

A Profile of Resident Wellbeing in Wood Buffalo Region

A Summary of Results from the CIW Community Wellbeing Survey

Submitted to:
FuseSocial

Submitted by:
Canadian Index of Wellbeing
Faculty of Applied Health Sciences
University of Waterloo

November 2019



When referencing this report, please use the following citation:

Smale, B., Gao, M., & Jiang, K. (2019). *A Profile of Resident Wellbeing in Wood Buffalo Region: A Summary of Results from the CIW Community Wellbeing Survey*. Waterloo, ON: Canadian Index of Wellbeing and the University of Waterloo.

© 2019 Canadian Index of Wellbeing

Canadian Index of Wellbeing
Faculty of Applied Health Sciences
University of Waterloo
Waterloo, Ontario
Canada N2L 3G1

For more information: www.ciw.ca



@ciwnetwork

Contents

What is Wellbeing?	1
Introduction	3
Weighting of data	5
Reading the report	6
List of abbreviations and terms	6
Demographic Profile	7
Community Vitality	15
Volunteering and Civic Participation	15
Social Connections and Support	16
Perceptions of Safety and Belonging	17
Sense of Community	19
Feelings of Social Isolation	20
Healthy Populations	21
Self-Assessed Health	21
<i>Impact of Mental Health Issues</i>	22
Democratic Engagement	23
Interest in Politics	23
Confidence in and Feelings of Influence on Government	25
Environment	27
Perceptions of Environment	27
Participation in Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities	28
Leisure and Culture	29
Participation in Leisure and Culture Activities	29
<i>Physically Active Leisure</i>	29
<i>Social Leisure</i>	29
<i>Cultural Leisure</i>	30
<i>Computer-Related Leisure</i>	30
<i>Television and Online Movies</i>	31
<i>Annual Holidays</i>	31
Use of Community Recreation and Cultural Facilities	32
Perceived Accessibility of Community Recreation and Cultural Facilities	33

Education	34
Ongoing Formal Education and Courses for Interest.....	34
Perceptions of Educational Opportunities	35
Living Standards	36
Working for Pay and Its Characteristics.....	36
Perceptions of Job Fit and Security	38
Work-Life Balance.....	39
Experiences of Financial Insecurity.....	41
Internet Access and Perceived Quality	42
Time Use	43
Time Providing Support to Others.....	43
Feeling the Time Crunch	45
Perceptions of Time Adequacy	46
Overall Wellbeing	48
Life Satisfaction	48
Satisfaction with Aspects of Wellbeing (from CIW Framework)	49

What is Wellbeing?

There are many definitions of wellbeing. *The Canadian Index of Wellbeing* has adopted the following as its working definition:

The presence of the highest possible quality of life in its full breadth of expression focused on but not necessarily exclusive to: good living standards, robust health, a sustainable environment, vital communities, an educated populace, balanced time use, high levels of democratic participation, and access to and participation in leisure and culture.

Introduction

The Wood Buffalo Community Wellbeing Survey was launched in the spring of 2019 and was administered to the residents using two strategies. First, in the initial phase, just over 28,000 letters were mailed to all households throughout Wood Buffalo region inviting one individual at least 16 years of age from within each household to complete the survey. The letters directed residents to an online site where they could complete the survey, or if they preferred, provided them with the option of requesting a paper copy of the questionnaire. Second, later during the survey period through targeted invitations and extensive social media efforts, residents who had not yet completed a questionnaire were encouraged to visit the online survey site or request a paper version.

When the survey was closed towards the end of the summer, 1,285 residents had provided complete and usable responses. Almost all of the surveys were completed online with only 14 paper questionnaires (1.1%) submitted by mail.

An accurate estimate of the overall response can only be estimated for two principal reasons. First, the total number of letters of invitation that ultimately reached residents could not be verified due to significant changes in the community in recent years as a result of the natural disasters. Second, promoting the survey through social media, while effective, does not provide evidence of how many residents were actually reached. Consequently, an accurate count of the total survey population – that is, the number of *potential* participants – could not be made. Nevertheless, based on previous experience with mailed surveys and an examination of the distribution of responses by areas within Wood Buffalo Region, the final response rate was estimated to be between 8 and 10%. Based on extensive research done by major polling firms (e.g., Rand Corporation), this response rate is consistent with most general population surveys.

With a final sample size of 1,285, the margin of error when reporting the overall results for Wood Buffalo Region is estimated to be within $\pm 2.7\%$, 19 times out of 20. This means that when an overall percentage is reported (e.g., 54.0% residents responded a certain way), you can conclude with 95% confidence the result is accurate, give or take 2.7%.

The vast majority of surveys were completed by residents within Fort McMurray (97.1%) with only a handful submitted by residents of rural communities in the Region (2.9%). Given this distribution, the 174 respondents for whom their location within the Region was not known, it seems likely that they, too, are principally residents of Fort McMurray (see Table 1).

Table 1
Distribution of Respondents by Core Geographic Area^a

Geographic Area	Respondents	
	n	Pct.
Fort McMurray	1,079	97.1
Rural communities	32	2.9
Total	1,111	100.0

^a Geographic information was missing for 174 respondents (13.5% of 1,285 total respondents).

Within Fort McMurray, three-quarters of the surveys ($n = 832$, 75.0%) were completed by residents of Timberlea, Thickwood, and Fort McMurray (see Table 2). An additional 12.6% of the responses came from residents in neighbouring areas – Lower Townsite and Parsons Creek – meaning that almost 9 in 10 residents responding to the survey live in these five areas of the Region. Further, approximately two-thirds of the survey respondents (66.0%) live to the northwest of the Athabaska River. This residential pattern might be important when reflecting on the results, especially to questions when location is a consideration.

Table 2
Distribution of Respondents by Geographic Area

Region ^a Area	Respondents	
	n	Pct.
Fort McMurray		
Timberlea	452	40.7
Thickwood	225	20.3
Fort McMurray (in town)	155	14.0
Lower Townsite	84	7.6
Parsons Creek	55	5.0
Abasand	42	3.8
Gregoire	29	2.6
Beacon Hill	28	2.5
Waterways	7	0.6
Saline Creek	2	0.2
Rural Communities^b		
Saprae Creek Estates	17	1.5
Anzac	13	1.2
Fort Chipewyan	2	0.2

^a Geographic information was missing for 174 respondents (13.5% of 1,285 total respondents).

