resource for policy analysts, program designers, service providers and researchers. Report of the veterans' identities research theme working group, Canadian Institute For Military And Veteran Health Research Forum 2016*. Charlottetown PE: Research Directorate, Veterans Affairs Canada.
- Thompson J., MacLean M., VanTil L., Sudom K., Sweet J., Poirier A., et al. (2011). *Survey on Transition to Civilian Life: Report on Regular Force Veterans*. Charlottetown, PE: Research Directorate, Veterans Affairs Canada and Director General Military Personnel Research and Analysis, Department of National Defence.
- True Patriot Love Foundation. (2017). *Veteran Transition Advisory Council: Final Report Supporting Veterans through their transition to civilian employment in Canada*. Toronto ON.
- VanTil L., Macintosh S., Thompson J.M., MacLean M.B., Campbell L., Sudom K., Dursun S., Herron M., Pedlar D. 2013 Synthesis of Life After Service Studies. Charlottetown (PE): Veterans Affairs Canada, Research Directorate Synthesis Report. 3 July 2014b. Avail: <http://publications.gc.ca/pub?id=9.699577&sl=0>

VanTil L., Sweet J., Thompson J., Poirier A., McKinnon K., Sudom K., et al. (2017). *Well-being of Canadian regular force veterans, findings from LASS 2016 survey research directorate technical report*. Charlottetown PE: Veterans Affairs Canada.
http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2017/acc-vac/V32-340-2017-eng.pdf

Veterans Affairs Canada, Statistics Directorate. (2016). *Facts and Figures Book Dec 2016 Edition*. Charlottetown PE.

Veterans Affairs Canada, Strategic Policy Unit. (2017). *Monitoring the Well-being of Veterans: A Veteran Well-being Surveillance Framework*. Charlottetown PE.
Avail: <http://www.publications.gc.ca/pub?id=9.849051&sl=0>

Veterans Affairs Canada. (2018). *Mandate, Mission, Vision, Values and Ethics*.
Retrieved 13 May, 2019, from
<https://www.veterans.gc.ca/eng/about-vac/what-we-do/mandate#raison-mandate>

Appendix A – Descriptions

INDICATOR	DESCRIPTION
Self-Rated Health	Widely used indicator of health status of populations.
Self-Rated Mental Health	Widely used indicator of mental health status of populations.
Activity Limitation	Summary of how any number of chronic conditions impact/impair an individual's life, regardless of what the particular condition is.
Need for assistance with Activities of Daily Living (ADL)	Describes the proportion of the population that needs help with at least one activity of daily living (e.g. personal care, indoor mobility, meals, errands, housework, or bill payment).
Employment Rate	Widely used indicator for the predominant activity among Canadians and is a measure of having a job (whether working or absent) of those in the population.
Satisfaction with Main Activity	Provides insight on a broader scope of activity for Veterans; more than employment rate can offer.
Satisfaction with Life	Broad measure that can be influenced by many things that are measured in all domains, but best fit is under the domain of purpose.
Rate of Low Income	Relative measure of household income that takes into account household/family size.
Satisfaction with Finances	Measure of financial security which includes reductions in income that do not result in low income, future prospects, savings and debt.
Sense of Belonging	Widely used indicator of social capital in population health research. It is associated positively with neighborhood network-based social capital measures and health measures.
Social Support Scale	Incorporates dimensions of emotional attachment, social integration, reassurance of worth, material assistance, and advice/guidance and can be measured using a threshold of high social support.
Adjustment to Civilian Life	Summary measure of social integration after release from the military and is relevant for Veterans re-integrating to civilian society.
Education Level	Measured as the highest certificate, diploma or degree completed.
Daily Smoking	Derived from the following questions: At what age did you begin to smoke cigarettes daily? How many cigarettes do you smoke each day now?
Heavy Drinking	For males, 5 or more drinks per occasion, at least monthly in the past year. In 2016, used 4 or more for women.
Obesity	BMI is calculated based on responses to questions on self-reported weight and height. $BMI = [weight \text{ in kilograms} / height \text{ in metres}]^2$. BMI categories use the international standard: Underweight (< 18.5), Normal weight (18.50 - 24.99), Overweight (25.00 - 29.99), Obese (30.00+).
Mastery	Widely used indicator of the extent to which people see themselves as being in control of their lives and is related to the concept of resilience.

