

Association of Ontario Health Centres (AOHC) Health Centre Intake Survey

Stage 1 Results: A Profile of the Wellbeing of Community Health Centre (CHC) Clients

A preliminary report for
The Association of Ontario Health Centres

Margo Hilbrecht
Bryan Smale
Robbie Shifman
Devan McNeill

Canadian Index of Wellbeing
University of Waterloo

January 2014

Contents

| | |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Demographic Profile | 3 |
| Community Vitality | 17 |
| Healthy Populations | 27 |
| Democratic Engagement | 29 |
| Environment | 32 |
| Leisure and Culture | 44 |
| Education | 45 |
| Time Use | 56 |
| Overall Wellbeing | 57 |
| Comments | 58 |

Hilbrecht, M., Smale, B., Shifman, R., & McNeill, D. (2014). *Stage 1 Results: A Profile of the Wellbeing of Community Health Centre (CHC) Clients*. A preliminary report for the Association of Ontario Health Centres. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Index of Wellbeing and the University of Waterloo.

© 2014 Canadian Index of Wellbeing

Introduction

The purpose of the Association of Ontario Health Centres (AOHC) Pilot Intake Survey was to allow the AOHC to begin benchmarking key indicators of wellbeing for people who use their services. This would allow for trend analysis over time, as well as the sharing of findings and best practices between Community Health Centres (CHCs). The survey can be used to identify service gaps that could be addressed by the CHC, or within the community network as a whole.

Subsequent surveys, administered after a period of time, would help to monitor the extent to which services implemented following the previous survey have improved overall health and wellbeing for the people they serve. Participation in the survey may also help to raise the level of awareness of CHC clients/members about health and wellbeing, and may help CHC workers to educate their clients/members in this regard.

The AOHC Pilot Intake Survey was launched in September 2013. Six CHCs volunteered to act as demonstration sites where the survey could be pilot tested, with the goal of assessing and refining the survey for broader implementation in subsequent years. Clients, aged 18 years or older, from six CHC sites were invited to participate in the survey. The survey closed on December 30, 2013. The objective was to gather at least 50 surveys from each of the sites, for a total of 300 surveys. By the end of December, a total of 332 questionnaires had been completed and submitted by CHC clients, and 327 were deemed usable.

Table A indicates the number of respondents at each of the participating CHCs.

Table A
Number of Respondents at Each Participating Site

| Location | n | Pct. |
|------------------------|------------|--------------|
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 128 | 39.1 |
| Vaughan | 51 | 15.6 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 48 | 14.7 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 10.7 |
| Chigamik | 33 | 10.1 |
| Guelph | 32 | 9.8 |
| Total | 327 | 100.0 |

These CHCs represented a diversity of geographic locations and clientele. A seventh site, the Somerset West Health Centre, was also interested in participating, but there were challenges collecting data and only 14 surveys were returned from this location. Due to the low number of participants, these surveys have been excluded from the results in this report.

Participants in the survey included people who were new to the Health Centre, as well as those who had used the services previously. The questionnaire was available in English, French, or Spanish to encourage broader inclusivity. For this report, any comments provided in French have been translated into English. There were no comments provided on Spanish language surveys.

The results presented in this report are preliminary descriptive statistics, reporting frequency distributions and measures of central tendency for all of the questions in each of the eight domains comprising the Canadian Index of Wellbeing: *Community Vitality, Democratic Engagement, Education, Environment, Healthy Populations, Leisure and Culture, Living Standards, and Time Use*. The descriptive results provide a general picture of wellbeing for AOHC clients, and assist in identifying areas for further consideration. Once priorities have been outlined in consultation with AOHC, the CIW will proceed with more in-depth analyses.

The report is organised by domain and consists largely of tables. Some background information is provided, but text has been kept to a minimum. Included in the titles on each table to follow is the corresponding survey question. Results are presented in each table for the six demonstration sites as well as for the total sample, usually shown at the bottom of each table in **bold**. For comparison purposes, the results for the *overall* sample provide a benchmark against which each of the CHC sites can be compared. Caution should be exercised when interpreting results for CHC sites with fewer than 50 participants.

List of abbreviations and terms

| | |
|-----------|--|
| n | Number of respondents |
| Pct. | Percentage of respondents |
| Mean | Arithmetic average |
| Std. Dev. | Standard deviation (average amount the scores deviate from the mean) |
| Min. | Minimum score reported |
| Max. | Maximum score reported |

Demographic Profile

Table 1 (Question 23)
Sex of Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Sex of Respondent ^b | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| | Female | Male |
| Chigamik | 71.9 (23) | 28.1 (9) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 67.2 (84) | 32.8 (41) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 75.6 (34) | 24.4 (11) |
| Vaughan | 58.8 (30) | 41.2 (21) |
| Kapuskasing | 57.1 (20) | 42.9 (15) |
| Guelph | 87.1 (27) | 12.9 (4) |
| Overall | 68.3 (218) | 31.7 (101) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b A "Transgender" category was provided, but no participants selected this option.

Table 2 (Question 24)
Age in Years of Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Age of Respondent (in years) ^b | | | | |
|------------------------|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | Under 35 | 35 to 44 | 45 to 54 | 55 to 64 | 65+ |
| Chigamik | 32.3 (10) | 6.5 (2) | 12.9 (4) | 29.0 (9) | 19.4 (6) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 14.4 (18) | 21.6 (27) | 11.2 (14) | 27.2 (34) | 25.6 (32) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 11.6 (5) | 9.3 (4) | 23.3 (10) | 32.6 (14) | 23.3 (10) |
| Vaughan | 15.7 (8) | 11.8 (6) | 13.7 (7) | 25.5 (13) | 33.3 (17) |
| Kapuskasing | 22.9 (8) | 5.7 (2) | 25.7 (9) | 25.7 (9) | 20.0 (7) |
| Guelph | 41.9 (13) | 29.0 (9) | 22.6 (7) | 6.5 (2) | 0.0 (0) |
| Overall | 19.6 (62) | 15.8 (50) | 16.1 (51) | 25.6 (81) | 22.8 (72) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Participants had to be at least 18 years of age to participate in the survey.

Table 3 (Question 25)
Marital Status of Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Marital Status of Respondent | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Married | Single, never married | Living common- law | Widowed | Separated or Divorced |
| Chigamik | 34.4 (11) | 31.3 (10) | 18.8 (6) | 6.3 (2) | 9.4 (3) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 65.1 (82) | 10.3 (13) | 14.3 (18) | 3.2 (4) | 7.1 (9) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 75.6 (34) | 6.7 (3) | 8.9 (4) | 2.2 (1) | 6.7 (3) |
| Vaughan | 82.4 (42) | 3.9 (2) | 2.0 (1) | 5.9 (3) | 5.9 (3) |
| Kapuskasing | 60.0 (21) | 17.1 (6) | 8.6 (3) | 11.4 (4) | 2.9 (1) |
| Guelph | 28.1 (9) | 18.8 (6) | 21.9 (7) | 3.1 (1) | 28.1 (9) |
| Overall | 62.0 (199) | 12.5 (40) | 12.1 (39) | 4.7 (15) | 8.7 (28) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 4 (Question 26)
Highest Level of Education Completed by Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Highest Level of Education Completed by Respondent | | | | |
|------------------------|---|----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Elementary school or less | High school | Post-secondary certificate | College diploma | University degree |
| Chigamik | 3.2 (1) | 51.6 (16) | 22.6 (7) | 16.1 (5) | 6.5 (2) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 3.2 (4) | 37.1 (46) | 11.3 (14) | 25.8 (32) | 22.6 (28) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 4.7 (2) | 34.9 (15) | 11.6 (5) | 30.2 (13) | 18.6 (8) |
| Vaughan | 22.0 (11) | 28.0 (14) | 0.0 (0) | 22.0 (11) | 28.0 (14) |
| Kapuskasing | 11.4 (4) | 45.7 (16) | 5.7 (2) | 31.4 (11) | 5.7 (2) |
| Guelph | 3.2 (1) | 38.7 (12) | 3.2 (1) | 25.8 (8) | 29.0 (9) |
| Overall | 7.3 (23) | 37.9 (119) | 9.2 (29) | 25.5 (80) | 20.1 (63) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 5 (Question 27)
Main Activity of Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Main Activity of Respondent | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---|--|
| | Working full-time | Working part-time | Non-standard employment^b | Unemployed /looking for work | Retired | Going to school | On leave from work (e.g., illness) | Household work/ caring for children |
| Chigamik | 19.4 (6) | 6.5 (2) | 3.2 (1) | 12.9 (4) | 32.2 (10) | 6.5 (2) | 9.7 (3) | 9.7 (3) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 65.4 (51) | 9.0 (7) | 1.3 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 16.7 (13) | 0.0 (0) | 3.8 (3) | 3.8 (3) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 23.3 (10) | 23.3 (10) | 4.7 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 37.2 (16) | 0.0 (0) | 2.3 (1) | 9.3 (4) |
| Vaughan | 22.9 (11) | 8.3 (4) | 2.1 (1) | 12.5 (6) | 31.3 (15) | 2.1 (1) | 8.3 (4) | 12.5 (6) |
| Kapuskasing | 42.9 (15) | 2.9 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 8.6 (3) | 34.3 (12) | 5.7 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 5.7 (2) |
| Guelph | 13.8 (4) | 13.8 (4) | 3.4 (1) | 13.8 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 6.9 (2) | 24.1 (7) | 24.1 (7) |
| Overall | 36.7 (97) | 10.6 (28) | 2.3 (6) | 6.4 (17) | 25.0 (66) | 2.7 (7) | 6.8 (18) | 9.5 (25) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Includes self-employed, contract, seasonal, temporary, and multiple jobs.