^b No responses received from Conklin, Draper, Fort Fitzgerald, Fort McKay, Gregoire Lake Estates, or Janvier.

This report consists largely of summary, descriptive statistics. It provides frequency distributions and measures of central tendency for all questions across the eight domains comprising the Canadian Index of Wellbeing (CIW) conceptual framework: *Community Vitality, Democratic Engagement, Education, Environment, Healthy Populations, Leisure and Culture, Living Standards, and Time Use*. A demographic profile of Wood Buffalo residents is presented first and measures of overall wellbeing are reported to conclude the main body of the report. Taken together the unedited comments of survey participants provided in the accompanying report, *Wood Buffalo Region: Resident Comments about Wellbeing from the Community Wellbeing Survey*, the results presented here provide a comprehensive profile of the overall wellbeing of Wood Buffalo Region residents.

Weighting of data

In order to ensure the results from the survey are representative of Wood Buffalo Region residents, the data were weighted by sex and age grouping to match 2019 population estimates based on the growth rates derived from the 2016 Canadian Census profile ($N = 56,656$). Population projections to 2019 were based on just those residents 15 years of age and older to match the age range of potential survey participants. By weighting the data, the overall results presented in this report accurately reflect the responses of residents without over- or under-representing any groups based on sex or age. Weighting based on location was not done because of insufficient numbers of respondents from some areas within the Region.

The following two tables provide a description of survey participants based on sex and age group, which were used in the weighting procedure (see Tables 3 and 4). Each table presents the unweighted results for age and sex, and then presents the results for these two characteristics once survey weights were applied. As noted, survey weights were based on the results taken from 2016 Canadian Census data with estimates of the population 15 years of age and older to 2019 based on growth rate. Weighting thereby adjusted the distributions of *respondents* to the survey to match the distributions of *residents* in the region.

Table 3
Distribution of Respondents *by Sex*^a

Sex	Unweighted		Weighted Sample	
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.
Female	689	64.1	25,762	45.5
Male	386	35.9	30,894	54.5
Total	1,075	100.0	56,656	100.0

^a 210 respondents did not indicate their sex.

Table 4
Distribution of Respondents *by Age Group*^a

Age Group	Unweighted		Weighted Sample	
	n	Pct.	n	Pct.
16 to 29 years	143	13.6	15,622	27.6
30 to 39 years	303	28.7	16,004	28.2
40 to 49 years	253	24.0	11,152	19.7
50 to 59 years	229	21.7	9,704	17.1
60 years and older	126	12.0	4,173	7.4
Total	1,054	100.0	56,656	100.0

^a 231 respondents did not indicate their age.

Reading the report

As noted, the results presented in the tables comprising the rest of this report are weighted to reflect estimates for the population, 15 years of age and older, of Wood Buffalo Region. In some tables, the total number of responses does not equal the total population due to missing responses. Non-response typically only represents a handful of people, so the totals are not substantially below the total population (15 years of age and older) for the Region. In other cases, greater numbers of people might simply have chosen not to answer certain questions for a variety of reasons (e.g., felt the question was not relevant to them, did not recall the requested information). For example, many people often decline to answer a question concerning income because they consider it personal; in this survey, almost one-quarter of the respondents (22.5%) chose not to report their incomes, which is fairly typical. For a few of the questions, response categories of “does not apply” or “don’t know” were offered to respondents, and these answers are not reported in the tables. Finally, total percentages in some tables may not always add up to precisely 100% due to rounding.

Table numbers linked to titles correspond with survey question numbers (e.g., Table J2 for age of respondent refers to question J2 on the questionnaire). For tables listing several items that respondents have reported participation or have rated on scales such as level of agreement or perceptions (e.g., Table A11 concerning perceptions of sense of community as a place to live), the items have been organised from highest to lowest based on their mean scores; in other words, they do not adhere to the order they appear in the questionnaire. By reorganising the items in this way, a ranking of the items is provided indicating, for example, those aspects with which residents agree most to least. Finally, not all response categories are reported in the table for some open-ended demographic questions, particularly when the number of responses is very low. In these instances, explanatory text follows the table.

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 J1
Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Sex

Gender	n	Pct.
Female	25,762	45.5
Male	30,895	54.5

Table J2
Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Age^a

Age	n	Pct.
16 to 29 years	15,622	27.6
30 to 39 years	16,004	28.2
40 to 49 years	11,152	19.7
50 to 59 years	9,704	17.1
60 years and older	4,173	7.4

^a Residents had to be at least 16 years of age to participate in the survey.
The average age of the respondents was 39.4 years (*SD* = 12.63).

Table J3
Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Marital Status

Marital Status	n	Pct.
Married	31,780	56.2
Single, never married	11,290	19.9
Living common-law	8,787	15.5
Separated	1,726	3.1
Divorced	2,343	4.1
Widowed	670	1.2

Table J4
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Highest Level of Education Completed

Education	n	Pct.
Elementary school	286	0.5
High school	7,622	13.5
Post-secondary certificate, trade or apprenticeship	15,296	27.1
College diploma	12,162	21.5
University degree (e.g., B.A., B.Sc.)	15,308	27.1
Graduate degree (e.g., M.A., M.Sc., Ph.D.)	5,791	10.3

Table J5
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Main Activity

Main Activity	n	Pct.
Employed full-time	43,542	77.4
Employed part-time	2,107	3.7
Self-employed	1,775	3.2
Unemployed, looking for work	1,205	2.1
Unemployed, <i>not</i> looking for work	502	0.9
Non-standard employment ^a	491	0.9
Retired, by choice	1,957	3.5
Retired, <i>not</i> by choice	547	1.0
Going to school	1,113	2.0
Household work/caring for children	1,647	2.9
On leave from work due to long-term disability	616	1.1
Temporary leave from work (e.g., illness, parental leave)	766	1.4

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

Table J6
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Work Schedule

Work Schedule	n	Pct.
Regular daytime, Monday to Friday	29,584	60.2
Non-standard shift schedule ^a	14,843	30.2
Irregular shift schedule ^b	4,692	9.6

^a Includes evenings, nights, and or rotating shifts throughout the week.