Appendix B - Well-Being Indicator Summary Tables

TABLE 82—CANADIAN COMPARATORS¹

DOMAIN	INDICATOR	MEASURE	CANADIAN (%)
Health	Self-Rated Health²	Very Good or Excellent	58.4 (57.8, 59.0)
	Self-Rated Mental Health²	Very Good or Excellent	71.2 (68.7, 71.7)
	Activity Limitation²	No Activity Limitations	74.4 (73.9, 74.9)
		Sometimes/Often Restricted	25.6 (25.1, 30.1)
	Needs help with at least one ADL²	Needs help with at least one ADL	6.6 (6.3, 6.9)
Purpose	Employment Rate³	Employed	73.9 (71.9, 75.9)
		Not in Labour Force	20.2 (18.2, 22.2)
	Satisfaction with Life²	Satisfied	91.0 (90.6, 91.4)
Social Integration	Sense of Belonging²	Very or somewhat strong	64.8 (64.2, 65.4)
Finances	Rate of Low Income⁴	Below LIM	14.5 (14.0, 15.0)
Life Skills	Education Level²	High School Graduation	19.8 (19.3, 20.3)
		Post-Secondary Graduation	64.8 (64.2, 65.4)
	Daily Smoking⁵	Daily Smoker	20.4 (20.0, 20.8)
	Heavy Drinking²	Heavy Drinker	23.6 (23.1, 24.1)
	Obesity²	Obese	22.9 (22.4, 23.4)

¹where Canadian well-being was significantly different than that of Veterans

Data Sources:

² Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) 2013-14

³ Labour Force Survey (LFS) March 2016

⁴ Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID) 2011

⁵ Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) 2011-12

TABLE 83—TRENDS IN VETERAN WELL-BEING BY DOMAIN (LASS - 2010 & 2016)

DOMAIN	INDICATOR	MEASURE		LASS COMPARISONS (%)***	
				2010	2016
Health	Self-Rated Health	Very Good/Excellent		52.0 (50.1, 53.9)	45.5 (43.0, 48.0)
		Good		28.1 (26.4, 29.9)	31.4 (29.1, 33.8)
		Fair/Poor		19.9 (18.5, 21.3)	23.1 (21.2, 25.2)
	Self-Rated Mental Health	Very Good/Excellent		64.9 (63.0, 66.7)	55.6 (53.1, 58.1)
		Good		19.8 (18.3, 21.5)	23.3 (21.2, 25.6)
		Fair/Poor		15.3 (14.1, 16.6)	21.1 (19.2, 23.2)
	Activity Limitation	No Activity Limitation		44.7 (42.9, 46.6)	41.1 (38.6, 43.6)
		Sometimes Restricted		28.1 (26.3, 29.9)	30.1 (27.8, 32.5)
		Often Restricted		27.2 (25.8, 28.7)	28.8 (26.7, 31.0)
	Need Assistance with ADL	Needs help with at least one ADL		19.3 (18.0, 20.5)	20.3 (18.4, 22.3)
Purpose	Employment Rate	Employed		72.8 (71.0, 74.5)	65.3 (63.0, 67.5)
		Unemployed		5.4 (4.6, 6.5)	6.0 (4.9, 7.3)
		Not in Labour Force		21.8 (20.3, 23.4)	28.7 (26.7, 30.9)
	Satisfaction with Main Activity	Satisfied		75.5 (73.7, 77.1)	74.0 (71.7, 76.1)
		Neither		10.4 (9.2, 11.7)	12.0 (10.4, 13.7)
		Dissatisfied		14.2 (12.9, 15.5)	14.1 (12.5, 15.9)
	Satisfaction with Life	Satisfied		83.9 (82.5, 85.3)	84.1 (82.2, 85.9)
		Neither		8.6 (7.6, 9.8)	7.7 (6.5, 9.1)
		Dissatisfied		7.5 (6.6, 8.4)	8.1 (6.9, 9.6)
Finances	Rate of Low Income	Below LIM		5.6 (4.7, 6.7)	4.2 (3.2, 5.4)
		Above LIM		94.4 (93.3, 95.3)	95.8 (94.6, 96.8)
	Satisfaction with Finances	Satisfied		74.5 (72.6, 76.2)	68.7 (66.3, 71.0)
		Neither		11.2 (10.0, 12.6)	13.7 (12.1, 15.5)
		Dissatisfied		14.3 (13.0, 15.8)	17.6 (15.7, 19.7)
Social Integration	Community Belonging	Very/Somewhat Strong		59.0 (56.9, 61.0)	57.4 (54.9, 59.8)
		Very/Somewhat Weak		41.1 (39.1, 43.1)	42.6 (40.2, 45.2)
	Social Support Scale**	High Support		83.4% (81.4, 85.2)	83.7 (81.7, 85.6)
	Adjustment to Civilian Life	Very/Moderately Easy		59.5 (57.6, 61.5)	52.4 (49.9, 54.9)
		Neither Difficult Nor Easy		12.8 (11.5, 14.2)	15.2 (13.5, 17.2)
		Very/Moderately Difficult		27.7 (26.0, 29.5)	32.4 (30.1, 34.8)
Life Skills	Education Level	Less than High School		6.9 (6.0, 8.0)	4.1 (3.2, 5.2)
		High School Graduation		42.2 (40.2, 44.2)	41.7 (39.3, 44.2)
		Post-Secondary Graduation	< Bachelor's Degree	36.2 (34.3, 38.2)	37.0 (34.5, 39.4)
			Bachelor's Degree +	14.7 (13.2, 16.2)	17.3 (15.9, 18.7)
	Daily Smoking*	Daily Smoker		18.4 (16.9, 20.1)	16.6 (14.7, 18.7)
	Heavy Drinking	Heavy Drinker		27.9 (25.9, 29.9)	27.3 (25.1, 29.7)
	Obesity	Obese		29.8 (28.0, 31.6)	28.8 (26.6, 31.1)
	Mastery*	Low		33.6 (31.8, 35.5)	31.7 (29.3, 34.1)
		Medium		28.4 (26.6, 30.4)	31.5 (29.2, 33.9)
		High		37.9 (35.9, 40.0)	36.8 (34.4, 39.3)