Table 6 (Question 33)
Household Income from All Sources of Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Household Income from All Sources of Respondents | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Under \$10,000 | \$10,000 to \$19,999 | \$20,000 to \$29,999 | \$30,000 to \$39,999 | \$40,000 to \$59,999 | \$60,000 to \$79,999 | \$80,000 and over |
| Chigamik | 23.3 (7) | 20.0 (6) | 16.7 (5) | 10.0 (3) | 20.0 (6) | 0.0 (0) | 10.0 (3) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 4.1 (5) | 6.6 (8) | 7.4 (9) | 16.5 (20) | 12.4 (15) | 16.5 (20) | 36.4 (44) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 0.0 (0) | 11.8 (4) | 20.6 (7) | 8.8 (3) | 23.5 (8) | 8.8 (3) | 26.5 (9) |
| Vaughan | 24.4 (10) | 9.8 (4) | 24.4 (10) | 7.3 (3) | 17.1 (7) | 7.3 (3) | 9.8 (4) |
| Kapuskasing | 6.1 (2) | 12.1 (4) | 15.2 (5) | 9.1 (3) | 6.1 (2) | 9.1 (3) | 42.4 (14) |
| Guelph | 19.4 (6) | 35.5 (11) | 6.5 (2) | 9.7 (3) | 6.5 (2) | 6.5 (2) | 16.1 (5) |
| Overall | 10.3 (30) | 12.8 (37) | 13.1 (38) | 12.1 (35) | 13.8 (4) | 10.7 (31) | 27.2 (79) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 7 (Question 28)
 Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey who were *Born in Canada*^a

| Location | Born in Canada | |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 32 | 100.0 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 125 | 100.0 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 43 | 95.6 |
| Vaughan | 6 | 12.0 |
| Kapuskasung | 35 | 100.0 |
| Guelph | 26 | 83.9 |
| Overall | 267 | 84.0 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 7a (Question 28a)
 Years Lived in Canada (if not born in Canada) of Respondents
 to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location ^b | Years Lived in Canada (if not born in Canada) | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | <5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16-20 | 21-30 | 31-50 | >50 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 (2) |
| Vaughan | 33.3 (14) | 16.7 (7) | 4.8 (2) | 4.8 (2) | 9.5 (4) | 16.7 (7) | 14.3 (6) |
| Guelph | 20.0 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 20.0 (1) | 40.0 (2) | 20.0 (1) | 0.0 (0) |
| Overall^c | 30.6 (15) | 14.3 (7) | 4.1 (2) | 6.1 (3) | 12.2 (6) | 16.3 (8) | 16.3 (8) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Only three of the six sites had respondents who were born outside of Canada so only they are shown in the table. Given the low numbers, caution in interpreting these results is necessary.

^c Overall, for those respondents who were *not* born in Canada ($n = 52$), the average length of time they have lived in Canada is just over 21 years ($M = 21.75$, $SD = 20.78$).

Table 8 (Question 29)
First Language of Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | First Language of Respondents^b | | |
|------------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------|
| | English | French | Other |
| Chigamik | 96.8 (30) | 3.2 (1) | 0.0 (0) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 15.1 (19) | 84.9 (107) | 0.0 (0) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 88.9 (40) | 6.7 (3) | 4.4 (2) |
| Vaughan | 24.0 (12) | 0.0 (0) | 76.0 (38) |
| Kapuskasing | 5.7 (2) | 94.3 (33) | 0.0 (0) |
| Guelph | 93.5 (29) | 0.0 (0) | 6.5 (2) |
| Overall | 41.5 (132) | 45.3 (144) | 13.2 (42) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Only 49 respondents in total from just three Health Centres reported a first language other than English or French. Of these, 38 (77.6%) were in Vaughan. Only one other language, Urdu, was reported by more than ten respondents ($n = 12$).

Table 8b
Language Chosen to Complete Questionnaire by Respondents^a

| Location | Language of Questionnaire^a | | |
|------------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------|
| | English | French | Spanish |
| Chigamik | 100.0 (33) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 48.8 (62) | 51.2 (65) | 0.0 (0) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 100.0 (48) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) |
| Vaughan | 94.1 (48) | 0.0 (0) | 5.9 (3) |
| Kapuskasing | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 (35) | 0.0 (0) |
| Guelph | 100.0 (32) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) |
| Overall | 68.4 (223) | 30.7 (100) | 0.9 (3) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 9 (Question 30)
First Nations Status of Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Has First Nations Status | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 6 | 19.4 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 4 | 3.3 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 2 | 4.7 |
| Vaughan | 3 | 6.1 |
| Kapuskasing | 3 | 8.8 |
| Guelph | 0 | 0.0 |
| Overall | 18 | 5.8 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 10 (Question 31)
Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey Living with a Disability^a

| Location | Lives with a Disability | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 19 | 61.3 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 20 | 16.1 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 13 | 28.9 |
| Vaughan | 13 | 25.5 |
| Kapuskasing | 7 | 20.0 |
| Guelph | 16 | 50.0 |
| Overall | 88 | 27.7 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 11 (Question 32)
Housing Situation of Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Housing Situation of Respondent | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| | Own | Rent | Does not have own home | Living with friends | Other |
| Chigamik | 54.5 (18) | 33.3 (11) | 3.0 (1) | 6.1 (2) | 3.0 (1) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 82.4 (103) | 15.2 (19) | 0.8 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 1.6 (2) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 91.1 (41) | 4.4 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 4.4 (2) | 0.0 (0) |
| Vaughan | 58.0 (29) | 28.0 (14) | 8.0 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 6.0 (3) |
| Kapuskasing | 68.6 (24) | 20.0 (7) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 11.4 (4) |
| Guelph | 32.3 (10) | 58.1 (18) | 0.0 (0) | 6.5 (2) | 3.2 (1) |
| Overall | 70.5 (225) | 22.3 (71) | 1.9 (6) | 1.9 (6) | 3.4 (11) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 12 (Question 34)
Household Type of Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Household Type of Respondent | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | Couple living with children at home | Couple no children at home | Couple with no children | Adult living with children | Adult living alone | Adult shared accommodation | Inter-generational | Other |
| Chigamik | 9.4 (3) | 28.1 (9) | 9.4 (3) | 6.3 (2) | 28.1 (9) | 12.5 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 6.3 (22) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 42.6 (52) | 28.7 (35) | 7.4 (9) | 5.7 (7) | 11.5 (14) | 1.6 (2) | 1.6 (2) | 0.8 (1) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 20.5 (9) | 52.3 (23) | 11.4 (5) | 4.5 (2) | 4.5 (2) | 6.8 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) |
| Vaughan | 31.9 (15) | 27.7 (13) | 8.5 (4) | 6.4 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 6.4 (3) | 19.1 (9) | 0.0 (0) |
| Kapuskasing | 23.5 (8) | 32.4 (11) | 11.8 (4) | 11.8 (4) | 14.7 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 5.9 (2) |
| Guelph | 41.9 (13) | 3.2 (1) | 3.2 (1) | 25.8 (8) | 6.5 (2) | 9.7 (3) | 9.7 (3) | 0.0 (0) |
| Overall | 32.2 (100) | 29.7 (92) | 8.4 (26) | 8.4 (26) | 10.3 (32) | 4.8 (15) | 4.5 (14) | 1.6 (5) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 13 (Question 3)
 Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey *Who Have Children*^a

| Location | Has Children | |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 24 | 72.7 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 105 | 83.3 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 43 | 89.6 |
| Vaughan | 41 | 89.1 |
| Kapuskasing | 30 | 85.7 |
| Guelph | 25 | 80.6 |
| Overall | 268 | 84.0 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 13a (Question 3a)
Number of Children Living with Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Number of Children ^b | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| | One | Two | Three | Four or more |
| Chigamik | 50.0 (2) | 25.0 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 25.0 (1) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 36.4 (24) | 40.9 (27) | 18.2 (12) | 4.5 (3) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 38.5 (5) | 38.5 (5) | 23.1 (3) | 0.0 (0) |
| Vaughan | 53.8 (14) | 34.6 (9) | 3.8 (1) | 7.7 (2) |
| Kapuskasing | 58.3 (7) | 33.3 (4) | 8.3 (1) | 0.0 (0) |
| Guelph | 26.1 (6) | 56.5 (13) | 8.7 (2) | 8.7 (2) |
| Overall | 40.3 (58) | 41.0 (59) | 13.9 (20) | 4.9 (7) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Results in this table are just for those respondents with children *living with them* and reported the number on the questionnaire. Many respondents described themselves as “empty nesters”, and had grown children who did not live with them.

Table 13b (Question 3b)
Age of Youngest Child for Participants Living with Children
 who responded to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Age of Youngest Child ^b | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| | Less than 6 years old | 6 to 11 years old | 12 to 19 years old | 20 years old or older |
| Chigamik | 66.7 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 33.3 (1) | 0.0 (0) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 35.5 (22) | 38.7 (24) | 12.9 (8) | 12.9 (8) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 46.2 (6) | 23.1 (3) | 23.1 (3) | 7.7 (1) |
| Vaughan | 25.0 (6) | 12.5 (3) | 12.5 (3) | 50.0 (12) |
| Kapuskasing | 30.0 (3) | 20.0 (2) | 20.0 (2) | 30.0 (3) |
| Guelph | 47.4 (9) | 15.8 (3) | 21.1 (4) | 15.8 (3) |
| Overall | 36.6 (48) | 26.7 (35) | 16.0 (21) | 20.6 (27) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Results in this table are just for those respondents with children *living with them* and reported the age of the youngest child on the questionnaire. Thirteen respondents with children living with them did not report the age of the youngest child.

Table 14 (Question 5)
Years Lived in the Community by Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey

| Location | Years Lived in the Community | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| | n | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 32 | 19.88 | 16.93 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 121 | 25.83 | 19.75 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 45 | 26.65 | 15.52 |
| Vaughan | 44 | 14.04 | 13.93 |
| Kapuskasing | 32 | 30.23 | 17.69 |
| Guelph | 31 | 10.67 | 10.41 |
| Overall | 305 | 22.55 | 18.07 |

Table 14a (Question 5a)
Number of Moves During Years Lived in the Community by Respondents
to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey

| Location | Number of Moves | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|
| | n | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 30 | 2.57 | 2.49 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 110 | 1.31 | 1.94 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 40 | 1.35 | 1.48 |
| Vaughan | 39 | 0.67 | 0.90 |
| Kapuskasing | 32 | 1.97 | 1.77 |
| Guelph | 30 | 1.57 | 1.83 |
| Overall | 281 | 1.46 | 1.87 |

Table 15 (Office use only section, line 1)
First or Repeat Visit to Health Centre by Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey^a

| Location | Visit | |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| | First | Repeat |
| Chigamik | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 (9) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 89.8 (114) | 10.2 (13) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 (41) |
| Vaughan | 74.5 (38) | 25.5 (13) |
| Kapuskasing | 96.6 (28) | 3.4 (1) |
| Guelph | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 (14) |
| Overall | 66.4 (180) | 33.6 (91) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 15a (Office use only section, line 2)
*If Repeat Visit, Length of Time Respondents to AOHC Pilot Intake Survey
has been a Client*

| Location ^b | Length of time as client | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| | Less than 1 year | 1 to 2 years | 2 or more years |
| Chigamik | 36.4 (4) | 54.5 (6) | 9.1 (1) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 50.0 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 50.0 (1) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 4.9 (2) | 4.9 (2) | 90.2 (37) |
| Kapuskasing | 0.0 (0) | 100.0 (1) | 0.0 (0) |
| Guelph | 41.7 (5) | 16.7 (2) | 41.7 (5) |
| Overall | 17.9 (12) | 16.4 (11) | 65.7 (44) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Vaughan did not have any repeat clients/members who completed this question.

