

# **Guelph Community Wellbeing Survey**

A preliminary report for  
**The City of Guelph**

## **Stage 1 Results: A Profile of the Wellbeing of Guelph Residents**

Margo Hilbrecht  
Bryan Smale  
Robbie Shifman

*Canadian Index of Wellbeing*  
University of Waterloo

September 24, 2012



# Contents

---

Introduction .....	1
<i>List of abbreviations and terms</i> .....	1
Demographic Profile .....	3
Community Vitality .....	8
Democratic Engagement.....	10
Education .....	12
Environment .....	14
Healthy Populations .....	15
Leisure and Culture .....	16
Living Standards .....	20
Time Use .....	23
Overall Health and Wellbeing.....	26

Hilbrecht, M., Smale, B., & Shifman, R. (2012). *Stage 1 Results: A Profile of the Wellbeing of Guelph Residents*. A Preliminary Report for the City of Guelph, Ontario. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Index of Wellbeing and the University of Waterloo.

© 2012 Canadian Index of Wellbeing

# 1. Introduction

---

The Guelph Community Wellbeing Survey was launched on June 20, 2012 when invitations to participate were distributed to 10,512 randomly selected households. The survey closed on August 18, 2012. During that time, 1,299 electronic and 111 paper surveys were completed by Guelph residents. Of the 1,410 surveys, 1,401 were deemed usable. This represents a response rate of approximately 14%.

The results presented in this report are preliminary descriptive statistics, summarizing means and frequencies for 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 data were weighted by to ensure that results are representative geographically within the City of Guelph and that the gender distribution matched the City of Guelph 2011 census profile.

The report is organized by domain, and consists largely of tables. Some background information is provided, but text has been kept to a minimum. The descriptive results provide a general picture of wellbeing for the City of Guelph, and will assist in identifying areas for further consideration. Once priorities have been outlined, the CIW will proceed with more in-depth analyses.

## ***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



## 2. Demographic Profile

---

A description of survey participants is outlined in the following tables. We begin with the results for gender and Ward to provide a better understanding of how the responses were distributed initially. Then we illustrate how respondents were distributed once the data were weighted based on these two characteristics. This step helps ensure that the results of the survey are representative of the residents of the City of Guelph. Hence, all other tables in this report use weighted data.

A total of 1,401 usable responses to the survey were collected. Weighting of the data generates estimates on each characteristic based on 121,688 residents in the six Wards of the City of Guelph.

Table 2.1  
Distribution of Respondents by **Gender**

<b>Gender</b>	<b>Unweighted</b>		<b>Weighted</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
Male	518	38.4	58,045	47.7
Female	830	61.5	63,643	52.3
Transgendered	2	.1	–	–
<b>Total</b>	1,350	100.0	121,688	100.0

Table 2.2  
Distribution of Respondents by **Ward**

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Unweighted</b>		<b>Weighted</b>	
	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
East	268	19.1	22,737	18.7
North	196	14.0	17,387	14.3
Centre	207	14.8	16,830	13.8
West	191	13.6	21,273	17.5
University	249	17.8	18,633	15.3
South	289	20.6	24,828	20.4
<b>Total</b>	1,400	100.0	121,688	100.0

Table 2.3  
Profile of Respondents to Guelph Community Wellbeing Survey

<b>Characteristic</b> Attribute	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	58,045	47.7
Female	63,643	52.3
<b>Age</b>		
Under 25	2,479	2.1
25 to 34	14,376	11.9
35 to 44	21,604	17.9
45 to 54	27,899	23.1
55 to 64	28,148	23.3
65 to 74	17,652	14.6
75 to 84	6,892	5.7
85 and older	1,627	1.3
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single, never married	12,310	10.2
Married	79,623	65.7
Living common-law	9,983	8.2
Separated	4,257	3.5
Divorced	8,836	7.3
Widowed	6,149	5.1
<b>Education</b>		
Elementary school	2,002	1.7
High school	18,793	15.5
Post-secondary certificate	9,610	7.9
College diploma	26,107	21.5
University degree	37,538	31.0
Graduate degree	27,211	22.4



Table 2.3 (continued)...