*data in 2016 column is actually from 2013 as question was last asked in LASS 2013

**data in 2010 column is actually from 2013 as question was first asked in LASS 2013

***shaded cells with bolded figures indicate where significant differences were found when comparison was made

TABLE 84—VETERAN WELL-BEING BY DOMAIN, COMPARISON TO CANADIANS, LASS 2016

DOMAIN	INDICATOR	MEASURE	VETERAN (%)***	CANADIAN (%)***
Health	Self-Rated Health ¹	Very Good/Excellent	45.5	58.4
		Good	31.4	N.A.
		Fair or Poor	23.1	N.A.
	Self-Rated Mental Health ¹	Very Good/Excellent	55.6	71.2
		Good	23.3	N.A.
		Fair/Poor	21.1	N.A.
	Activity Limitation ¹	No Activity Limitation	41.1	74.4
		Sometimes Restricted	30.1	15.9
		Often Restricted	28.8	9.6
	Need Assistance with ADL ¹	Needs help with at least one ADL	20.3	6.6
Purpose	Employment Rate ²	Employed	65.3	73.9
		Unemployed	8.4	7.5
		Not in Labour Force	28.7	20.2
	Satisfaction with Main Activity ¹	Satisfied	74.0	N.A.
		Neither	12.0	N.A.
		Dissatisfied	14.1	N.A.
	Satisfaction with Life ¹	Satisfied	84.1	91.0
		Neither	7.7	N.A.
		Dissatisfied	8.1	N.A.
Finances	Rate of Low Income ²	Below LIM	4.2	14.5
		Above LIM	95.8	N.A.
	Satisfaction with Finances ¹	Satisfied	68.7	N.A.
		Neither	13.7	N.A.
		Dissatisfied	17.6	N.A.
Social Integration	Community Belonging ¹	Very/Somewhat Strong	57.4	64.8
		Very/Somewhat Weak	42.6	N.A.
	Social Support Scale ¹	High Support	83.7	N.A.
	Adjustment to Civilian Life ¹	Very/Moderately Easy	52.4	N.A.
		Neither Difficult Nor Easy	15.2	N.A.
		Very/Moderately Difficult	32.4	N.A.
Life Skills	Education Level ¹	Less than High School	4.1	5.0
		High School Graduation	41.7	23.8
		Post-Secondary Graduation	54.2	64.8
		< Bachelor's Degree		
		Bachelor's Degree +		
	Daily Smoking ³	Daily Smoker	16.6	20.4
	Heavy Drinking ¹	Heavy Drinker	27.3	23.6
	Obesity ¹	Obese	28.8	22.9
	Mastery ³	Low	31.7	N.A.
		Medium	31.5	N.A.
		High	36.8	N.A.