Community Vitality

Table 16 (Question 14, Part 1)
Respondents Who Volunteered *Informally* During the Past Year

| Location | Volunteered <i>Informally</i> During the Past Year ^a | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 22 | 71.0 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 94 | 74.0 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 42 | 89.4 |
| Vaughan | 20 | 40.8 |
| Kapuskasing | 26 | 74.3 |
| Guelph | 25 | 78.1 |
| Overall | 229 | 71.3 |

Notes: ^a Informal volunteering included such things as helping out a neighbour, supporting neighbourhood events, and so on.

Table 17 (Question 14, Part 2)
Respondents Who Volunteered *Formally*
With an Organised Group During the Past Year

| Location | Volunteered <i>Formally</i> During the Past Year ^a | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 12 | 40.0 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 58 | 46.0 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 24 | 51.1 |
| Vaughan | 8 | 17.0 |
| Kapuskasing | 8 | 22.9 |
| Guelph | 20 | 62.5 |
| Overall | 130 | 41.0 |

Notes: ^a Formal volunteering included involvement with groups such as a sports organisation or a service club.

Table 17a (Question 14a)
 Type of Organisation for which Participant Volunteered During the Past Year:
Union or Professional Association

| Location | Volunteered for a Union or Professional Association | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 2 | 25.0 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 4 | 7.8 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 4 | 16.7 |
| Vaughan | 2 | 22.2 |
| Kapuskasing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Guelph | 2 | 10.5 |
| Overall | 14 | 11.8 |

Table 17b (Question 14a)
 Type of Organisation for which Participant Volunteered During the Past Year:
Political Party or Group

| Location | Volunteered for a Political Party or Group | |
|------------------------|---|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 1 | 12.5 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 3 | 6.0 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 5 | 21.7 |
| Vaughan | 1 | 11.1 |
| Kapuskasing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Guelph | 2 | 10.5 |
| Overall | 12 | 10.3 |

Table 17c (Question 14a)
 Type of Organisation for which Participant Volunteered During the Past Year:
Sports Organisation (e.g., hockey league, soccer club)

| Location | Volunteered for a Sports Organisation | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 3 | 37.5 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 21 | 36.8 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 10 | 38.5 |
| Vaughan | 2 | 20.0 |
| Kapuskasing | 3 | 37.5 |
| Guelph | 6 | 31.6 |
| Overall | 45 | 35.2 |

Table 17d (Question 14a)
 Type of Organisation for which Participant Volunteered During the Past Year:
Cultural or recreational organisation (e.g., theatre group, book club, bridge club)

| Location | Volunteered for a Cultural or Recreational Organisation | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 6 | 66.7 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 13 | 25.5 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 4 | 17.4 |
| Vaughan | 4 | 44.4 |
| Kapuskasing | 3 | 30.0 |
| Guelph | 9 | 47.4 |
| Overall | 39 | 32.2 |

Table 17e (Question 14a)
 Type of Organisation for which Participant Volunteered During the Past Year:
Faith-based group (e.g., church youth group, choir)

| Location | Volunteered for a Faith-Based Group | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 3 | 33.3 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 8 | 15.4 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 12 | 46.2 |
| Vaughan | 6 | 50.0 |
| Kapuskasing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Guelph | 6 | 33.3 |
| Overall | 35 | 28.2 |

Table 17f (Question 14a)
 Type of Organisation for which Participant Volunteered During the Past Year:
School group, neighbourhood, civic, or community association
 (e.g., PTA, block parents, neighbourhood watch)

| Location | Volunteered for a School Group, Neighbourhood, Civic, or Community Association | |
|------------------------|---|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 3 | 37.5 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 25 | 44.6 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 9 | 36.0 |
| Vaughan | 4 | 36.4 |
| Kapuskasing | 2 | 25.0 |
| Guelph | 15 | 75.0 |
| Overall | 58 | 45.3 |

Table 17g (Question 14a)
 Type of Organisation for which Participant Volunteered During the Past Year:
Service club or fraternal organisation (e.g., Kiwanis, 4-H)

| Location | Volunteered for a Service Club or Fraternal Organisation | |
|------------------------|---|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 4 | 44.4 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 14 | 28.0 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 6 | 27.3 |
| Vaughan | 0 | 0.0 |
| Kapuskasing | 2 | 25.0 |
| Guelph | 3 | 15.8 |
| Overall | 29 | 24.8 |

Table 17h (Question 14a)
 Type of Organisation for which Participant Volunteered During the Past Year:
Public interest group (e.g., environmental group, animal welfare)

| Location | Volunteered for a Public Interest Group | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 3 | 33.3 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 5 | 10.0 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 6 | 27.3 |
| Vaughan | 0 | 0.0 |
| Kapuskasing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Guelph | 10 | 50.0 |
| Overall | 24 | 20.3 |

Table 18 (Question 1, Part 1)
Numbers of Social Contacts: *Relatives*

| Location | Number of Relatives | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| | n | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 33 | 0 | 22 | 5.27 | 5.48 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 121 | 0 | 30 | 7.45 | 6.66 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 45 | 0 | 24 | 6.18 | 5.71 |
| Vaughan | 50 | 0 | 15 | 4.66 | 3.48 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 1 | 10 | 5.51 | 2.90 |
| Guelph | 31 | 0 | 20 | 4.71 | 4.23 |
| Overall | 315 | 0 | 30 | 6.11 | 5.51 |

Table 19 (Question 1, Part 2)
Numbers of Social Contacts: *Close Friends*

| Location | Number of Close Friends | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| | n | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 33 | 0 | 30 | 4.67 | 6.92 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 124 | 0 | 26 | 5.11 | 4.53 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 48 | 0 | 21 | 4.33 | 4.19 |
| Vaughan | 49 | 0 | 30 | 3.76 | 4.53 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 0 | 10 | 3.74 | 2.85 |
| Guelph | 31 | 0 | 20 | 4.77 | 4.97 |
| Overall | 320 | 0 | 30 | 4.56 | 4.68 |

Table 20 (Question 2)
 Numbers of Social Contacts:
Neighbours or People in the Community Participant Could Ask for a Favour

| Location | Number of People in the Community that can be Asked for a Favour | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| | n | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 33 | 0 | 17 | 4.03 | 3.93 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 118 | 0 | 30 | 6.45 | 6.83 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 45 | 0 | 20 | 6.13 | 5.31 |
| Vaughan | 50 | 0 | 20 | 3.32 | 4.16 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 0 | 30 | 7.83 | 7.35 |
| Guelph | 30 | 0 | 20 | 3.60 | 4.23 |
| Overall | 311 | 0 | 30 | 5.52 | 5.99 |

Table 21 (Question 7)
 Feelings of Trust in Others^a

| Location | “Most people can be trusted” | “You cannot be too careful in dealing with people” |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Chigamik | 34.6 (9) | 65.4 (17) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 63.8 (74) | 36.2 (42) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 48.8 (20) | 51.2 (21) |
| Vaughan | 53.5 (23) | 46.5 (20) |
| Kapuskasing | 48.5 (16) | 51.5 (17) |
| Guelph | 67.9 (19) | 32.1 (9) |
| Overall | 56.1 (161) | 43.9 (126) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

Table 22 (Question 6)
 Perceptions of Safety and Belonging:
Sense of Belonging in Local Community

| Location | n | Sense of Community Belonging ^a | | | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Very weak | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very strong | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 16.1 (5) | 6.5 (2) | 16.1 (5) | 16.1 (5) | 25.8 (8) | 9.7 (3) | 9.7 (3) | 3.97 | 1.87 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 125 | 6.4 (8) | 7.2 (9) | 5.6 (7) | 20.8 (26) | 24.8 (31) | 15.2 (19) | 20.0 (25) | 4.76 | 1.74 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 47 | 4.3 (2) | 4.3 (2) | 12.8 (6) | 19.1 (9) | 21.3 (10) | 21.3 (10) | 17.0 (8) | 4.81 | 1.64 |
| Vaughan | 51 | 9.8 (5) | 9.8 (5) | 3.9 (2) | 15.7 (8) | 15.7 (8) | 15.7 (8) | 29.4 (15) | 4.82 | 2.04 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 5.7 (2) | 2.9 (1) | 5.7 (2) | 22.9 (8) | 20.0 (7) | 17.1 (6) | 25.7 (9) | 5.03 | 1.71 |
| Guelph | 31 | 6.5 (2) | 3.2 (1) | 3.2 (1) | 19.4 (6) | 16.1 (5) | 22.6 (7) | 29.0 (9) | 5.19 | 1.76 |
| Overall | 320 | 7.5 (24) | 6.3 (20) | 7.2 (23) | 19.4 (62) | 21.6 (69) | 16.6 (53) | 21.6 (69) | 4.77 | 1.80 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect a stronger sense of belonging.