<b>Characteristic</b> Attribute	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
<b>Main Activity</b>		
Working full-time	62,693	51.7
Working part-time	10,079	8.3
Unemployed / looking for work	2,335	1.9
Retired	34,283	28.3
Going to school	2,412	2.0
Household work / caring for children	5,489	4.5
On leave from work	3,892	3.2
<b>Household Income</b>		
Under \$10,000	2,452	2.2
\$10,000 to \$19,999	3,337	2.9
\$20,000 to \$29,999	5,914	5.2
\$30,000 to \$39,999	7,477	6.6
\$40,000 to \$59,999	18,185	16.0
\$60,000 to \$79,999	20,235	17.8
\$80,000 to \$99,999	18,376	16.2
\$100,000 to \$119,999	13,612	12.0
\$120,000 to \$149,999	12,344	10.9
\$150,000 and over	11,811	10.4
<b>Own or Rent Residence</b>		
Own	111,201	92.0
Rent	9,676	8.0
<b>Born in Canada</b>	92,603	76.4
<b>First Language</b>		
English	105,715	87.3
French	2,367	2.0
Other	12,949	10.7
<b>First Nation Status</b>	2,467	2.1
<b>Living with Disability</b>	9,676	11.8

Table 2.4  
Country of Birth of Respondents Other than Canada<sup>a</sup>

<b>Country of Birth</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
England	4,547	17.0
United States	2,823	10.6
The Netherlands	1,762	6.6
Italy	1,483	5.6
India	1,456	5.5
United Kingdom	1,240	4.6
Scotland	1,230	4.6
Germany	1,223	4.6
China	984	3.7
Northern Ireland	733	2.7
Philippines	491	1.8
Poland	488	1.8
Wales	420	1.6
Ireland	353	1.3
Croatia	342	1.3
Guyana	307	1.2
Sri Lanka	305	1.1
Romania	270	1.0

<sup>a</sup> 23.6% respondents were born outside of Canada. The countries listed in table represent 78.0% of Guelph residents born outside of Canada. The remaining 22.0% are not presented in the table due to low response rates. These countries include Afghanistan, Argentina, Asia, Azerbaijan, Australia, Barbados, Belgium, Bermuda, Brazil, British Virgin Islands, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Ghana, Honduras, Hong Kong, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lebanon, Libya, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mexico, Moldova, New Zealand, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, South Africa, Switzerland, Taiwan, Uganda, Ukraine, Vietnam, and Yugoslavia.

Table 2.5  
 First Language of Respondents Other than English or French<sup>a</sup>

<b>First Language</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
Italian	1,556	12.5
German	1,526	12.2
Dutch	1,117	9.0
Polish	610	4.9
Spanish	575	4.6
Chinese	566	4.5
Filipino	513	4.1
Gujarati	471	3.8
Mandarin	450	3.6
Hungarian	315	2.5
Portuguese	262	2.1
Ukrainian	247	2.0
Arabic	241	1.9
Serbian	231	1.9
Russian	217	1.7
Croatian	207	1.7
Malayan	202	1.6
Romanian	195	1.6
Cantonese	183	1.5

<sup>a</sup> The languages listed represent 77.7% of residents whose first language was something other than English or French. The first languages of the remaining 22.9% of residents are not presented in the table due to the low response rate. These additional languages include Czech, Estonian, Farsi, Finnish, Greek, Hindi, Indonesian, Irish, Japanese, Kalenjin, Kannada, Kuchi, Madeiran, Maltese, Moldavian, Pashto, Sinhalese, Slovenian, Tamil, Twi, Urdu, Uzbeki, Vietnamese, and Saraiki