¹ Veteran data from LASS 2016, comparisons made to Canadians using data from CCHS 2013-14.

² Veteran data from LASS 2016, comparisons made to Canadians using data from Labour Force Survey (LFS) March 2016 (Employment Rate) and Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics (SLID) 2011 (Below LIM).

³ Veteran data was from LASS 2013, with comparisons being made to Canadians using data from CCHS 2011-12.

***shaded cells with bolded figures indicate where significant differences were found when comparison was made

TABLE 85–VETERAN WELL-BEING BY DOMAIN AND SEX, LASS 2016

DOMAIN	INDICATOR	MEASURE	MALE(%)***	FEMALE(%)***
Health	Self-Rated Health	Very Good/Excellent	45.9	42.6
		Good	31.7	29.0
		Fair/Poor	22.4	28.4
	Self-Rated Mental Health	Very Good/Excellent	56.4	50.0
		Good	23.5	21.9
		Fair/Poor	20.1	28.1
	Activity Limitation	No Activity Limitation	42.1	34.0
		Sometimes Restricted	29.8	32.6
		Often Restricted	28.2	33.4
	Need Assistance with ADL	Needs help with at least one ADL	18.8	31.2
Purpose	Employment Rate	Employed	67.2	51.7
		Unemployed	5.6	9.1
		Not in Labour Force	27.3	39.2
	Satisfaction with Main Activity	Satisfied	74.3	71.5
		Neither	12.2	10.0
		Dissatisfied	13.5	18.5
	Satisfaction with Life	Satisfied	84.6	80.6
		Neither	7.2	11.4
		Dissatisfied	8.2	F
Finances	Rate of Low Income	Below LIM	4.0	F
		Above LIM	96.0	94.5
	Satisfaction with Finances	Satisfied	69.0	66.3
		Neither	13.7	13.4
		Dissatisfied	17.2	20.3
Social Integration	Community Belonging	Very/Somewhat Strong	58.5	49.4
		Very/Somewhat Weak	41.5	50.6
	Social Support Scale	High Support	83.9	82.7
	Adjustment to Civilian Life	Very/Moderately Easy	52.4	52.2
		Neither Difficult Nor Easy	15.6	12.4
		Very/Moderately Difficult	32.0	35.4
Life Skills	Education Level	Less than High School	4.2	F
		High School Graduation	42.8	34.0
		Post-Secondary Graduation	36.6	39.5
		Bachelor's Degree +	16.4	23.5
	Daily Smoking*	Daily Smoker	17.0	13.6
	Heavy Drinking	Heavy Drinker	28.5	18.9
	Obesity	Obese	29.9	20.4
	Mastery*	Low	31.4	33.6
		Medium	32.0	28.2
		High	36.6	38.2