Table 23 (Question 8)
 Perceptions of Safety and Belonging:
Uncomfortable/ Out of Place Because of Religion, Culture, Race, Skin Colour, or Sexual Orientation

| Location | n | Feel Uncomfortable/Out of Place Because of Religion, Culture, Race, Skin Colour, or Sexual Orientation ^a | | | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| | | Never | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | All of the time | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 32 | 71.9 (23) | 3.1 (1) | 3.1 (1) | 15.6 (5) | 3.1 (1) | 3.1 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 1.84 | 1.48 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 125 | 71.2 (89) | 9.6 (12) | 8.0 (10) | 6.4 (8) | 0.8 (1) | 4.0 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 1.68 | 1.29 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 47 | 72.3 (34) | 4.3 (2) | 4.3 (2) | 14.9 (7) | 0.0 (0) | 2.1 (1) | 2.1 (1) | 1.81 | 1.50 |
| Vaughan | 51 | 78.4 (40) | 7.8 (4) | 2.0 (1) | 3.9 (2) | 3.9 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 3.9 (2) | 1.63 | 1.48 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 82.9 (29) | 5.7 (2) | 2.9 (1) | 2.9 (1) | 5.7 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 1.43 | 1.09 |
| Guelph | 32 | 65.6 (21) | 9.4 (3) | 9.4 (3) | 12.5 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 3.1 (1) | 1.84 | 1.44 |
| Overall | 322 | 73.3 (236) | 7.5 (24) | 5.6 (18) | 8.4 (27) | 1.9 (6) | 2.2 (7) | 1.2 (4) | 1.70 | 1.37 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of feelings of discomfort.

Table 24 (Question 9)
 Perceptions of Safety and Belonging:
Uncomfortable/ Out of Place Because of Physical Appearance, Mental Health, or Other Health Condition

| Location | n | Feel Uncomfortable/Out of Place Because of Physical Appearance, Mental Health, or Other Health Condition ^a | | | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|---|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Never | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | All of the time | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 32 | 46.9 (15) | 9.4 (3) | 9.4 (3) | 12.5 (4) | 6.3 (2) | 3.1 (1) | 12.5 (4) | 2.81 | 2.18 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 126 | 62.7 (79) | 8.7 (11) | 9.5 (12) | 10.3 (13) | 4.8 (6) | 2.4 (3) | 1.6 (2) | 1.99 | 1.54 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 47 | 63.8 (30) | 10.6 (5) | 8.5 (4) | 6.4 (3) | 4.3 (2) | 2.1 (1) | 4.3 (2) | 2.00 | 1.68 |
| Vaughan | 49 | 83.7 (41) | 4.1 (2) | 6.1 (3) | 2.0 (1) | 2.0 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 2.0 (1) | 1.43 | 1.17 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 74.3 (26) | 14.3 (5) | 5.7 (2) | 2.9 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 2.9 (1) | 1.51 | 1.20 |
| Guelph | 32 | 34.4 (11) | 18.8 (6) | 9.4 (3) | 21.9 (7) | 9.4 (3) | 3.1 (1) | 3.1 (1) | 2.75 | 1.72 |
| Overall | 321 | 62.9 (202) | 10.0 (32) | 8.4 (27) | 9.0 (29) | 4.4 (14) | 1.9 (6) | 3.4 (11) | 2.01 | 1.62 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of feelings of discomfort.

Healthy Populations

Table 25 (Question 20)
Respondents' Self-Assessed *Physical Health*

| Location | n | Self-Assessed Physical Health ^a | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|--|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | Excellent | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 16.1 (5) | 35.5 (11) | 35.5 (11) | 12.9 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 2.45 | 0.93 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 124 | 8.1 (10) | 14.5 (18) | 32.3 (40) | 37.9 (47) | 7.3 (9) | 3.22 | 1.05 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 45 | 11.1 (5) | 22.2 (10) | 44.4 (20) | 17.8 (8) | 4.4 (2) | 2.82 | 1.01 |
| Vaughan | 51 | 5.9 (3) | 39.2 (20) | 33.3 (17) | 13.7 (7) | 7.8 (4) | 2.78 | 1.03 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 8.6 (3) | 14.3 (5) | 40.0 (14) | 28.6 (10) | 8.6 (3) | 3.14 | 1.06 |
| Guelph | 32 | 3.1 (1) | 46.9 (15) | 31.3 (10) | 15.6 (5) | 3.1 (1) | 2.69 | 0.90 |
| Overall | 318 | 8.5 (27) | 24.8 (79) | 35.2 (112) | 25.5 (81) | 6.0 (19) | 2.96 | 1.04 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher perceived levels of physical health.

Table 26 (Question 21)
 Respondents' Self-Assessed *Mental Health*

| Location | n | Self-Assessed Mental Health ^a | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|--|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Poor | Fair | Good | Very good | Excellent | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 32 | 37.5 (12) | 6.3 (2) | 21.9 (7) | 15.6 (5) | 18.8 (6) | 2.72 | 1.57 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 126 | 4.0 (5) | 7.1 (9) | 23.8 (30) | 48.4 (61) | 16.7 (21) | 3.67 | 0.97 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 45 | 0.0 (0) | 8.9 (4) | 40.0 (18) | 37.8 (17) | 13.3 (6) | 3.56 | 0.84 |
| Vaughan | 51 | 5.9 (3) | 17.6 (9) | 31.4 (16) | 19.6 (10) | 25.5 (13) | 3.41 | 1.22 |
| Kapuskasing | 34 | 0.0 (0) | 8.8 (3) | 32.4 (11) | 38.2 (13) | 20.6 (7) | 3.71 | 0.91 |
| Guelph | 31 | 6.5 (2) | 35.5 (11) | 32.3 (10) | 12.9 (4) | 12.9 (4) | 2.90 | 1.14 |
| Overall | 319 | 6.9 (22) | 11.9 (38) | 28.8 (92) | 34.5 (110) | 17.9 (57) | 3.45 | 1.12 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher perceived levels of physical health.

Democratic Engagement

Table 27a (Question 16)
Level of Interest in Politics at the *Federal Level*

| Location | n | Level of Interest in Politics at the <i>Federal Level</i> | | | | | | | | | | Summary statistics | |
|---------------------------|------------|---|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | None | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Great deal | Mean ^a | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 30 | 43.3 (13) | 0.0 (0) | 6.7 (2) | 10.0 (3) | 6.7 (2) | 13.3 (4) | 6.7 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 3.3 (1) | 10.0 (3) | 3.93 | 3.15 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 126 | 23.8 (30) | 9.5 (12) | 5.6 (7) | 6.3 (8) | 15.9 (20) | 9.5 (12) | 10.3 (13) | 9.5 (12) | 4.0 (5) | 5.6 (7) | 4.61 | 2.87 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 45 | 31.1 (14) | 8.9 (4) | 11.1 (5) | 6.7 (3) | 13.3 (6) | 0.0 (0) | 4.4 (2) | 2.2 (1) | 4.4 (2) | 17.8 (8) | 4.42 | 3.43 |
| Vaughan | 48 | 35.4 (17) | 10.4 (5) | 8.3 (4) | 2.1 (1) | 16.7 (8) | 0.0 (0) | 4.2 (2) | 8.3 (4) | 4.2 (2) | 10.4 (5) | 4.10 | 3.25 |
| Kapaskasing | 32 | 40.0 (14) | 31.4 (11) | 2.9 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 5.7 (2) | 2.9 (1) | 8.6 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 5.7 (2) | 2.9 (1) | 2.97 | 2.73 |
| Guelph | 31 | 29.0 (9) | 16.1 (5) | 6.5 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 6.5 (2) | 12.9 (4) | 19.4 (6) | 6.5 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 3.2 (1) | 4.10 | 2.84 |
| Overall | 315 | 30.8 (97) | 11.7 (37) | 6.7 (21) | 4.8 (15) | 12.7 (40) | 6.7 (21) | 8.9 (28) | 6.0 (19) | 3.8 (12) | 7.9 (25) | 4.21 | 3.04 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 10-point scale where higher scores reflect higher levels of interest.

Table 27b (Question 16)
Level of Interest in Politics at the *Provincial Level*

| Location | n | Level of Interest in Politics at the <i>Provincial Level</i> | | | | | | | | | | Summary statistics | |
|---------------------------|------------|--|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | None | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Great deal | Mean ^a | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 30 | 43.3 (13) | 0.0 (0) | 6.7 (2) | 10.0 (3) | 3.3 (1) | 16.7 (5) | 6.7 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 6.7 (2) | 6.7 (2) | 3.93 | 3.11 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 125 | 24.0 (30) | 8.8 (11) | 7.2 (9) | 8.8 (11) | 21.6 (27) | 9.6 (12) | 5.6 (7) | 8.0 (10) | 4.0 (5) | 2.4 (3) | 4.27 | 2.61 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 44 | 29.5 (13) | 6.8 (3) | 2.3 (1) | 13.6 (6) | 15.9 (7) | 0.0 (0) | 4.5 (2) | 9.1 (4) | 4.5 (2) | 13.6 (6) | 4.66 | 3.29 |
| Vaughan | 47 | 36.2 (17) | 12.8 (6) | 10.6 (5) | 6.4 (3) | 12.8 (6) | 2.1 (1) | 4.3 (2) | 4.3 (2) | 2.1 (1) | 8.5 (4) | 3.64 | 2.97 |
| Kapaskasing | 35 | 40.0 (14) | 25.7 (9) | 5.7 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 5.7 (2) | 2.9 (1) | 2.9 (1) | 5.7 (2) | 5.7 (2) | 5.7 (2) | 3.29 | 3.04 |
| Guelph | 31 | 29.0 (9) | 12.9 (4) | 6.5 (2) | 6.5 (2) | 6.5 (2) | 12.9 (4) | 12.9 (4) | 6.5 (2) | 3.2 (1) | 3.2 (1) | 4.13 | 2.86 |
| Overall | 312 | 30.8 (96) | 10.6 (33) | 6.7 (21) | 8.0 (25) | 14.4 (45) | 7.4 (23) | 5.8 (18) | 6.4 (20) | 4.2 (13) | 5.8 (18) | 4.07 | 2.90 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 10-point scale where higher scores reflect higher levels of interest.