Table 2.6  
 Time Spent Living in Guelph and At Current Residence

	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Years living at current residence	120,973	12.20	11.30
Years living in Guelph	120,804	24.35	18.03

### 3. Community Vitality

---

Table 3.1  
Respondents who Volunteered During the Past 12 Months

<b>Volunteered</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
No	55,187	46.6
Yes	63,187	53.4

Table 3.2  
Respondents who are a Member of or Participant in  
an Organization During the Past 12 Months

<b>Organization</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
Sports organization	48,121	40.9
Union or professional association	44,397	37.8
Cultural, educational or hobby organization	30,143	25.6
Religious affiliated group	27,282	23.3
Other organized group or activity	26,467	23.0
School group, neighbourhood, civic, or community association	19,720	16.9
Public interest group	16,339	14.1
Political party or group	12,927	11.1
Service club or fraternal organization	10,236	8.8

Table 3.3  
Respondents Providing Unpaid Help to Others in the Past 12 Months

<b>Activity</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
Domestic work at their home	61,827	52.3
Health related or personal care	61,187	51.4
Shopping, driving, appointments	54,351	45.9
Admin. – taxes, banking, paying bills, etc.	46,409	39.4
Teaching, coaching, tutoring, or literacy	27,378	23.3

Table 3.4  
Numbers of Social Contacts Reported by Respondents

<b>Type of Social Contact</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Relatives	120,022	0	120	6.19	7.64
Friends	119,907	0	50	5.69	5.33
Neighbours	119,908	0	50	4.33	4.57

Table 3.5  
Perceptions of Safety and Belonging

<b>Perceptions of Safety and Belonging</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Walking in neighbourhood at night	120,047	5.74	1.54
Walking in Guelph at night	120,649	4.62	1.73
Frequency of discomfort in neighbourhood due to ethnicity, race, culture, skin colour	120,884	1.47	1.17
Sense of belonging to local community	120,785	4.67	1.58

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scales where higher scores reflect greater feelings safety of belonging

Table 3.6  
Respondents' Perceptions of Dimensions of Sense of Community

<b>Sense of Community<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Social climate and bonds <sup>c</sup>	119,146	5.13	.86
Help in case of need <sup>b</sup>	118,486	4.99	.84
Needs fulfilment	117,630	4.97	.99

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scales where higher scores reflect greater satisfaction with community

<sup>b</sup> Notes: *Social climate and bonds* is an average of responses to statements assessing friendships, sociability, and ability to connect with people in the city  
*Help in case of need* includes responses to statements about the number and willingness of people to provide help in an emergency of situation of need  
*Needs fulfilment* refers to perceptions of the range and accessibility of opportunities to satisfy activity needs.

## 4. Democratic Engagement

---

Table 4.1  
 Respondents Participating in Democratic Activity  
 During the Past 12 Months

<b>Activity</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
Participated in a local event in support of a charitable organization	37,476	30.9
Participated in a local event in support of my community	30,046	24.9
Wrote a letter/e-mail to a City official about a local issue	24,627	20.4
Attended a Ward/neighbourhood meeting	11,932	9.9
Attended a City planning meeting or open house	11,498	9.5
Joined a Facebook page on a local issue	10,457	8.7
Wrote a letter to the editor of a newspaper	8,891	7.3
Attended a City council meeting	7,674	6.3
Participated in a public demonstration or protest	5,574	4.6

Table 4.2  
 Respondents who Voted During Previous Elections

<b>Election</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
Federal	109,772	91.6
Provincial	108,359	90.5
Municipal	100,638	84.4

Table 4.3  
Level of Interest in Politics at the Federal, Provincial, and Municipal Levels

<b>Interest in Politics</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Federal	6.98	2.48
Provincial	6.89	2.40
Municipal	6.61	2.50

<sup>a</sup> based on 10-point scales where higher scores reflect greater interest

Table 4.4a  
Respondents who Feel Policies of the Local Government  
Have Made Them Better Off<sup>a</sup>