^b Includes irregular shifts, on call, compressed work weeks.

Table J7
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Type of Industry, Business, or Service Respondent Works For

Type of Work	n	Pct.
Oil, gas, and mining	27,694	53.5
Health care and social assistance	3,775	7.3
Educational services	3,725	7.2
Management, administrative, other support	2,640	5.1
Professional, scientific, and technical services	1,915	3.7
Public administration	1,710	3.3
Construction	1,560	3.0
Information, culture, and recreation	1,110	2.1
Trade (retail and wholesale)	1,028	2.0
Transportation and warehousing	1,035	2.0
Finance, insurance, real estate, and leasing	546	1.1
Accommodation and food services	399	0.8
Utilities	285	0.6
Agriculture	74	0.1
Forestry, fishing	74	0.1
Manufacturing	64	0.1
Other services	4,109	7.9

Table J8
Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Annual Household Income from All Sources

Annual Household Income	n	Pct.
Under \$10,000	599	1.1
\$10,000 to \$19,999	545	1.0
\$20,000 to \$29,999	647	1.2
\$30,000 to \$39,999	875	1.6
\$40,000 to \$59,999	1,685	3.2
\$60,000 to \$79,999	3,286	6.1
\$80,000 to \$99,999	2,861	5.4
\$100,000 to \$119,999	5,370	10.1
\$120,000 to \$149,999	6,715	12.6
\$150,000 to \$199,999	11,848	22.2
\$200,000 to \$299,999	14,284	26.7
\$300,000 and over	4,714	8.8

Table J9a
Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Born in Canada

Born in Canada	n	Pct.
Yes	47,221	83.8
No	9,139	16.2

Table J9b
Country of Birth of Respondents Other than Canada

Note: Due to low response rates, percentages cannot be accurately reported for country of birth for those individuals not born in Canada. Among those who did report place of birth, the countries other than Canada included a wide diversity of birth places: United Kingdom, Malaysia, Trinidad, Pakistan, India, Iran, Germany, USA, Saudi Arabia, China, Guyana, Sierra Leone, Brazil, Bosnia, Philippines, South Africa, Fiji, Nepal, Zambia, Korea, Sri Lanka, Venezuela, Slovenia, Netherlands, Brunei, Poland, France, Israel, and Mexico.

Table J10
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Years Lived in Canada (if not born in Canada)

Years lived in Canada	n	Pct.
5 years or fewer	778	8.7
6 to 10 years	2,195	24.7
11 to 15 years	1,902	21.4
16 to 20 years	1,716	19.3
21 to 30 years	1,021	11.5
31 to 50 years	897	10.1
51 years or more	395	4.4

Note: For those respondents who were not born in Canada ($n = 9,139$, or 16.2%), the average length of time they have lived in Canada is 17.78 years ($SD = 13.08$).

Table J11
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
First Nations, Metis, or Inuit

First Nations status	n	Pct.
No	50,151	88.9
Yes	4,003	7.1

Table J12
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Cultural, Ethnic, or National Background

Cultural, ethnic, or national background	n	Pct.
Canadian	37,977	67.6
English	2,306	4.1
East Indian	2,189	3.9
First Nations / Métis	1,948	3.5
Filipino	1,239	2.2
African origins	1,148	2.0

Notes: Percentages of less than 2.0% are not reported in the table.

Some of the backgrounds *not* reported in the table include Irish, Dutch, Scottish, Ukranian, German, and French. Among the many other backgrounds reported, they represented less than 1.0% of the total responses received.

Table J13a
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
First Language

First language	n	Pct.
English	51,566	91.4
French	992	1.8
Other	3,870	6.9

Table J13b
 Language Spoken Most Often Home by Respondents

Language spoken at home	n	Pct.
English	50,241	89.9
Gujarati	980	1.8
French	824	1.5
Tagalog/Filipino	760	1.4
Spanish	503	0.9
Urdu	313	0.6
Arabic	213	0.4

Notes: Percentages of less than 0.4% are not reported in the table.
 Other languages spoken most often at home, but *not* reported in the table include
 Aboriginal languages, Somali, and Chinese.

Table J14a
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Living with a Disability or Chronic Illness

Living with disability/chronic illness	n	Pct.
No	47,574	84.4
Yes	8,819	15.6

Table J14b
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Physical Health, Mental Health, or Chronic Illness Limits Full Participation in Community

Participation in community limited by...	n	Pct.
Physical disability	2,148	24.4
Mental health challenge	3,094	35.5
Chronic illness	2,487	28.3

Table J15
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Years Resident of Wood Buffalo Region

	n	Mean	Std. Dev.
Years resident of Region	55,287	15.06	11.41

Table J16
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Years Lived in Current Residence

	n	Mean	Std. Dev.
Years living in current location	53,016	7.78	7.29

Table J17
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Own, Rent, or Lease Residence Where Respondent is Living

Own or rent	n	Pct.
Own	42,861	76.5
Rent	11,372	20.3
Lease	344	0.6
Other	1,470	2.6

Note: Other types of living arrangements include living with parents, evacuated since wildfire, company owned, and others.

Table J18
 Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Percentage of Monthly Income Spent on Housing (Mortgage or Rent)

Income spent on housing	n	Pct.
Less than 30%	26,139	47.4
30% to 50%	23,585	42.7
More than 50%	5,475	9.9

Table J19
Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Main Form of Transportation Used by Respondent to Get Around Community

Main transportation used	n	Pct.
Personal car	52,322	93.2
Walk	1,392	2.5
Public transit	1,029	1.8
Other	1,112	2.0
Bicycle	256	0.5

Note: Other types of transportation used include company vehicles, taxi, and car pool.