*question last asked in LASS 2013

***shaded cells with bolded figures indicate where significant differences were found when comparison was made

TABLE 86—VETERAN WELL-BEING BY DOMAIN AND AGE GROUP, LASS 2016

DOMAIN	INDICATOR	MEASURE	< 35 vs 35 - 54(%)***	35 - 54 vs 55 +(%)***	< 35 vs 55 +(%)***
Health	Self-Rated Health	Very Good/Excellent	51.9-43.3	43.3-45.4	51.9-45.4
		Good	35.1-30.6	30.6-30.6	35.1-30.6
		Fair/Poor	12.9-26.1	26.1-23.9	12.9-23.9
	Self-Rated Mental Health	Very Good/Excellent	52.8-51.1	51.1-64.1	52.8-64.1
		Good	28.6-23.2	23.2-20.7	28.6-20.7
		Fair/Poor	18.6-25.7	25.7-15.2	18.6-15.2
	Activity Limitation	No Activity Limitation	61.3-35.8	35.8-38.7	61.3-38.7
		Sometimes Restricted	23.5-31.1	31.1-32.0	23.5-32.0
		Often Restricted	15.2-33.1	33.1-29.3	15.2-29.3
	Need Assistance with ADL	Needs help with at least one ADL	5.6-25.7	25.7-19.7	5.6-19.7
Purpose	Employment Rate	Employed	76.0-70.5	70.5-51.3	76.0-51.3
		Unemployed	12.3-4.9	4.9-4.3	12.3-4.3
		Not in Labour Force	11.8-24.5	24.5-44.4	11.8-44.4
	Satisfaction with Main Activity	Satisfied	66.8-73.1	73.1-79.2	66.8-79.2
		Neither	16.8-11.4	11.4-10.2	16.8-10.2
		Dissatisfied	16.5-15.5	15.5-10.6	16.5-10.6
	Satisfaction with Life	Satisfied	85.3-82.7	82.7-85.7	85.3-85.7
		Neither	5.7-8.9	8.9-6.9	5.7-6.9
		Dissatisfied	9.0-8.3	8.3-7.3	9.0-7.3
Finances	Rate of Low Income	Below LIM	8.7-4.0	4.0-F	8.7-F
		Above LIM	91.3-96.0	96.0-98.0	91.3-98.0
	Satisfaction with Finances	Satisfied	52.6-67.6	67.6-79.1	52.6-79.1
		Neither	18.4-13.6	13.6-11.3	18.4-11.3
Social Integration	Community Belonging	Very/Somewhat Strong	54.2-53.7	53.7-64.7	54.2-64.7
		Very/Somewhat Weak	45.8-46.3	46.3-35.3	45.8-35.3
	Social Support Scale	High Support	87.9-80.9	80.9-86.0	87.9-86.0
	Adjustment to Civilian Life	Very/Moderately Easy	40.5-50.1	50.1-62.3	40.5-62.3
		Neither Difficult Nor Easy	19.7-14.8	14.8-13.6	19.7-13.6
		Very/Moderately Difficult	39.8-35.1	35.1-24.1	39.8-24.1
Life Skills	Education Level	Less than High School	F-3.3	3.3-6.0	F-6.0
		High School Graduation	45.4-38.6	38.6-44.6	45.4-44.6
		Post-Secondary Graduation	< Bachelor's Degree	39.9-28.1	44.7-28.1
			Bachelor's Degree +	7.2-18.1	7.2-21.3
	Daily Smoking*	Daily Smoker	20.5-16.7	16.7-13.5	20.5-13.5
	Heavy Drinking	Heavy Drinker	34.2-29.2	29.2-20.7	34.2-20.7
	Obesity	Obese	20.2-31.0	31.0-29.9	20.2-29.9
	Mastery*	Low	21.8-34.8	34.8-31.6	21.8-31.6
		Medium	37.1-30.4	30.4-30.1	37.1-30.1
		High	41.1-34.8	34.8-38.3	41.1-38.3

*question last asked in LASS 2013

***shaded cells with bolded figures indicate where significant differences were found when comparison was made

TABLE 87—VETERAN WELL-BEING BY DOMAIN AND RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