<b>Perception of Local Policies</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
1 Much worse off	5,655	4.7
2	12,375	10.3
3	15,408	12.8
4 Have not made a difference/not sure	56,040	46.5
5	17,838	14.8
6	10,635	8.8
7 Much better off	2,461	2.0

<sup>a</sup> Table 4.4a reports the distribution of responses across all responses categories. Table 4.4b summarises the responses as a mean score

Table 4.4b  
Respondents' Perception of Whether Policies of the Local Government  
Have Made Them Better Off

	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Overall Perception of Local Policies	120,411	3.91	1.28

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scale where higher scores reflect perception that policies have made people better off

## 5. Education

---

Table 5.1  
Respondents Who Took Formal Education Courses During the Past Year

<b>Type of Course</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
To prepare for a potential future job	29,440	24.7
To lead to a qualification related to your current job	21,903	18.4
To improve your skills	13,936	11.7
To help you get started in a current or new job	207	.2

Table 5.2  
Respondents Who Took Courses for Interest in the Past Year?

<b>Courses of Interest</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
No	97,683	81.6
Yes	22,064	18.4

Table 5.3  
Number of Courses Taken by Respondents for Interest in the Past Year

	<b>n</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Courses taken for interest	114,957	0	8	1.18	.50



Table 5.4  
 Respondents' Perceptions of Opportunities for  
 Formal Education and Courses of Interest

<b>Opportunities To Take Courses</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
There are plenty of opportunities to take courses of interest	118,938	4.99	1.01
There are plenty of opportunities to take formal education courses	119,549	4.98	1.04
Schools are nearby where I can upgrade my educational qualification	118,437	4.74	1.12
Places are nearby where I can take classes out of interest	118,968	4.74	1.03
There are many opportunities to get to know people from different cultures	118,526	4.41	.99
Courses I am interested in taking are reasonably priced	117,841	4.27	1.09
The courses I want to take are offered at convenient times	118,517	4.18	1.30

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scales where higher scores reflect greater opportunities perceived

## 6. Environment

Table 6.1  
Respondents' Perceptions of the Environment in Guelph

<b>Environmental Aspects</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
I have a responsibility to protect the natural environment	120,385	5.65	1.01
Opportunities to enjoy nature	120,625	5.51	.94
Quality of the natural environment	121,009	5.11	1.00
Opportunities to enjoy nature in my neighbourhood	120,938	5.06	1.16
Quality of the natural environment in my neighbourhood	120,781	5.00	1.15
Water quality	120,510	4.89	1.30
Air quality	120,832	4.67	1.08
Traffic congestion is not a problem	120,800	3.61	1.48
I participate regularly in events to protect nature	120,149	3.22	1.31

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scales where higher scores reflect greater agreement with aspect of environment in the City of Guelph

Table 6.2  
Respondents' Participation in Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities During the Past 12 Months

<b>Conservation/Sustainable Activities</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Recycle materials	120,539	4.55	.85
Separate waste	121,162	4.55	.91
Conserve energy	121,231	4.37	.86
Conserve water	121,228	4.17	.99
Tried to reduce household waste	119,515	4.00	1.05
Reuse materials	121,200	3.71	1.14
Purchase foods produced locally	121,159	2.94	1.08
Walk/bike/take public transit	121,184	2.52	1.32

<sup>a</sup> based on 5-point scales where higher scores reflect higher frequency of activities

## 7. Healthy Populations

Table 7.1  
Respondents' Self-Assessed Physical and Mental Health

<b>Assessment of Health</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Mental Health	121,202	3.80	0.89
Physical Health	121,272	3.52	0.91

<sup>a</sup> based on 5-point scales where higher scores reflect more positive assessments of health (1 = "poor"; 5 = "excellent")