Table J20a
Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Type of Household in Which Respondent is Living

Household type	n	Pct.
Couple living with children at home	21,336	38.3
Couple with no children	10,977	19.7
Adult living alone	7,600	13.6
Couple with no children at home (i.e., "empty nester")	7,144	12.8
Adult sharing accommodation	3,626	6.5
Adult with children living at home	2,222	4.0
Other household type ^a	2,828	5.1

^a Other household types include adult children living with parents, multigenerational households, and blended families.

Table J20b
Profile of Respondents to Wood Buffalo Region Community Wellbeing Survey:
Percentage of Households with at Least One Child of Selected Ages

Households with children	n	Pct.
Under 5 years	11,579	20.8
5 to 12 years	10,315	18.5
13 to 18 years	6,545	11.8
Over 18 years	12,938	23.3

Community Vitality

Volunteering and Civic Participation

Table A1
Residents who Volunteered During the Past 12 Months

Volunteered	n	Pct.
Volunteered in past 12 months	28,403	50.1

Table A2
Residents who were a Member of or Participant in an Organisation During the Past 12 Months

Organisation type	n	Pct.
Union or professional association	21,464	39.0
Sports or recreational organisation (e.g., hockey league, health club, golf club)	19,377	35.2
Cultural, educational or hobby organisation (e.g., theatre group, book club, bridge club)	9,603	17.4
Faith-based group (e.g., church youth group, choir)	9,044	16.4
Public interest group (e.g., focused on the environment, animal welfare, food security, homelessness)	7,347	13.4
Political party or group	6,407	11.7
School group, neighbourhood, civic, or community association (e.g., PTA, alumni, block parents, neighbourhood watch)	6,251	11.4
Service club or fraternal organisation (e.g., Kiwanis, Knights of Columbus, the Legion)	4,734	8.6
Other organised group or activity	9,005	16.6

Table A3
Residents Who Provided Unpaid Help to Others in the Past 12 Months

Type of Unpaid Help	n	Pct.
Work at their home such as cooking, cleaning, gardening, maintenance, painting, shovelling snow, or car repairs	24,947	45.7
Health-related or personal care, such as emotional support, counselling, providing advice, visiting the elderly, unpaid babysitting	21,886	40.2
Doing any shopping, driving someone to the store, or to any other appointments	20,485	37.7
Paperwork tasks such as writing letters, doing taxes, filling out forms, banking, paying bills, or finding information	16,077	29.4
Unpaid teaching, coaching, tutoring, or assisting with reading	12,377	22.8

Social Connections and Support

Table A4
Numbers of Social Contacts Reported by Residents:
Relatives (i.e., feel close to, can call on for help)

Relatives	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Number of relatives	56,434	0	20	4.58	4.56

Table A5
Numbers of Social Contacts Reported by Residents:
Close Friends (i.e., feel at ease with, talk to, can call on for help)

Close friends	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Number of close friends	56,532	0	20	4.44	3.95

Table A6
Numbers of Social Contacts Reported by Residents:
Neighbours (i.e., know well enough to ask for a favour)

Neighbours	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Number of neighbours	56,332	0	20	2.60	3.27

Perceptions of Safety and Belonging

Table A7
Perceptions of Safety and Belonging:
How Safe Walking in Neighbourhood at Night

Safety	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Very unsafe	2	3	4	5	6	Very safe	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Feel safe walking alone in your neighbourhood after dark	56,556	3.3	1.7	4.2	8.9	15.6	19.0	47.2	5.78	1.56

^a Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher feelings of safety.

Table A8
Perceptions of Safety and Belonging:
Feeling Uncomfortable or Out of Place due to Ethnicity, Culture, Race, or Skin Colour

Feel uncomfortable due to ...	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Never	2	3	4	5	6	All of the time	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour	56,625	73.6	11.4	4.3	5.6	2.3	1.2	1.5	1.62	1.28

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

Table A9
Perceptions of Safety and Belonging:
Experience of Discrimination in the Community

Experience of discrimination in community due to ...	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Never						All of the time	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
ethnicity, culture, race, skin colour	55,290	76.9	6.7	4.7	3.9	4.5	1.5	1.8	1.64	1.39
sexual orientation	55,157	90.8	2.9	2.3	1.6	1.6	0.5	0.4	1.23	0.85
age	55,124	77.4	8.1	5.2	4.0	2.8	1.4	1.0	1.55	1.23
gender	55,066	77.9	6.5	4.8	4.5	3.3	1.5	1.5	1.59	1.32
religion	55,218	86.4	3.7	3.2	3.5	1.6	1.2	0.4	1.35	1.03
disability	55,033	93.2	1.9	1.7	1.8	0.4	0.6	0.5	1.18	0.78

^a Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of experience of discrimination.

Table A10
Perceptions of Safety and Belonging:
Sense of Belonging in Local Community

Belonging	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Never	2	3	4	5	6	All of the time	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
sense of belonging to your local community	56,615	6.7	6.8	9.1	22.2	23.8	14.0	17.4	4.61	1.72