Table 27c (Question 16)
Level of Interest in Politics at the *Municipal Level*

| Location | n | Level of Interest in Politics at the <i>Municipal Level</i> | | | | | | | | | | Summary statistics | |
|---------------------------|------------|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | None | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Great deal | Mean ^a | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 30 | 40.0 (12) | 0.0 (0) | 10.0 (3) | 10.0 (3) | 10.0 (3) | 16.7 (5) | 6.7 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 3.3 (1) | 3.3 (1) | 3.70 | 2.69 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 125 | 26.4 (33) | 8.0 (10) | 8.0 (10) | 7.2 (9) | 10.4 (13) | 11.2 (14) | 8.0 (10) | 12.0 (15) | 4.8 (6) | 4.0 (5) | 4.50 | 2.90 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 43 | 25.6 (11) | 2.3 (1) | 2.3 (1) | 4.7 (2) | 16.3 (7) | 4.7 (2) | 14.0 (6) | 7.0 (3) | 14.0 (6) | 9.3 (4) | 5.37 | 3.22 |
| Vaughan | 48 | 37.5 (18) | 12.5 (6) | 8.3 (4) | 2.1 (1) | 12.5 (6) | 4.2 (2) | 6.3 (3) | 8.3 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 8.3 (4) | 3.77 | 3.05 |
| Kapaskasing | 35 | 42.9 (15) | 14.3 (5) | 5.7 (2) | 2.9 (1) | 2.9 (1) | 11.4 (4) | 8.6 (3) | 5.7 (2) | 2.9 (1) | 2.9 (1) | 3.43 | 2.88 |
| Guelph | 31 | 32.3 (10) | 12.9 (4) | 9.7 (3) | 3.2 (1) | 9.7 (3) | 12.9 (4) | 9.7 (3) | 3.2 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 6.5 (2) | 3.84 | 2.84 |
| Overall | 312 | 31.7 (99) | 8.3 (26) | 7.4 (23) | 5.4 (17) | 10.6 (33) | 9.9 (31) | 8.7 (27) | 8.0 (25) | 4.5 (14) | 5.4 (17) | 4.24 | 2.98 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 10-point scale where higher scores reflect higher levels of interest.

Environment

Table 28a (Question 10)
 Respondents' Perceptions of the Environment in their Community:
Quality of the Natural Environment

| Location | n | Quality of the natural environment in my community is very high ^a | | | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|--|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Very strongly disagree | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Very strongly agree | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 29 | 6.9 (2) | 3.4 (1) | 3.4 (1) | 20.7 (6) | 44.8 (13) | 6.9 (2) | 13.8 (4) | 4.69 | 1.54 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 125 | 1.6 (2) | 0.8 (1) | 3.2 (4) | 8.0 (10) | 44.0 (55) | 25.6 (32) | 16.8 (21) | 5.36 | 1.16 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 46 | 6.5 (3) | 4.3 (2) | 2.2 (1) | 17.4 (8) | 39.1 (18) | 15.2 (7) | 15.2 (7) | 4.85 | 1.58 |
| Vaughan | 50 | 8.0 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 8.0 (4) | 22.0 (11) | 18.0 (9) | 20.0 (10) | 24.0 (12) | 4.98 | 1.74 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 2.9 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 5.7 (2) | 17.1 (6) | 28.6 (10) | 28.6 (10) | 17.1 (6) | 5.23 | 1.35 |
| Guelph | 31 | 3.2 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 3.2 (1) | 22.6 (7) | 22.6 (7) | 32.3 (10) | 16.1 (5) | 5.23 | 1.36 |
| Overall | 316 | 4.1 (13) | 1.3 (4) | 4.1 (13) | 15.2 (48) | 35.4 (112) | 22.5 (71) | 17.4 (55) | 5.14 | 1.41 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect greater agreement with aspect of environment in the community.

Table 28b (Question 10)
 Respondents' Perceptions of the Environment in their Community:
Opportunities to Enjoy Nature

| Location | n | There are plenty of opportunities to enjoy nature in my community ^a | | | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Very strongly disagree | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Very strongly agree | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 3.2 (1) | 6.5 (2) | 3.2 (1) | 9.7 (3) | 35.5 (11) | 6.5 (2) | 35.5 (2) | 5.29 | 1.68 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 126 | 0.8 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.8 (1) | 7.9 (10) | 31.7 (40) | 26.2 (33) | 32.5 (41) | 5.79 | 1.09 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 46 | 6.5 (3) | 4.3 (2) | 2.2 (1) | 4.3 (2) | 26.1 (12) | 30.4 (14) | 26.1 (12) | 5.35 | 1.69 |
| Vaughan | 50 | 8.0 (4) | 0.0 (0) | 8.0 (4) | 10.0 (5) | 22.0 (11) | 32.0 (16) | 20.0 (10) | 5.14 | 1.69 |
| Kapuskasing | 34 | 2.9 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 8.8 (3) | 17.6 (6) | 26.5 (9) | 44.1 (15) | 5.94 | 1.32 |
| Guelph | 32 | 3.1 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 12.5 (4) | 34.4 (11) | 18.8 (6) | 31.3 (10) | 5.56 | 1.34 |
| Overall | 319 | 3.4 (11) | 1.3 (4) | 2.2 (7) | 8.5 (27) | 28.5 (91) | 25.1 (80) | 31.0 (99) | 5.57 | 1.42 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect greater agreement with aspect of environment in the community.

Table 28c (Question 10)
 Respondents' Perceptions of the Environment in their Community:
Air Quality

| Location | n | "The air quality in my community is very good" ^a | | | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Very strongly disagree | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Very strongly agree | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 30 | 3.3 (1) | 3.3 (1) | 3.3 (1) | 16.7 (5) | 33.3 (10) | 13.3 (4) | 26.7 (8) | 5.20 | 1.54 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 125 | 0.8 (1) | 0.8 (1) | 0.8 (1) | 2.4 (3) | 27.2 (34) | 38.4 (48) | 29.6 (37) | 5.88 | 1.03 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 47 | 6.4 (3) | 4.3 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 6.4 (3) | 25.5 (12) | 27.7 (13) | 29.8 (14) | 5.43 | 1.68 |
| Vaughan | 49 | 8.2 (4) | 2.0 (1) | 6.1 (3) | 8.2 (4) | 28.6 (14) | 22.4 (11) | 24.5 (12) | 5.12 | 1.75 |
| Kapuskasing | 34 | 2.9 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 2.9 (1) | 11.8 (4) | 17.6 (6) | 41.2 (14) | 23.5 (8) | 5.59 | 1.33 |
| Guelph | 32 | 3.1 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 6.3 (2) | 3.1 (1) | 34.4 (11) | 37.5 (12) | 15.6 (5) | 5.41 | 1.29 |
| Overall | 317 | 3.5 (11) | 1.6 (5) | 2.5 (8) | 6.3 (20) | 27.4 (87) | 32.2 (102) | 26.5 (84) | 5.55 | 1.39 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect greater agreement with aspect of environment in the community.

Table 28d (Question 10)
 Respondents' Perceptions of the Environment in their Community:
Quality of the Water

| Location | n | "The water quality in my community is very good" ^a | | | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|---|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Very strongly disagree | Strongly disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly agree | Very strongly agree | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 3.2 (1) | 9.7 (3) | 12.9 (4) | 16.1 (5) | 45.2 (14) | 9.7 (3) | 3.2 (1) | 4.32 | 1.38 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 127 | 5.5 (7) | 0.0 (0) | 6.3 (8) | 13.4 (17) | 27.6 (35) | 31.5 (40) | 15.7 (20) | 5.15 | 1.49 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 45 | 6.7 (3) | 2.2 (1) | 4.4 (2) | 20.0 (9) | 24.4 (11) | 24.4 (11) | 17.8 (8) | 4.98 | 1.63 |
| Vaughan | 49 | 8.2 (4) | 2.0 (1) | 4.1 (2) | 6.1 (3) | 32.7 (16) | 28.6 (14) | 18.4 (9) | 5.12 | 1.67 |
| Kapuskasing | 34 | 2.9 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 2.9 (1) | 14.7 (5) | 20.6 (7) | 38.2 (13) | 20.6 (7) | 5.47 | 1.33 |
| Guelph | 32 | 6.3 (2) | 3.1 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 28.1 (9) | 18.8 (6) | 28.1 (9) | 15.6 (5) | 4.97 | 1.60 |
| Overall | 318 | 5.7 (18) | 1.9 (6) | 5.3 (17) | 15.1 (48) | 28.0 (89) | 28.3 (90) | 15.7 (50) | 5.06 | 1.54 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect greater agreement with aspect of environment in the community.

Table 29a (Question 11)
 Respondents' Perceptions of Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities During the Past 12 months:
Recycled materials (e.g., plastics, tin, cans, cardboard)

| Location | n | Recycled Materials During the Past 12 Months ^a | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|---|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Never | Some-times | Regular-ly | Quite Often | All of the time | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 3.2 (1) | 3.2 (1) | 16.1 (5) | 16.1 (5) | 61.3 (19) | 4.29 | 1.07 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 128 | 0.8 (1) | 3.9 (5) | 14.1 (18) | 11.7 (15) | 69.5 (89) | 4.45 | 0.93 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 44 | 56.8 (25) | 20.5 (9) | 13.6 (6) | 4.5 (2) | 4.5 (2) | 1.80 | 1.13 |
| Vaughan | 45 | 13.3 (6) | 4.4 (2) | 20.0 (9) | 4.4 (2) | 57.8 (26) | 3.89 | 1.48 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 37.1 (13) | 25.7 (9) | 5.7 (2) | 11.4 (4) | 20.0 (7) | 2.51 | 1.58 |
| Guelph | 32 | 6.3 (2) | 9.4 (3) | 25.0 (8) | 12.5 (4) | 46.9 (15) | 3.84 | 1.30 |
| Overall | 315 | 15.2 (48) | 9.2 (29) | 15.2 (48) | 10.2 (32) | 50.2 (158) | 3.71 | 1.52 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of engagement in activities.

Table 29b (Question 11)
 Respondents' Perceptions of Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities During the Past 12 months:
Reused Materials (e.g., plastic bottles, plastic bags, tin cans)

| Location | n | Reused Materials During the Past 12 Months ^a | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Never | Some-times | Regular-ly | Quite Often | All of the time | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 9.7 (3) | 12.9 (4) | 22.6 (7) | 19.4 (6) | 35.5 (11) | 3.58 | 1.36 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 128 | 4.7 (6) | 15.6 (20) | 22.7 (29) | 27.3 (35) | 29.7 (38) | 3.62 | 1.20 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 48 | 25.0 (12) | 25.0 (12) | 14.6 (7) | 18.8 (9) | 16.7 (8) | 2.77 | 1.45 |
| Vaughan | 48 | 6.3 (3) | 18.8 (9) | 29.2 (14) | 18.8 (9) | 27.1 (13) | 3.42 | 1.25 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 11.4 (4) | 31.4 (11) | 8.6 (3) | 34.3 (12) | 14.3 (5) | 3.09 | 1.31 |
| Guelph | 32 | 3.1 (1) | 25.0 (8) | 18.8 (6) | 12.5 (4) | 40.6 (13) | 3.63 | 1.34 |
| Overall | 322 | 9.0 (29) | 19.9 (64) | 20.5 (66) | 23.3 (75) | 27.3 (88) | 3.40 | 1.31 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of engagement in activities.