Table 7.2  
Respondents' Perceptions of Health Behaviours During the Past Week

<b>Health Behaviour</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
I could perform all my daily living activities	120,779	5.33	1.17
I ate healthy meals regularly	121,242	5.32	1.13
I had a lot of energy	121,322	4.73	1.23
I took part in good quality exercise	121,127	4.67	1.33
I could not get going	120,190	2.77	1.23
Physical pain prevented me from doing what I needed to do	121,187	2.51	1.42

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scales where higher scores reflect more positive assessments of health

Table 7.3  
Respondents' Perceptions of Health Care Services in Guelph

<b>Health Care Services</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Overall quality	121,167	3.25	.93
Overall accessibility	121,176	3.02	.99

<sup>a</sup> based on 5-point scales where higher scores reflect more positive assessments of health (1 = "poor"; 5 = "excellent")

## 8. Leisure and Culture

Table 8.1  
Typical Number of Times Respondents Participated in *Physical Activity*  
During the Past Month

Type of Activity	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Light exercise	118,747	0	130	16.48	14.38
Physical exercise	113,082	0	50	6.55	7.90
Individual sports	111,245	0	30	1.19	4.42
Team sports	110,293	0	30	1.14	2.96

Table 8.2  
Typical Number of Times Respondents Participated in “*Getting Out*” Activities  
During the Past Month

Type of Activity	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Getting together with friends	119,733	0	60	5.39	5.01
Going out to clubs, bars, taverns	114,098	0	30	1.13	2.32
Going out to sports events as a spectator	113,814	0	50	0.96	2.66
Going out to the movies	114,014	0	10	0.69	1.00

Table 8.3  
Typical Number of Times Respondents Participated in *Home-Based Activities*  
During the Past Month

Type of Activity	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Searching Internet for interest	119,657	0	1,000	12.12	45.15
Reading for pleasure	120,886	0	200	9.63	10.91
Socializing with others online	116,029	0	500	8.15	25.73
Doing puzzles	115,323	0	60	2.63	4.98
Playing computer games online	114,514	0	100	2.36	6.71
Hobbies	114,287	0	60	2.02	4.45
Playing board or card games	113,994	0	50	1.10	2.74

Table 8.4  
 Typical Number of Times Respondents Participated in *Cultural Activities*  
 During the Past Month

<b>Type of Activity</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Attending musical concerts	116,381	0	75	2.58	4.95
Visiting art galleries/museums	115,473	0	40	1.79	2.86
Attend live theatre	115,013	0	30	1.60	2.69
Attending festivals	115,662	0	15	1.55	1.75
Attend ballet/dance perform.	112,244	0	20	.49	1.27

Table 8.5  
 Amount of Time Respondents Spend Watching Television  
 (minutes per day)

	<b>n</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Watching television per day	120,499	0	1,440	107.13	103.45

Table 8.6  
 Number of Days Respondents Had on Holidays in Previous Year

<b>Type of Activity</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Days on holiday	120,511	0	365	20.42	28.50

Table 8.7  
 Respondents' Use of Recreation and Cultural Facilities During the Past Year

<b>Recreation and Cultural Facility</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Local park	120,776	2.86	1.21
Public library	120,090	2.54	1.36
Multi-purpose recreation centre	120,111	1.76	1.04
Performing arts facility	120,281	1.65	.73
Swimming pool	120,126	1.64	1.05
Sports fields	119,712	1.63	1.05
Historic site in Guelph	120,243	1.53	.68
Arena	119,550	1.49	.90
Splash pads or wading pools	119,473	1.35	.78
Outdoor skating rink	119,601	1.30	.63
Visual arts facility	119,892	1.26	.55

<sup>a</sup> based on 5-point scales where higher scores reflect higher frequency of facility use (1 = "never"; 5 = "all of the time")

Table 8.8  
 Respondents' Perceived Accessibility of Recreation and Cultural Facilities