DOMAIN	INDICATORS	MEASURES	OFFICERS vs SNCMS(%)***	OFFICERS vs JNCMS(%)***	JNCMS vs SNCMS(%)***
Health	Self-Rated Health	Very Good/Excellent	62.2-38.2	62.2-44.2	44.2-38.2
		Good	25.4-34.8	25.4-31.4	31.4-34.8
		Fair/Poor	12.4-27.0	12.4-24.4	24.4-27.0
	Self-Rated Mental Health	Very Good/Excellent	74.1-54.9	74.1-49.8	49.8-54.9
		Good	16.1-23.2	16.1-25.8	25.8-23.2
		Fair/Poor	9.9-21.9	9.9-24.4	24.4-21.9
	Activity Limitation	No Activity Limitation	50.3-33.3	50.3-42.6	42.6-33.3
		Sometimes Restricted	28.4-32.5	28.4-29.3	29.3-32.5
		Often Restricted	21.3-34.2	21.3-28.1	28.1-34.2
	Need Assistance with ADL	Needs help with at least one ADL	14.1-23.4	14.1-20.5	20.5-23.4
Purpose	Employment Rate	Employed	64.4-57.3	64.4-70.3	70.3-57.3
		Unemployed	F-4.6	F-7.3	7.3-4.6
		Not in Labour Force	31.2-38.1	31.2-22.4	22.4-38.1
	Satisfaction with Main Activity	Satisfied	85.4-77.1	85.4-68.3	68.3-77.1
		Neither	5.9-11.5	5.9-14.3	14.3-11.5
		Dissatisfied	8.7-11.4	8.7-17.5	17.4-11.5
	Satisfaction with Life	Satisfied	94.0-83.5	94.0-81.3	81.3-83.5
		Neither	2.7-9.1	2.7-8.6	8.6-9.1
		Dissatisfied	3.3-7.4	3.3-10.1	10.1-7.4
Finances	Rate of Low Income	Below LIM	F-F	F-6.0	6.0-F
		Above LIM	98.6-97.5	98.6-94.0	94.0-97.5
	Satisfaction with Finances	Satisfied	84.7-75.3	84.7-59.5	59.5-75.3
		Neither	7.9-11.3	7.9-17.0	17.0-11.3
		Dissatisfied	7.3-13.4	7.3-23.5	23.5-13.4
Social Integration	Community Belonging	Very/Somewhat Strong	68.4-60.7	68.4-51.7	51.7-60.7
		Very/Somewhat Weak	31.6-39.3	31.6-48.3	48.3-39.3
	Social Support Scale	High Support	91.9-84.1	91.9-80.8	80.8-84.1
	Adjustment to Civilian Life	Very/Moderately Easy	68.8-57.0	68.8-44.2	44.2-57.0
		Neither Difficult Nor Easy	13.9-13.5	13.9-16.7	16.7-13.5
		Very/Moderately Difficult	17.2-29.4	17.2-39.1	39.1-29.4
Life Skills	Education Level	Less than High School	F-5.7	F-4.3	4.3-5.7
		High School Graduation	12.3-53.7	12.3-44.5	44.5-53.7
		Post-Secondary Graduation	< Bachelor's Degree	12.6-36.5	45.2-36.5
			Bachelor's Degree +	74.5-4.0	6.0-4.0
	Daily Smoking*	Daily Smoker	F-17.0	F-20.5	20.5-17.0
	Heavy Drinking	Heavy Drinker	18.9-25.4	18.9-31.2	31.2-25.4
	Obesity	Obese	23.3-32.7	23.3-28.4	28.4-32.7
	Mastery*	Low	17.8-33.9	17.8-34.9	34.9-33.9
		Medium	29.1-32.5	29.1-31.8	31.8-32.5
		High	53.1-33.6	53.1-33.3	33.3-33.6