Table 29c (Question 11)
 Respondents' Perceptions of Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities During the Past 12 months:
Tried to Reduce Household Waste

| Location | n | <i>Tried to Reduce Household Waste During the Past 12 Months^a</i> | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | | Never | Some- times | Regular- ly | Quite Often | All of the time | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 6.5 (2) | 16.1 (5) | 25.8 (8) | 19.4 (6) | 32.3 (10) | 3.55 | 1.29 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 127 | 2.4 (3) | 7.1 (9) | 23.6 (30) | 29.1 (37) | 37.8 (48) | 3.93 | 1.06 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 44 | 6.8 (3) | 34.1 (15) | 18.2 (8) | 29.5 (13) | 11.4 (5) | 3.05 | 1.18 |
| Vaughan | 48 | 8.3 (4) | 8.3 (4) | 16.7 (8) | 16.7 (8) | 50.0 (24) | 3.92 | 1.33 |
| Kapuskasing | 33 | 21.2 (7) | 21.2 (7) | 24.2 (8) | 21.2 (7) | 12.1 (4) | 2.82 | 1.33 |
| Guelph | 32 | 3.1 (1) | 12.5 (4) | 46.9 (15) | 12.5 (4) | 25.0 (8) | 3.44 | 1.01 |
| Overall | 315 | 6.3 (20) | 14.0 (44) | 24.4 (77) | 23.8 (75) | 31.4 (99) | 3.60 | 1.24 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of engagement in activities.

Table 29d (Question 11)
 Respondents' Perceptions of Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities During the Past 12 months:
Separated Waste

| Location | n | Separated Waste During the Past 12 Months ^a | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|--|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Never | Some-times | Regular-ly | Quite Often | All of the time | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 19.4 (6) | 9.7 (3) | 16.1 (5) | 16.1 (5) | 38.7 (12) | 3.45 | 1.57 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 126 | 25.4 (32) | 19.8 (25) | 14.3 (18) | 11.9 (15) | 38.6 (36) | 2.98 | 1.58 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 45 | 55.6 (25) | 24.4 (11) | 11.1 (5) | 6.7 (3) | 2.2 (1) | 1.76 | 1.05 |
| Vaughan | 49 | 8.2 (4) | 8.2 (4) | 16.3 (8) | 2.0 (1) | 65.3 (32) | 4.08 | 1.38 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 54.3 (19) | 2.9 (1) | 8.6 (3) | 14.3 (5) | 20.0 (7) | 2.43 | 1.70 |
| Guelph | 31 | 19.4 (6) | 3.2 (1) | 22.6 (7) | 9.7 (3) | 45.2 (14) | 3.58 | 1.57 |
| Overall | 317 | 29.0 (92) | 14.2 (45) | 14.5 (46) | 10.1 (32) | 32.2 (102) | 3.02 | 1.64 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of engagement in activities.

Table 29e (Question 11)
 Respondents' Perceptions of Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities During the Past 12 months:
Conserved energy (e.g., buy energy efficient bulbs and appliances, turn off lights)

| Location | n | Conserved Energy During the Past 12 Months ^a | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|---|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Never | Some-times | Regular-ly | Quite Often | All of the time | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 9.7 (3) | 6.5 (2) | 12.9 (4) | 19.4 (6) | 51.6 (16) | 3.97 | 1.35 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 128 | 1.6 (2) | 4.7 (6) | 13.3 (17) | 30.5 (39) | 50.0 (64) | 4.23 | 0.96 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 47 | 4.3 (2) | 10.6 (5) | 19.1 (9) | 23.4 (11) | 42.6 (20) | 3.89 | 1.20 |
| Vaughan | 49 | 2.0 (1) | 10.2 (5) | 18.4 (9) | 8.2 (4) | 61.2 (30) | 4.16 | 1.18 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 2.9 (1) | 17.1 (6) | 20.0 (7) | 22.9 (8) | 37.1 (13) | 3.74 | 1.22 |
| Guelph | 32 | 3.1 (1) | 12.5 (4) | 21.9 (7) | 18.8 (6) | 43.8 (14) | 3.88 | 1.21 |
| Overall | 322 | 3.1 (10) | 8.7 (28) | 16.5 (53) | 23.0 (74) | 48.8 (157) | 4.06 | 1.13 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of engagement in activities.

Table 29f (Question 11)
 Respondents' Perceptions of Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities During the Past 12 months:
Conserved water (e.g., not leaving the water tap running, taking shorter showers)

| Location | n | Conserved Water During the Past 12 Months ^a | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|--|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Never | Some-times | Regular-ly | Quite Often | All of the time | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 30 | 10.0 (3) | 13.3 (4) | 10.0 (3) | 26.7 (8) | 40.0 (12) | 3.73 | 1.39 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 126 | 2.4 (3) | 4.8 (6) | 22.2 (28) | 27.8 (35) | 42.9 (54) | 4.04 | 1.03 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 48 | 0.0 (0) | 12.5 (6) | 18.8 (9) | 35.4 (17) | 33.3 (16) | 3.90 | 1.02 |
| Vaughan | 49 | 12.2 (6) | 4.1 (2) | 12.2 (6) | 12.2 (6) | 59.2 (29) | 4.02 | 1.42 |
| Kapuskasing | 34 | 8.8 (3) | 14.7 (5) | 26.5 (9) | 20.6 (7) | 29.4 (10) | 3.47 | 1.31 |
| Guelph | 31 | 9.7 (3) | 22.6 (7) | 16.1 (5) | 25.8 (8) | 25.8 (8) | 3.35 | 1.36 |
| Overall | 318 | 5.7 (18) | 9.4 (30) | 18.9 (60) | 25.5 (81) | 40.6 (129) | 3.86 | 1.21 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of engagement in activities.

Table 29g (Question 11)
 Respondents' Perceptions of Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities During the Past 12 months:
Walked, Biked, or Took Public Transit More Often (rather than drive your car)

| Location | n | <i>Walked, Biked, or Took Public Transit More Often During the Past 12 Months^a</i> | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Never | Some-times | Regular-ly | Quite Often | All of the time | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 22.6 (7) | 41.9 (13) | 9.7 (3) | 6.5 (2) | 19.4 (6) | 2.58 | 1.43 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 125 | 25.6 (32) | 28.8 (36) | 19.2 (24) | 20.0 (25) | 6.4 (8) | 2.53 | 1.25 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 44 | 20.5 (9) | 40.9 (18) | 13.6 (6) | 18.2 (8) | 6.8 (3) | 2.50 | 1.21 |
| Vaughan | 49 | 22.4 (11) | 26.5 (13) | 16.3 (8) | 14.3 (7) | 20.4 (10) | 2.84 | 1.46 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 25.7 (9) | 31.4 (11) | 11.4 (4) | 22.9 (8) | 8.6 (3) | 2.57 | 1.34 |
| Guelph | 31 | 16.1 (5) | 22.6 (7) | 29.0 (9) | 9.7 (3) | 22.6 (7) | 3.00 | 1.39 |
| Overall | 315 | 23.2 (73) | 31.1 (98) | 17.1 (54) | 16.8 (53) | 11.7 (37) | 2.63 | 1.32 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of engagement in activities.

Table 29h (Question 11)
 Respondents' Perceptions of Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities During the Past 12 months:
Purchase Foods Produced Locally

| Location | n | <i>Purchased Food Locally During the Past 12 Months^a</i> | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | | Never | Some- times | Regular- ly | Quite Often | All of the time | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 6.5 (2) | 29.0 (9) | 22.6 (7) | 22.6 (7) | 19.4 (6) | 3.19 | 1.25 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 126 | 3.2 (4) | 27.0 (34) | 31.0 (39) | 31.7 (40) | 7.1 (9) | 3.13 | 1.00 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 47 | 12.8 (6) | 27.7 (13) | 23.4 (11) | 25.5 (12) | 10.6 (5) | 2.94 | 1.22 |
| Vaughan | 49 | 4.1 (2) | 20.4 (10) | 30.6 (15) | 18.4 (9) | 26.5 (13) | 3.43 | 1.21 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 8.6 (3) | 37.1 (13) | 5.7 (2) | 25.7 (9) | 22.9 (8) | 3.17 | 1.38 |
| Guelph | 32 | 6.3 (2) | 43.8 (14) | 21.9 (7) | 12.5 (4) | 15.6 (5) | 2.88 | 1.21 |
| Overall | 320 | 5.9 (19) | 29.1 (93) | 25.3 (81) | 25.3 (81) | 14.4 (46) | 3.13 | 1.16 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.
^b Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of engagement in activities.

Leisure and Culture

Table 30 (Question 12)
Amount of Time Respondents Spend Engaged in Social Activities^a
on a Typical Day (in minutes per day)

| Location | Time Spent in Social Activities on a Typical Day (in minutes) ^b | | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------|------------|---------------|---------------|
| | n | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 23 | 30 | 780 | 226.30 | 182.76 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 97 | 10 | 600 | 123.97 | 91.88 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 35 | 10 | 600 | 150.03 | 141.26 |
| Vaughan | 38 | 30 | 720 | 149.79 | 112.81 |
| Kapuskasing | 29 | 30 | 360 | 122.59 | 87.10 |
| Guelph | 26 | 20 | 480 | 164.31 | 108.78 |
| Overall | 248 | 10 | 780 | 145.16 | 117.74 |

Notes: ^a Examples of social leisure activities are visiting with a friend, talking on the phone, and having a meal with someone.

^b Results include those reporting at least one minute per day of participation, which overall, includes 93.5% of all respondents.

Table 31 (Question 13)
Amount of Time Respondents Spend Participating in Physically Active Leisure^a
(in hours per week)

| Location | Time Spent in Physically Active Leisure on a Typical Day (in minutes) ^b | | | | |
|------------------------|---|----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| | n | Min. | Max. | Mean | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 23 | 2 | 35 | 9.28 | 8.31 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 110 | 1 | 40 | 6.43 | 6.94 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 41 | 1 | 30 | 7.18 | 6.37 |
| Vaughan | 40 | 1 | 15 | 4.43 | 3.15 |
| Kapuskasing | 29 | 1 | 10 | 4.93 | 2.68 |
| Guelph | 31 | 1 | 52 | 8.07 | 11.19 |
| Overall | 274 | 1 | 52 | 6.52 | 6.97 |

Notes: ^a Examples of physically active leisure are going for a walk, taking an exercise class, playing a sport, and gardening.