<b>Recreation and Cultural Facility</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
There is a local park nearby	120,624	5.72	1.12
Facilities are easy to get to from home	120,875	5.04	1.17
Places are nearby to take classes of interest	120,187	4.72	1.19
The cost does not prevent participation	120,159	4.66	1.33
Facilities are welcoming	119,596	4.55	.95
Programs are at convenient times	119,908	4.40	1.13
Childcare is available if needed	114,591	4.09	.84

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scales where higher scores reflect higher perceived accessibility

Table 8.9  
 Respondents' Perceptions of Dimensions of Leisure Experience

<b>Dimension<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Relaxation	119,203	5.35	.81
Physiological	119,398	5.12	.96
Social	118,879	4.80	.89
Educational	115,967	4.74	.81

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher agreement that dimension is important part of leisure experience

<sup>b</sup> Notes: *Relaxation* – leisure contributes to relaxation, stress relief and emotional wellbeing

*Physiological* – leisure contributes to physical fitness and health

*Social* – leisure facilitates social connections and the development and/or maintenance of social bonds

*Educational* – leisure allows opportunities to learn new things, learn about different people, or try new things

## 9. Living Standards

---

Table 9.1  
Respondents Who Work for Pay

<b>Work for Pay?</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
No	39,731	32.8
Yes	81,488	67.2

Table 9.2  
Number of Paid Jobs Held by Respondents

<b>Number of Paid Jobs</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
1	68,357	84.4
2	10,578	13.1
3	1,657	2.0
4 <sup>a</sup>	–	–
5	68	.1
6	82	.1
7	106	.1
8	68	.1
9 <sup>a</sup>	–	–
10	64	.1

<sup>a</sup> insufficient data

Of the 67.2% of respondents who work for pay, 84.4% have one job

Table 9.3  
Respondents' Weekly Hours Spent Working for Pay on *Main Job*

<b>Work Hour Categories</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
Less than 25 hours	13,135	16.2
25 to 34 hours	7,015	8.7
35 to 49 hours	43,785	54.1
50 to 59 hours	11,910	14.7
60 or more hours	5,145	6.4



Table 9.4  
 Respondents' Weekly Hours Spent Working for Pay on *Other Job(s)*

<b>Work Hour Categories</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
Less than 10 hours	5,734	43.2
10 to 20 hours	6,603	49.7
21 to 35 hours	582	4.4
More than 35 hours	354	2.7

Table 9.5  
 Respondents' Workday Commute from Home to Workplace (minutes per day)

<b>Type of Activity</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Commute time in minutes	80,982	0	130	21.82	21.62

Table 9.6  
 Respondents' Perceptions of Dimensions of Job Fit

<b>Dimension<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Job promotion	80,327	4.46	1.12
Job security	80,584	3.51	1.29

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher agreement that dimension is important part of job fit

<sup>b</sup> Notes: *Job promotion* – comprised of questions related to opportunities for promotion, to use one's training and education, recognition of effort, and appropriate remuneration

*Job security* – comprised of perceptions of job security and experience of an undesirable change in work situation

Table 9.7  
 Respondents' Perceptions of Financial Security During the Past Year

<b>Financial Security Experience</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Not enough money to buy things I wanted	114,284	2.23	1.55
Not enough money to buy things I needed	114,598	1.39	.98
Could not pay bills on time	114,915	1.32	.83
Ate less because there was not enough food or money for food	114,793	1.24	.80

<sup>a</sup> based on 5-point scales where higher scores reflect higher frequency of these experiences

Table 9.8  
 Respondents' Perceptions of Housing Situation During the Past Year

<b>Housing</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
To afford residence, must sometimes have to do without other needs	114,377	2.90	1.62
Rather be living in a different residence	114,422	2.86	1.62
Residence is barely affordable	114,271	2.74	1.53
Residence is less than adequate for needs	114,231	2.73	1.31
Unhappy with residence	114,554	2.38	1.21

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scales where higher scores reflect greater agreement with aspect of current housing situation

## 10. Time Use

---

Table 10.1  
 Respondents Providing Unpaid Care to  
 Children and Older or Dependent Adult(s)