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

Sense of Community

Table A11: Residents' Perceptions of Community as a Place to Live

Community as a place to live	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Very strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Very strongly agree	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
I have good friends in this community	55,531	3.1	3.0	4.9	11.8	33.0	22.2	22.0	5.23	1.46
I am proud of this community	55,731	3.8	2.3	5.1	15.1	26.7	23.6	23.4	5.23	1.51
Many people in this community are available to give help if somebody needs it	55,592	1.4	2.5	5.4	15.5	34.3	25.7	15.2	5.17	1.29
If I had an emergency, even people I do not know would be willing to help me	55,495	2.9	2.9	8.8	18.6	32.9	18.9	15.0	4.92	1.43
I would recommend this community to others as a great place to live	55,741	5.4	5.7	7.9	14.3	25.0	23.0	18.7	4.91	1.68
This community provides opportunities for me to do a lot of different things	55,585	3.3	5.4	10.7	12.9	29.7	22.3	15.6	4.90	1.55
I feel at ease with the people in this community	55,474	2.1	2.6	7.8	20.6	39.2	19.0	8.6	4.84	1.27
People are sociable here	55,575	2.9	2.9	9.6	17.8	38.0	18.8	10.0	4.82	1.36
If I need help, this community has many excellent services to meet my needs	55,758	2.9	5.1	12.0	20.9	31.5	17.5	10.1	4.66	1.44
There are places in this community that inspire me	55,731	5.1	5.0	10.1	23.2	25.7	18.9	12.0	4.64	1.56
If I had problem, few people in this community would try to help me	55,700	8.3	13.5	29.2	21.7	18.6	5.9	2.9	3.58	1.44
It is difficult for me to connect with the people in this community	55,302	10.9	15.5	26.0	19.0	17.7	6.0	5.0	3.55	1.59
In this community, there is never much to do	55,410	13.4	16.9	24.8	16.6	13.9	6.6	7.9	3.52	1.74
In this community, I have few opportunities to satisfy my needs	55,545	10.9	17.2	26.3	18.2	16.3	6.9	4.2	3.49	1.58
In this community, people are not willing to help those in need	55,732	22.0	24.4	32.7	11.0	5.8	2.5	1.6	2.68	1.36

^a Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher levels of agreement.

Table A11b
Dimensions of Sense of Community

Sense of Community ^a	n	Mean ^b	Std. Dev.
Social climate and bonds	55,805	4.83	1.13
Help in case of need	55,829	4.96	0.98
Needs fulfilment	55,805	4.64	1.28

- ^a *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 or situation of need.
Needs fulfilment refers to perceptions of the range and accessibility of opportunities to satisfy activity needs.
- ^b Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect greater satisfaction with dimension of sense of community.

Feelings of Social Isolation

(a component of the Sense of Community scale)

Table A11-SI
Residents' Perceptions of Social Isolation

Social Isolation	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Very strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Very strongly agree	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
I often feel I lack companionship	55,635	12.0	17.0	22.4	15.3	19.4	8.2	5.7	3.60	1.69
I often feel isolated from others in the community	55,300	14.7	16.4	27.8	18.3	13.3	4.3	5.2	3.33	1.61
I often feel left out	55,739	14.4	18.5	26.3	22.2	11.1	3.7	3.9	3.24	1.52

Note: ^a Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect greater social isolation.
 After combining the responses to all three statements, overall social isolation has a mean score of 3.39 ($SD = 1.39$).

Healthy Populations

Self-Assessed Health

Table B1
Residents Self-Assessed *Physical Health*

Self-Reported <i>Physical Health</i>	n	Percentage of Residents					Summary Statistics	
		Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
In general, would you say your <i>physical</i> health is...	56,656	4.0	13.4	40.2	33.0	9.5	3.30	0.95

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

Table B2
Residents Self-Assessed *Mental Health*

Self-Reported <i>Mental Health</i>	n	Percentage of Residents					Summary Statistics	
		Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
In general, would you say your <i>mental</i> health is...	56,554	7.9	19.3	33.0	29.0	10.8	3.16	1.10

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

Impact of Mental Health Issues

Table B3
Residents' Experience of Negative Impacts Due to Mental Health Issues

Negative Impacts due to ...	n	Pct.
Own mental health issues	22,120	40.4
Family member's mental health issues	20,346	37.2
Someone else's mental health issues (e.g., friend)	19,598	36.0

Table B4
Assessment of Health Care Services in Community:
Overall Quality

Overall Quality of Health Care Services in the Community	n	Percentage of Residents					Summary Statistics	
		Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Residents' perceptions of overall <i>quality</i>	56,558	13.1	29.0	34.1	19.7	4.1	2.73	1.05

^a Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher ratings of perceived quality.

Table B5
Assessment of Health Care Services in Community:
Overall Accessibility

Overall Accessibility of Health Care Services in the Community	n	Percentage of Residents					Summary Statistics	
		Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Residents' perceptions of overall <i>accessibility</i>	56,622	16.6	32.3	31.1	16.4	3.7	2.58	1.06

^a Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher ratings of perceived accessibility.

Democratic Engagement

Interest in Politics

Table C1
Level of Interest in Politics at the Federal, Provincial, and Municipal Levels

Interest level in politics	n	Percentage of Residents										Summary statistics	
		None	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Great deal	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Federal	56,622	11.4	3.9	5.1	3.7	10.6	8.5	17.2	13.9	6.4	19.3	6.36	2.90
Provincial	56,497	10.8	3.0	4.3	3.5	10.4	7.4	17.8	13.5	9.1	20.2	6.57	2.87
Municipal	56,481	11.3	5.2	6.2	7.6	15.1	9.8	13.3	11.5	7.7	12.2	5.82	2.81

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

Participation in Democratic Activities

Table C2
Residents Participating in Democratic Activity During the Past 12 Months

Activity	n	Pct.
I participated in local event to support a charitable organisation (e.g., 5km run for breast cancer)	21,607	38.5
I joined a Facebook page on a local issue	20,259	36.1
I participated in a local event in support of community (e.g., "pick up litter days," earth day)	19,540	34.8
I wrote a letter or email to or spoke with a municipal official about a local issue	13,328	23.9
I attended a local planning meeting or open house	8,390	15.0
I attended a municipal council meeting	7,000	12.5
I attended a neighbourhood meeting	6,474	11.6
I participated in a public demonstration or protest	3,611	6.5
I wrote a letter to the editor of the newspaper about a local issue	1,054	1.9

Confidence in and Feelings of Influence on Government (Political Efficacy)

Table C3
Residents' Confidence in Different Levels of Government

Institution	n	Percentage of Residents					Summary Statistics	
		No confidence at all				A great deal of confidence	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Municipal government	56,524	14.0	20.2	38.0	20.8	6.9	2.86	1.11
Provincial government	56,418	16.4	20.2	34.5	21.1	7.8	2.84	1.16
Federal government	56,524	43.9	21.9	24.6	7.6	2.0	2.02	1.08

^a Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher ratings of perceived quality.