^b Results include those reporting at least one hour per week of participation, which overall, includes 90.6% of all respondents.

Education

Table 32 (Question 15)
Respondents Who Took Courses During the Past Year
to Improve Skills or for Personal Interest

| Location | Took Courses During the Past Year | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 19 | 61.3 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 43 | 34.4 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 11 | 24.4 |
| Vaughan | 10 | 20.8 |
| Kapuskasing | 9 | 26.5 |
| Guelph | 16 | 50.0 |
| Overall | 108 | 34.3 |

Table 32a(i) (Question 15)¹
Main Reason for Taking Courses During the Past Year:
To Improve Your Skills in Your Current Job^a

| Location | To Improve Your Skills in Your Current Job | |
|------------------------|---|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 2 | 13.3 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 15 | 35.7 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 5 | 45.5 |
| Vaughan | 4 | 25.0 |
| Kapuskasing | 1 | 9.1 |
| Guelph | 4 | 25.0 |
| Overall | 31 | 27.9 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who had taken a course in the past year to improve skills or for personal interest.

¹ Some respondents gave more than one reason for taking courses in the past year to improve their skills or for personal interest.

Table 32a(ii) (Question 15)
 Main Reason for Taking Courses During the Past Year:
To Prepare for a Job You Might do in the Future^a

| Location | To Prepare for Job You Might do in the Future | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 3 | 20.0 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 2 | 4.8 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 1 | 9.1 |
| Vaughan | 2 | 12.5 |
| Kapuskasing | 1 | 9.1 |
| Guelph | 5 | 31.3 |
| Overall | 14 | 12.6 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who had taken a course in the past year to improve skills or for personal interest.

Table 32a(iii) (Question 15)
 Main Reason for Taking Courses During the Past Year:
To Lead Directly to a Qualification Related to Current Job

| Location | To Prepare for Job You Might do in the Future | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 0 | 0.0 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Vaughan | 1 | 6.3 |
| Kapuskasing | 1 | 9.1 |
| Guelph | 0 | 0.0 |
| Overall | 2 | 1.8 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who had taken a course in the past year to improve skills or for personal interest.

Table 32a(iv) (Question 15)
 Main Reason for Taking Courses During the Past Year
To Help You Get Started in a Current or New Job^a

| Location | To Prepare for Job You Might do in the Future | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 0 | 0.0 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 4 | 9.5 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 0 | 0.0 |
| Vaughan | 1 | 6.3 |
| Kapuskasing | 4 | 36.4 |
| Guelph | 2 | 12.5 |
| Overall | 11 | 9.9 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who had taken a course in the past year to improve skills or for personal interest.

Table 32a(iv) (Question 15)
 Main Reason for Taking Courses During the Past Year:
For Personal Development, Interest, or Enjoyment^a

| Location | For Personal Development, Interest, or Enjoyment | |
|------------------------|---|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 9 | 60.9 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 20 | 47.6 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 4 | 36.4 |
| Vaughan | 8 | 50.0 |
| Kapuskasing | 4 | 36.4 |
| Guelph | 5 | 31.3 |
| Overall | 50 | 45.0 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who had taken a course in the past year to improve skills or for personal interest.

Table 32b (Question 15a)
 Respondents Who Did Not Take Courses During the Past Year, but Wanted To

| Location | Did Not Take Courses During Past Year, but Wanted To | |
|------------------------|---|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 8 | 61.5 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 30 | 35.3 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 10 | 31.3 |
| Vaughan | 15 | 41.7 |
| Kapuskasing | 7 | 28.0 |
| Guelph | 9 | 52.9 |
| Overall | 79 | 38.0 |

Table 32c(i) (Question 15c)
 Barriers to Taking Courses for Respondents:
Past Experiences or Challenges with Education^a

| Location | Past Experiences or Challenges with Education | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 9 | 69.2 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 2 | 8.3 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 4 | 40.0 |
| Vaughan | 1 | 11.1 |
| Kapuskasing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Guelph | 6 | 46.2 |
| Overall | 22 | 31.9 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who did not take courses during the past year, but wanted to.

Table 32c(ii) (Question 15c)
 Barriers to Taking Courses for Respondents:
Childcare or Attendant Care Not Available^a

| Location | Childcare or Attendant Care Not Available | |
|------------------------|---|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 0 | 0.0 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 11 | 37.9 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 5 | 45.5 |
| Vaughan | 3 | 27.3 |
| Kapusksing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Guelph | 4 | 33.3 |
| Overall | 23 | 31.5 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who did not take courses during the past year, but wanted to.

Table 32c(iii) (Question 15c)
 Barriers to Taking Courses for Respondents:
Too Costly^a

| Location | Too Costly | |
|------------------------|------------|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 12 | 85.7 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 21 | 63.6 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 14 | 82.4 |
| Vaughan | 7 | 53.8 |
| Kapusksing | 1 | 100.0 |
| Guelph | 14 | 82.4 |
| Overall | 69 | 72.6 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who did not take courses during the past year, but wanted to.

Table 32c(iv) (Question 15c)
 Barriers to Taking Courses for Respondents:
Not Enough Time^a

| Location | Not Enough Time | |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 5 | 38.5 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 29 | 72.5 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 7 | 50.0 |
| Vaughan | 10 | 62.5 |
| Kapuskasing | 6 | 100.0 |
| Guelph | 13 | 86.7 |
| Overall | 70 | 67.3 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who did not take courses during the past year, but wanted to.

Table 32c(v) (Question 15c)
 Barriers to Taking Courses for Respondents:
Don't Have a Way to Get to Courses/School^a

| Location | Don't Have a Way to Get to Courses/School | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 6 | 54.5 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 6 | 23.1 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 3 | 30.0 |
| Vaughan | 4 | 44.4 |
| Kapuskasing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Guelph | 2 | 20.0 |
| Overall | 21 | 31.8 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who did not take courses during the past year, but wanted to.

Table 32c(vi) (Question 15c)
 Barriers to Taking Courses for Respondents:
Don't Have the Confidence to Do It

| Location | Don't Have the Confidence to Do It | |
|------------------------|---|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 8 | 61.5 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 1 | 4.2 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 3 | 27.3 |
| Vaughan | 2 | 20.0 |
| Kapuskasing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Guelph | 3 | 27.3 |
| Overall | 17 | 24.6 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who did not take courses during the past year, but wanted to.

Table 32c(vii) (Question 15c)
 Barriers to Taking Courses for Respondents:
Don't Have the Necessary Background or Qualifications

| Location | Don't Have the Necessary Background or Qualifications | |
|------------------------|--|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 6 | 50.0 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 1 | 4.2 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 4 | 40.0 |
| Vaughan | 2 | 20.0 |
| Kapuskasing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Guelph | 4 | 36.4 |
| Overall | 17 | 19.6 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who did not take courses during the past year, but wanted to.

Table 32c(viii) (Question 15c)
 Barriers to Taking Courses for Respondents:
Other Reason^a

| Location | Other Reason | |
|------------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| | n | Pct. |
| Chigamik | 6 | 50.0 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 1 | 4.2 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 4 | 40.0 |
| Vaughan | 2 | 20.0 |
| Kapuskasing | 0 | 0.0 |
| Guelph | 4 | 36.4 |
| Overall | 17 | 19.6 |

Notes: ^a Includes just those respondents who did not take courses during the past year, but wanted to. Other reasons for not taking courses included: distance, language, age, a lot of time volunteer, course not offered in my community, health, none of interest, primary caregiver responsibilities, and work problems.

Living Standards

Table 33 (Question 17)
Respondents' Primary Source of Income^a

| Location | Primary Source of Income | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | Wages for full-time work | Wages for part-time work | Wages for casual work | Some form of assistance ^b |
| Chigamik | 17.9 (5) | 7.1 (2) | 3.6 (1) | 71.4 (20) |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 47.3 (53) | 9.8 (11) | 4.5 (5) | 38.4 (43) |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 27.9 (12) | 23.3 (10) | 4.7 (2) | 44.2 (19) |
| Vaughan | 31.6 (12) | 13.2 (5) | 0.0 (0) | 55.3 (21) |
| Kapuskasing | 43.8 (14) | 6.3 (2) | 3.1 (1) | 46.9 (15) |
| Guelph | 14.8 (4) | 22.2 (6) | 3.7 (1) | 59.3 (16) |
| Overall | 35.7 (100) | 12.9 (36) | 3.6 (10) | 47.9 (134) |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Assistance may include PNA/Personal Needs Allowance, Welfare/Ontario Works, Provincial disability benefits/ODSP/FBA/Federal disability benefits/CPDP, Pension – CPP, OAS, private pension plan, Employment Insurance, Child Tax Benefit, Alimony/Child support, Workers Compensation/Other government cheques.

Table 34 (Question 18)
 Respondents' Perceptions of Financial Security During the Past Year:
Difficulty Making Ends Meet

| Location | n | Difficulty Making Ends Meet | | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Never | Once in past year | At least once in past 6 months | At least once in past 3 months | At least once a month | At least once in past week | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 31 | 41.9 (13) | 12.9 (4) | 3.2 (1) | 12.9 (4) | 19.4 (6) | 9.7 (3) | 2.84 | 1.92 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 124 | 62.1 (77) | 11.3 (14) | 3.2 (4) | 10.5 (13) | 6.5 (8) | 6.5 (8) | 2.07 | 1.64 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 45 | 57.8 (26) | 6.7 (3) | 8.9 (4) | 4.4 (2) | 22.2 (10) | 0.0 (0) | 2.27 | 1.68 |
| Vaughan | 48 | 68.8 (33) | 8.3 (4) | 8.3 (4) | 2.1 (1) | 8.3 (4) | 4.2 (2) | 1.85 | 1.52 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 85.7 (30) | 0.0 (0) | 5.7 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 8.6 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 1.46 | 1.20 |
| Guelph | 31 | 29.0 (9) | 3.2 (1) | 12.9 (4) | 12.9 (4) | 32.3 (10) | 9.7 (3) | 3.45 | 1.84 |
| Overall | 314 | 59.9 (188) | 8.3 (26) | 6.1 (19) | 7.6 (24) | 13.1 (41) | 5.1 (16) | 2.21 | 1.71 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 6-point scale where higher scores reflect higher incidence of these experiences.