<b>Provide Unpaid Care to...</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Pct.</b>
Children	27,784	24.3
Older or dependent adult(s)	15,773	13.8

Table 10.2  
 Weekly Hours Spent by Respondents Providing Unpaid Care  
 to Children and Older or Dependent Adult(s)

<b>Unpaid Care Provided to...</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Min.</b>	<b>Max.</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Children in family	26,625	0	168	41.81	53.00
Children not in family	19,591	0	40	1.70	4.55
Older or dependent adult family member(s)	15,125	0	168	11.82	21.07
Older or dependent adult(s) who is a neighbour or friend	10,760	0	20	1.12	2.81

Table 10.3  
 Respondents' Perceptions of Time Adequacy

<b>Adequate Time</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
To be your self	112,988	7.45	2.36
To prepare or eat healthy meals	113,276	7.39	2.20
To get enough sleep/rest	114,163	7.18	2.68
To be with your partner or spouse	100,913	7.15	2.48
To be with the children you live with	82,509	7.08	2.39
To socialize	113,079	6.99	2.39
To form and sustain serious relationships	103,392	6.93	2.50
For your family to be together	105,308	6.93	2.43
To complete housework or chores	113,167	6.85	2.33
To keep in shape	113,427	6.81	2.49
To nurture your spiritual and/or creative side	110,575	6.56	2.62
To participate in or be active in the community	110,465	6.22	2.61
Overall sense of time adequacy <sup>b</sup>	110,130	6.97	1.98

<sup>a</sup> based on 10-point scales where higher scores reflect more adequate amounts of time perceived by respondent

<sup>b</sup> Overall sense of time adequacy based on at least 9 of 12 items in scale

Table 10.4  
 Respondents' Perceptions of Dimensions of Work-Life Balance

<b>Dimension<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Work/personal life enhancement	80,697	4.44	1.00
Work interference with personal life	79,865	3.70	1.25
Personal life interference with work	80,252	2.74	.95

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher agreement with balance in work-life dimension

<sup>b</sup> Notes: *Work/personal life enhancement* refers to the positive transfer of mood and energy between work and personal domains  
*Work interference with personal life* refers to difficulties related to the detrimental influence of work on personal needs, time, energy and relationships  
*Personal life interference with work* refers to difficulties performing job requirements because of personal matters

## 11. Overall Health and Wellbeing

---

Table 11.1  
Respondents' Level of Satisfaction with Aspects of Wellbeing

<b>Aspect of Wellbeing</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
Neighbourhood as a place to live	120,405	5.63	1.24
Access to recreational and parks opportunities	119,,748	5.48	1.18
Environmental quality of neighbourhood	119,777	5.47	1.24
Mental wellbeing	120,671	5.37	1.37
Personal relationships	119,991	5.28	1.41
Access to arts and cultural opportunities	118,546	5.01	1.26
Access to educational opportunities	117,695	4.89	1.28
Leisure time	119,623	4.87	1.44
Work situation	107,194	4.84	1.61
Physical wellbeing	120,215	4.81	1.44
Financial situation	119,968	4.76	1.52
Sense of belonging to this community	119,788	4.56	1.39
Honesty and transparency of the local government	102,295	3.73	1.60

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scales where higher scores reflect higher levels of satisfaction

Table 11.2  
 Respondents' Level of Satisfaction with  
 Internal and External Factors Affecting Wellbeing

<b>Level of Satisfaction<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>Mean<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>
External Factors	4.96	.96
Internal Factors	4.94	1.07
Overall Wellbeing	4.94	.89

<sup>a</sup> based on 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher levels of satisfaction

<sup>b</sup> Notes: *External factors* include satisfaction with the neighbourhood, community, access to recreation, parks, and cultural opportunities, environmental quality of the neighbourhood, and the local government

*Internal factors* include mental and physical wellbeing, leisure time, personal relationships, financial and work situation

*Overall wellbeing* is the average of all external and internal factors