Table C4
The Degree to Which Residents Feel Programmes and Services of the Local Government Have Made Them Better Off

Perception of Local Programmes and Services...	n	Percentage of Residents						Summary Statistics		
		Much worse off			Not made any diff.		Much better off	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.	
have made you better off	48,005	4.2	2.5	8.6	43.4	21.2	14.4	5.8	4.41	1.30

^a Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect feelings of being better off.

Table C5
Residents' Perceptions of Their Influence on Government

Perception of Political Influence	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Very strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Very strongly agree	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
I feel I have a pretty good understanding of the important political issues facing our region	56,272	3.5	2.1	7.3	15.8	40.9	20.3	10.2	4.90	1.34
I think I am as well-informed about politics and government as most people	56,273	3.1	2.5	10.8	21.0	33.1	19.4	10.1	4.77	1.38
I consider myself to be well-qualified to participate in politics	56,305	7.4	4.9	16.2	25.1	25.3	13.4	7.8	4.27	1.56
I feel I could do as good a job in public office as most people	56,244	7.0	5.5	17.2	28.3	22.7	10.9	8.4	4.20	1.55
I do not think public officials care much what people like me think	56,242	3.4	6.9	23.8	25.6	22.5	9.4	8.3	4.19	1.46
People like me do not have any say about what government does	56,331	8.6	9.1	28.1	23.3	17.9	6.2	6.7	3.78	1.55

^a Based on the original 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher levels of agreement. After combining the responses to all six statements, overall feelings of influence on government has a mean score of 4.36 (*SD* = 0.86).

Environment

Perceptions of Environment

Table D1: Residents' Perceptions of the Environment in Wood Buffalo Region

Environmental Concern	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Very strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Very strongly agree	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
I feel I have a personal responsibility to help protect the natural environment	56,282	1.1	0.9	3.0	9.3	37.3	26.9	21.4	5.47	1.18
There are plenty of opportunities to enjoy nature in <i>my town/city</i>	55,770	2.0	1.7	6.0	9.5	31.7	30.3	18.8	5.33	1.32
There are plenty of opportunities to enjoy nature in <i>my neighbourhood</i>	56,188	3.3	2.5	9.2	10.8	32.6	24.3	17.2	5.09	1.47
The <i>quality</i> of the natural environment in <i>my town/city</i> is very high	56,242	4.7	3.9	10.2	13.5	39.4	20.8	7.5	4.72	1.44
The <i>quality</i> of the natural environment in <i>my neighbourhood</i> is very high	56,400	4.9	3.8	11.0	13.3	38.6	20.0	8.3	4.70	1.47
The <i>water quality</i> in our community is very good	56,302	3.9	4.3	13.1	20.4	34.1	16.1	8.2	4.58	1.43
The <i>air quality</i> in our community is very good	56,231	5.4	6.4	18.9	21.4	31.4	12.2	4.1	4.20	1.44
Traffic congestion in our community is a problem	56,182	10.5	12.6	36.6	17.1	16.8	4.0	2.4	3.39	1.41
I regularly participate in events organized by local groups to protect the natural environment (e.g., protests, fund raising)	56,334	17.3	10.7	30.4	28.3	8.7	2.4	2.3	3.17	1.41

^a Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect greater agreement with aspect of environment in Wood Buffalo Region.

Participation in Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities

Table D2
Residents Participation in Resource Conservation and Sustainable Activities During the Past 12 Months

Conservation/Sustainable Activities	n	Percentage of Residents					Summary Statistics	
		Never	Some-times	Regu-larly	Quite often	All of the time	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Recycle materials (e.g., plastics, tin cans, cardboard)	56,118	2.0	3.7	13.6	17.6	63.1	4.36	0.98
Conserve <i>energy</i> (e.g., buy energy efficient bulbs and appliances, turn off lights)	56,467	1.3	6.2	16.9	28.5	47.1	4.14	0.99
Reuse materials (e.g., plastic bottles, plastic bags, tins cans)	56,502	1.9	10.0	18.4	23.6	46.0	4.02	1.11
Try to reduce household waste	56,190	3.2	11.1	25.0	22.1	38.6	3.82	1.16
Conserve <i>water</i> (e.g., not leaving the water tap running, take shorter showers)	56,435	3.5	14.0	24.9	27.1	30.6	3.67	1.15
Separate waste (e.g., sort and dispose of bio-degradable and non-biodegradable waste)	56,439	26.6	15.6	14.8	13.5	29.5	3.04	1.59
Purchase foods produced locally	56,310	17.7	36.5	19.6	13.9	12.3	2.67	1.26
Walk or bike more often (rather than use a car)	56,309	24.5	39.8	15.9	12.3	7.5	2.38	1.19
Carpool or use car share	56,220	38.0	32.1	13.5	9.6	6.8	2.15	1.22
Take public transit rather than use a car	56,440	70.1	15.7	5.0	5.2	4.0	1.57	1.07

^a Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of engagement in conservation activities.

Leisure and Culture

Participation in Leisure and Culture Activities

Physically Active Leisure

Table E1
Residents Who Reported Participation in
Physical Activity During a Typical Month

Physical Activity	Pct. of Population Participating		Participation Rate (times per month)			
	n	Pct.	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Team sports (e.g., baseball, hockey, volleyball, basketball)	12,158	21.5	0	15	1.34	3.20
Individual sports (e.g., tennis, badminton, skiing)	15,855	28.0	0	15	1.40	3.17
Vigorous exercise (e.g., aerobics, jogging, weight training)	29,756	52.5	0	30	6.44	8.57
Light exercise (e.g., going for a walk, bicycling)	49,576	87.5	0	30	11.06	9.24

Social Leisure

Table E2
Residents Who Reported Participation in
“Getting Out” Activities During a Typical Month

Social Activity	Pct. of Population Participating		Participation Rate (times per month)			
	n	Pct.	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Socialising with friends (e.g., getting together at someone’s home, dining out)	48,878	86.3	0	15	4.60	4.13
Going out to movies	35,415	62.6	0	4	1.01	1.08
Going out to clubs, bars, taverns	25,557	45.1	0	4	1.02	1.41
Going to sports events as spectator	17,350	30.7	0	4	0.61	1.12