Table 35 (Question 19)
 Respondents' Perceptions of Financial Security During the Past Year:
Ate Less

| Location | n | Ate Less | | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Never | Once in past year | At least once in past 6 months | At least once in past 3 months | At least once a month | At least once in past week | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 32 | 62.5 (20) | 9.4 (3) | 0.0 (0) | 6.3 (2) | 9.4 (3) | 12.5 (4) | 2.28 | 1.94 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 124 | 86.3 (107) | 1.6 (2) | 1.6 (2) | 2.4 (3) | 5.6 (7) | 2.4 (3) | 1.47 | 1.27 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 46 | 91.3 (42) | 0.0 (0) | 2.2 (1) | 2.2 (1) | 4.3 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 1.28 | 0.96 |
| Vaughan | 48 | 91.7 (44) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 2.1 (1) | 6.3 (3) | 1.40 | 1.33 |
| Kapuskasing | 35 | 100.0 (35) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 0.0 (0) | 1.00 | 0.00 |
| Guelph | 31 | 41.9 (13) | 6.5 (2) | 16.1 (5) | 9.7 (3) | 12.9 (4) | 12.9 (4) | 2.84 | 1.90 |
| Overall | 316 | 82.6 (261) | 2.2 (7) | 2.5 (8) | 2.8 (9) | 5.4 (17) | 4.4 (14) | 1.59 | 1.41 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 6-point scale where higher scores reflect higher incidence of these experiences.

Time Use

Table 36 (Question 22)
 Respondents' Perceptions of Time Adequacy:
Time Daily to do Everything Needed at Work and at Home^a

| Location | n | Enough Time Daily to do Everything Needed at Work and at Home | | | | | | | | | | Summary statistics | |
|---------------------------|------------|---|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Not enough | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Always enough | Mean ^a | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 32 | 6.3 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 15.6 (5) | 9.4 (3) | 15.6 (5) | 3.1 (1) | 6.3 (2) | 6.3 (2) | 6.3 (2) | 31.3 (10) | 6.50 | 3.07 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 125 | 9.6 (12) | 5.6 (7) | 12.0 (15) | 8.0 (10) | 12.8 (16) | 9.6 (12) | 8.0 (10) | 9.6 (12) | 5.6 (7) | 19.2 (24) | 5.86 | 2.99 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 45 | 13.3 (6) | 0.0 (0) | 8.9 (4) | 8.9 (4) | 13.3 (6) | 8.9 (4) | 2.2 (1) | 8.9 (4) | 8.9 (4) | 26.7 (12) | 6.29 | 3.20 |
| Vaughan | 51 | 3.9 (2) | 3.9 (2) | 7.8 (4) | 5.9 (3) | 13.7 (7) | 11.8 (6) | 5.9 (3) | 19.6 (10) | 7.8 (4) | 19.6 (10) | 6.63 | 2.67 |
| Kapaskasing | 35 | 14.3 (5) | 2.9 (1) | 14.3 (5) | 2.9 (1) | 14.3 (5) | 2.9 (1) | 0.0 (0) | 20.0 (7) | 2.9 (1) | 25.7 (9) | 6.06 | 3.33 |
| Guelph | 32 | 9.4 (3) | 6.3 (2) | 28.1 (9) | 15.6 (5) | 9.4 (3) | 6.3 (2) | 15.6 (5) | 6.3 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 3.1 (1) | 4.44 | 2.29 |
| Overall | 320 | 9.4 (30) | 3.8 (12) | 13.1 (42) | 8.1 (26) | 13.1 (42) | 8.1 (26) | 6.6 (21) | 11.6 (37) | 5.6 (18) | 20.6 (66) | 5.98 | 2.99 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 10-point scale where higher scores reflect more adequate amounts of time perceived by respondent.

Overall Wellbeing

Table 37 (Final Question)
Respondents' Level of Satisfaction with Life in General^a

| Location | n | Satisfaction with Life in General | | | | | Summary Statistics | |
|------------------------|------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| | | Very dissatisfied | Dissatisfied | Neither satisfied/dissatisfied | Satisfied | Very satisfied | Mean ^b | Std. Dev. |
| Chigamik | 33 | 15.2 (5) | 15.2 (5) | 27.3 (9) | 33.3 (11) | 9.1 (3) | 3.06 | 1.22 |
| L'Estrie (Bourget) | 123 | 2.4 (3) | 2.4 (3) | 12.2 (15) | 48.0 (59) | 35.0 (43) | 4.11 | 0.89 |
| Mary Berglund (Ignace) | 45 | 2.2 (1) | 4.4 (2) | 20.0 (9) | 40.0 (18) | 33.3 (15) | 3.98 | 0.97 |
| Vaughan | 51 | 0.0 (0) | 3.9 (2) | 3.9 (2) | 62.7 (32) | 29.4 (15) | 4.18 | 0.68 |
| Kapuskasing | 34 | 5.9 (2) | 0.0 (0) | 8.8 (3) | 50.0 (17) | 35.3 (12) | 4.09 | 1.00 |
| Guelph | 31 | 0.0 (0) | 12.9 (4) | 6.5 (2) | 64.5 (20) | 16.1 (5) | 3.84 | 0.86 |
| Overall | 317 | 3.5 (11) | 5.0 (16) | 12.6 (40) | 49.5 (157) | 29.3 (93) | 3.96 | 0.97 |

Notes: ^a Percentages are reported above with number of respondents in parentheses below.

^b Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher levels of satisfaction with life in general.

Comments

The following *unedited* comments were provided by the survey participants in final section of the questionnaire. Covering a wide range of topics, they have been organised by Health Centre location, and placed within each of the eight CIW domains where possible.

Chigamik

- Community and mental health in this area has been great in this area.
- I volunteer for the Cancer Society. (Driver)
- Since July 2012 - spouse dying, on oxygen. Now deceased Aug 2013.
- Moving from the city (Oakville) to a small town - extremely difficult adjustment. Losing my job - Nortel - very difficult. Being an empty nester - very difficult. Sad community, high unemployment – a lot of poverty. I came from high income white collar city. People with money do much better and are better taken care of then people without money. Very, very sad.
- Thanks for caring.

L'Estrie (Bourget)

- My generation was lucky; but I participated by working hard to seize the opportunities.
- Health care services should be less specialized and more holistic, i.e. consider the person as a whole not just the injury or the illness.
- I'm at the end of the rope with misery with my spouse and my kids.
- I would really like the opportunity to participate in Bourget in a free program lasting a year or so on healthy eating and active living so I could lose the extra 75 pounds I'm carrying before the excess weight causes me lasting health problems. A healthy eating and active living program, similar to Fit for Life and based on the Canadian guide to healthy living and physical activity, would educate the participants (unlike the Weight Watchers Program that is expensive and whose point system doesn't teach how to eat well). Or there could be a nutritionist or a nurse for weighting once a week to guide and support us in the process as well as a group to exercise together and share recipes, ideas and encouragement to lose weight in a healthy and lasting way. Thank you.
- The government (all levels) need to help seniors more financially or otherwise. Fixed income very hard to deal with inflation, utility costs, etc! *Should not be taxed! Necessities!
- We pay too much for tax for services in return, and that's at all levels of government.
- The municipal government does not have fair policies, is not honest, and has an obligation to society. Thank you.

- Hope this survey is not provincial use.
- I just hope the people who run the country recognize that everything is going up (ex: rent, food, bills, etc) but no raises for pensions or other government programs. Please make them listen somehow, somehow. Thank you. God bless.
- Have a number of activities for seniors living in a village and with access to transportation.
- I wish there was a gym/exercise facility with daycare/childcare.
- I would like to have courses close to Bourget on active living, cooking or the environment.
- Different sorts of local courses to avoid travel. Facilitate or increase the number of sessions.
- Other courses for our age group.
- I'm three courses from finishing my diploma.
- This questionnaire seems to be aimed mostly at working adults. I'm retired. A lot of people need help managing their budget.
- More affordable housing.
- I live in the woods in a rural area – nothing is close by.
- Traffic is a big stress for the community.
- Thank God for the food banks!
- Best of luck with your study.

Mary Berglund (Ignace)

- Feel fortunate to have good healthcare and enough income to make ends meet. Even though some things could be better, I can't really complain.
- MBCHC provides good care. Would not like to see it reduced. Would be nice to have a doctor or nurse on call after hours.
- Ignace is a depressing town to retire in. Not enough activities & too far from major centre.
- No employment available in this town.
- Sorry, out of time.
- Live life to the fullest. Be positive and be happy.
- Long winters make this great comm. very isolating.
- These are pretty personal questions, for what reason?
- I gave up on this questionnaire - it does not seem at all relevant to the issues involved in one's senior years.

Vaughan

- I am very happy to live in Canada

- Thank you for providing health care for those who really need it and have no where to go otherwise. It's truly showing the Canadian spirit.
- I will like that this centre offers more programs for teenagers
- To sponsored my kids Pubistar.
- I want to share that those people who came to Canada as a refugee or immigrant - they want to driving but here driving classes are so expense so if some people or center to help them to learn driving and to help them complete programming. Thank you
- Please keep up the great work.
- No, Thank you! Great service
- Thank you for this wonderful service.
- Thank you all for these community surveys. These services help so many people.

Kapuskasing

- Add option for Metis status.

Guelph

- This community is great and Guelph community health centre is doing a wonderful job. I think may help women to get more confidence and overcome the fear that they lived in the past.
- More mental health questions would be beneficial for those living with mood disorders.
- Teeth care is needed in communities. Mindfulness and cognitive training in communities.
- I was employed full-time with the ministry of labour as an admin assistant for 10 years in Toronto. Left due to husbands job move to Guelph. Was at home with kids until divorce. I am underqualified for jobs held as I do not have college/university and over qualified for part-time service industry. I'm in a horrendous loop - I want to support my kids out of poverty. I need a hand-up not a hand-out.
- Thank you.



Measuring what matters

For more information about the Canadian Index of Wellbeing, visit ciw.ca
© 2014 Canadian Index of Wellbeing