*question last asked in LASS 2013

***shaded cells with bolded figures indicate where significant differences were found when comparison was made

TABLE 88—VETERAN WELL-BEING BY DOMAIN AND BRANCH, LASS 2016

DOMAIN	INDICATOR	MEASURE	ARMY vs NAVY(%)***	NAVY vs AIR FORCE(%)***	ARMY vs AIR FORCE(%)***
Health	Self-Rated Health	Very Good/Excellent	43.7-45.3	45.3-48.6	43.7-48.6
		Good	32.4-33.6	33.6-28.4	32.4-28.4
		Fair/Poor	23.9-21.2	21.2-23.0	23.9-23.0
	Self-Rated Mental Health	Very Good/Excellent	52.8-55.9	55.9-60.1	52.8-60.1
		Good	23.4-24.7	24.7-22.4	23.4-22.4
		Fair/Poor	23.8-19.4	19.4-17.6	23.9-17.6
	Activity Limitation	No Activity Limitation	41.4-42.0	42.0-40.0	41.4-40.0
		Sometimes Restricted	28.5-32.0	32.0-31.8	28.5-31.8
		Often Restricted	30.1-26.0	26.0-28.2	30.1-28.2
	Need Assistance with ADL	Needs help with at least one ADL	21.9-16.7	16.7-19.6	21.9-19.6
Purpose	Employment Rate	Employed	67.4-66.0	66.0-61.3	67.4-61.3
		Unemployed	7.0-F	F-4.8	7.0-4.8
		Not in Labour Force	25.6-29.1	29.1-33.9	25.6-33.9
	Satisfaction with Main Activity	Satisfied	70.2-78.1	78.1-77.9	70.2-77.9
		Neither	13.2-10.5	10.5-10.7	13.2-10.7
		Dissatisfied	16.6-11.4	11.4-11.4	16.6-11.4
	Satisfaction with Life	Satisfied	82.5-85.7	85.7-86.0	82.5-86.0
		Neither	8.6-6.3	6.3-7.1	8.6-7.1
		Dissatisfied	8.9-8.0	8.0-6.9	8.9-6.9
Finances	Rate of Low Income	Below LIM	5.1-F	F-F	5.1-F
		Above LIM	94.9-97.0	97.0-96.7	94.9-96.7
	Satisfaction with Finances	Satisfied	64.1-68.1	68.1-76.7	64.1-76.7
		Neither	14.6-15.5	15.5-11.1	14.6-11.1
		Dissatisfied	21.3-16.4	16.4-12.2	21.3-12.2
Social Integration	Community Belonging	Very/Somewhat Strong	55.1-59.6	59.6-59.9	55.1-59.6
		Very/Somewhat Weak	44.9-40.5	40.5-40.1	44.9-40.1
	Social Support Scale	High Support	81.3-84.7	84.7-87.2	81.3-87.2
	Adjustment to Civilian Life	Very/Moderately Easy	45.6-57.6	57.6-60.7	45.6-60.7
		Neither Difficult Nor Easy	16.5-15.1	15.1-13.3	16.5-13.3
		Very/Moderately Difficult	37.9-27.3	27.3-26.0	37.9-26.0
Life Skills	Education Level	Less than High School	4.3-F	F-F	4.3-F
		High School Graduation	44.9-35.1	35.1-40.1	44.9-40.1
		Post-Secondary Graduation	36.9-40.4	40.4-35.0	36.9-35.0
		< Bachelor's Degree	13.8-20.1	20.1-21.5	13.8-21.5
	Daily Smoking*	Daily Smoker	18.3-18.0	18.0-13.2	18.3-13.2
	Heavy Drinking	Heavy Drinker	28.9-27.0	27.0-24.8	28.9-24.8
	Obesity	Obese	27.4-35.1	35.1-27.5	27.4-27.5
	Mastery*	Low	33.1-26.9	26.9-31.7	33.1-31.7
		Medium	32.4-32.2	32.2-29.8	32.4-29.8
		High	34.5-41.0	41.0-38.5	34.5-38.5

*question last asked in LASS 2013

***shaded cells with bolded figures indicate where significant differences were found when comparison was made

Annex 1 – Veteran Demographics

TABLE 90 – VETERANS BY BRANCH AND RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Army (51.6%)	Navy (17.9%)	Air Force (30.5%)	Overall (100%)
Officers	13.1% (11.8, 14.6)	19.6% (16.7, 22.9)	23.1% (20.7, 25.7)	17.3% (16.6, 18.1)
Senior NCMs	24.6% (22.6, 26.8)	36.9% (32.3, 41.7)	36.7% (33.4, 40.1)	30.5% (29.5, 31.6)
Junior NCMs	62.2% (59.7, 64.7)	43.5% (37.8, 49.2)	40.2% (36.1, 44.5)	52.2% (50.7, 53.6)

TABLE 89 – AVERAGE AGE & YEARS OF SERVICE BY RANK GROUP, LASS 2016

	Officer	Senior NCM	Junior NCM	Overall
Average Age	54.6	55.3	41.7	48.1
Years of Service				
Under 10	14.1% (11.6, 17.2)	F	53.1% (48.9, 57.3)	30.7% (28.3, 33.1)
10-19	12.6% (10.2, 15.4)	6.8% (5.3, 8.8)	21.5% (18.4, 25.0)	15.5% (13.7, 17.4)
20 & Over	73.3% (69.7, 76.6)	91.6% (89.4, 93.3)	25.4% (22.0, 29.2)	53.9% (51.6, 56.1)

F = estimates deemed unreliable due to small sample size (<30).