Cultural Leisure

Table E3
Residents Who Reported Participation in
Cultural Activities During the Past Year

Cultural Activity	Pct. of Population Participating		Participation Rate (times in past year)			
	n	Pct.	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Attending music concerts	28,269	49.9	0	12	1.17	1.83
Visiting art galleries/museums	18,575	32.8	0	12	0.81	1.70
Attending festivals	26,364	46.6	0	6	0.96	1.39
Attending ballet, dance performances	10,439	18.4	0	3	0.30	0.72
Attend live theatre	22,157	39.1	0	6	0.92	1.53

Computer-Related Leisure

Table E4
Residents Who Reported Participation in
Computer-related Activities for Leisure on a Typical Day

On-line Activity	Pct. of Population Participating		Participation Rate (times per day)			
	n	Pct.	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Searching the internet for interest	53,394	94.2	0	20	6.04	5.67
Playing computer games (including online, console, & handheld)	23,760	42.0	0	20	1.45	3.20
Socializing with others online (e.g., Facebook, Skype, texting)	48,349	85.4	0	20	6.65	6.79

Table E5
Amount of Time Residents Spend Engaged in Computer-related Activities for Leisure
(Hours per day)^a

Engaged in online activities	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Total time on a typical day spent engaged in computer-related activities for leisure	52,814	0	16	2.83	2.27

^a Includes those reporting at least one minute of participation (98.2% of all residents).

Television and Online Movies

Table E6
Amount of Time Residents Spend Watching Television/DVDs/Movies
(Hours per day)^a

Watching Television, DVDs, ...	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Total time on a typical day spent watching television, DVDs, shows/movies on-line	52,734	0	12	2.21	1.56

^a Includes those reporting at least one minute of participation (94.7% of all residents).

Annual Holidays

Table E7
Number of Days Residents Had on Holidays in Previous Year

Days on Holiday	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Total days on holiday in past year	56,301	0	60	21.49	15.47

Note: ^a Almost one in ten residents (9.3%) reported taking no vacation days in the past year.

Use of Community Recreation and Cultural Facilities

Table E8
Residents Use of Recreation and Cultural Facilities During the Past Year

Recreation and cultural facility	n	Percentage of Residents					Summary Statistics	
		Never	Some- times	Regu- larly	Quite often	All of the time	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Local parks, playgrounds, and/ or trails	56,160	11.2	28.5	24.0	22.4	13.8	2.99	1.23
Multi-purpose recreation centre	56,251	24.5	34.9	13.3	16.3	11.0	2.54	1.31
Swimming pool	56,194	43.8	29.9	12.9	9.0	4.4	2.00	1.15
Public library	56,025	43.9	32.2	9.8	8.6	5.5	2.00	1.17
Sports fields (e.g., soccer, baseball)	55,986	59.3	21.3	8.7	7.1	3.6	1.74	1.11
Arena	56,059	58.9	24.5	6.7	5.7	4.2	1.72	1.09
Other outdoor sports facilities (e.g., golf, tennis)	56,084	60.5	22.5	7.2	6.5	3.3	1.70	1.07
Performing arts facility (e.g., Suncor Energy Centre for the Performing Arts at Holy Trinity High School)	56,299	56.7	31.5	6.1	3.8	1.9	1.63	0.90
Splash pads or wading pools	55,948	66.2	18.8	8.4	4.5	2.1	1.57	0.97
An historic site (e.g., Fort Chipewyan, Heritage Park)	56,146	56.9	38.3	2.8	1.4	0.6	1.50	0.68
Visual arts facility (e.g., Kirschner Family Art Gallery at MacDonald Island Park)	56,329	68.5	22.8	4.9	2.6	1.2	1.45	0.80
Outdoor skating rink	56,222	73.5	19.3	3.7	2.6	0.9	1.38	0.76
Curling rink	55,913	89.1	6.9	1.7	1.7	0.6	1.18	0.60

^a Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher frequency of facility use.

Perceived Accessibility of Community Recreation and Cultural Facilities

Table E9
Residents Perceived Accessibility of Recreation and Cultural Facilities

Perceived Access to Facilities	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Very strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Very strongly agree	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
There is a local park nearby that is easy for me to get to from my home	54,517	1.8	1.7	3.5	9.1	33.7	19.9	30.3	5.52	1.34
The recreation and culture facilities are easy for me to get to	55,956	1.5	2.2	4.4	12.4	36.6	21.1	21.7	5.31	1.31
The recreation and cultural facilities are very welcoming to me	54,013	2.1	1.7	4.1	29.1	37.5	13.5	12.1	4.87	1.24
There are places nearby where I can take classes for my own interest	54,470	5.3	4.2	13.9	23.2	31.2	12.4	9.8	4.47	1.50
Childcare is available at the recreation facilities if I need to use it	38,837	4.5	4.3	8.7	47.5	20.9	7.6	6.5	4.25	1.30
Recreation and culture programs are offered at times that are convenient to me	54,386	3.9	7.0	13.9	32.6	27.9	8.2	6.5	4.24	1.38
The cost of public recreation and culture programs prevents me from participating	54,146	10.0	10.7	23.9	23.5	19.4	5.1	7.4	3.76	1.61

^a Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher perceived accessibility.

Education

Ongoing Formal Education and Courses for Interest

Table F1
Residents Who Took Formal Education Courses During the Past Year
to Improve Skills or to Prepare for a Job

Type of Course	n	Pct.
To improve your skills in your current job	22,748	40.7
To prepare for a job you might do in the future	16,014	28.7
To lead directly to a qualification related to current job	15,897	28.6
To help you get started in a current or new job	11,344	20.3

Table F2
Residents Who Took Courses *for Interest* in the Community During the Past Year

Course Taken for Interest	n	Pct.
Course for interest (e.g., computer skills, woodworking, sewing, creative writing)	15,660	27.8

Perceptions of Educational Opportunities

Table F3
Residents' Perceptions of Opportunities for Formal Education and Courses of Interest

Opportunities to Take Courses	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Very strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Very strongly agree	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
There are many opportunities for me to get to know people from different cultures	56,068	2.6	2.0	5.1	29.2	36.2	14.8	10.0	4.79	1.26
There are schools nearby where I can upgrade my educational qualifications	56,170	7.4	4.0	11.6	26.9	34.4	10.8	5.0	4.29	1.44
There are plenty of opportunities to take formal education courses	56,201	4.9	6.4	15.7	28.3	33.7	7.4	3.6	4.16	1.34
There are places nearby where I can take courses out of interest	55,868	6.1	4.5	15.9	31.2	33.9	5.3	3.1	4.11	1.31
I would take courses, but they are offered at inconvenient times	56,276	4.5	3.0	15.8	46.8	19.3	5.6	5.1	4.10	1.24
I would take courses, but they are too expensive	56,050	4.7	5.6	19.2	37.6	19.5	8.1	5.3	4.07	1.35
There are plenty of opportunities to take courses of interest	56,009	6.4	5.6	17.6	29.3	32.1	6.1	3.0	4.05	1.35

^a Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect greater agreement.

Living Standards

Working for Pay and Its Characteristics

Table G1
Residents Who Work for Pay

Work for Pay	n	Pct.
Yes	49,250	87.0
No	7,335	13.0

Table G2
Number of *Different* Paid Jobs (full- or part-time) Held by Residents^a

Number of <i>different</i> jobs	n	Pct.
1 job	42,515	87.4
2 jobs	4,707	9.7
3 jobs	1,048	2.2
4 or more jobs	348	0.7

^a Includes only those residents who indicated that they worked for pay.

Table G3
Residents' Weekly Hours Spent Working for Pay on *Main Job*

Hours per week spent at <i>main job</i>	n	Pct.
Fewer than 25 hours	2,367	4.8
25 to 34 hours	2,078	4.2
35 to 49 hours	31,196	63.5
50 to 59 hours	6,306	12.8
60 or more hours	7,171	14.6

Table G4
Residents' Weekly Hours Spent Working for Pay on *Other Job(s)*^a

Hours per week spent at <i>other job(s)</i>	n	Pct.
Fewer than 10 hours	24,816	84.8
10 to 20 hours	3,451	11.8
21 to 35 hours	691	2.4
More than 35 hours	294	1.0

^a Includes only those residents who reported working at more than one job.

Table G5
Residents who Work for Pay with Flexible Work Hours^a

Flexible Work Hours	n	Pct.
Those with flexible work hours	9,020	18.4

^a Employees with flexible hours who work the full number of hours required by the employer, but have some control over the time their workday begins and ends.

Table G6
Residents' Usual Work Schedule at Their Main Job

Work Schedule	n	Pct.
Regular daytime, Monday to Friday	29,584	60.2
Shift schedule ^a	14,843	30.2
Irregular shift schedule ^b	4,692	9.6

^a Includes evenings, nights, and/or rotating shifts throughout the week.

^b Includes irregular shifts, on call, compressed work weeks.

Table G7
Residents Workday Commute from Home to Workplace for Main Job
(Minutes per day)

Commute time	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Length of time to commute from residence to place of work for main job	48,746	0	120	31.52	21.77

^a Includes only those residents who reported working for pay.

Perceptions of Job Fit and Security

Table G8a
Residents' Perceptions of Job Fit

Feelings Concerning Main Job	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Very strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Very strongly agree	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
My current occupational position adequately reflects my education and training	48,765	4.1	3.8	10.5	11.0	37.7	19.5	13.5	4.87	1.50
Considering all my efforts and achievements, my opportunities at work are adequate	48,908	5.3	4.7	11.8	14.1	38.0	16.6	9.5	4.62	1.51
Considering all my efforts and achievements, my salary/income is adequate	48,962	5.6	7.0	11.6	14.8	35.3	14.5	11.2	4.55	1.59
I have little hope for promotion at my job	48,854	8.1	10.3	24.2	17.5	17.7	9.8	12.3	4.05	1.75
I have experienced or I expect to experience an undesirable change in my work situation	48,854	8.1	8.8	24.0	23.2	17.5	10.1	8.2	3.96	1.63
My job security is poor	48,932	18.1	17.7	26.8	17.6	10.9	5.1	3.8	3.16	1.60

^a Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect greater agreement.

Table G8b Summary: Dimensions of Job Fit

Dimensions of job fit ^a	n	Mean ^b	Std. Dev.
Job promotion	49,003	4.50	1.16
Job security	48,962	4.44	1.37

^a Notes: *Job promotion* is comprised of questions related to opportunities for promotion, to use one's training/education, recognition of effort, and appropriate remuneration.

Job security is comprised of perceptions of job security and experience of an undesirable change in work sit.

^b Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher agreement that dimension is important part of job fit.

Work-Life Balance

Table G9a
Residents' Reactions to Work

Reactions to Work	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Very strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Very strongly agree	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
I am in a better mood at work because of my personal life	48,552	4.2	4.3	13.4	23.0	35.0	12.6	7.5	4.48	1.41
My personal life gives me energy for my job	48,758	4.6	4.3	17.5	29.9	29.5	9.7	4.6	4.23	1.34
I am in a better mood generally because of my job	48,692	7.3	6.5	17.9	25.2	29.1	10.3	3.7	4.08	1.46
I am happy with the amount of time for non-work activities	48,632	5.5	7.1	23.8	18.1	32.4	9.5	3.5	4.07	1.43
I put my personal life on hold for work	48,733	8.8	7.3	25.0	12.1	29.4	8.6	8.8	4.07	1.66
My personal life suffers because of work	48,789	5.4	10.6	28.1	13.2	24.3	8.6	9.8	4.05	1.63
I neglect personal needs because of work	48,685	8.0	8.8	26.0	12.8	28.2	7.9	8.4	4.02	1.64
I struggle to juggle work and non-work activities	48,357	7.7	8.3	28.0	14.9	25.9	7.4	7.8	3.96	1.60
My job makes a personal life difficult	48,790	7.6	11.5	30.1	14.9	21.0	6.4	8.5	3.83	1.63
I am too tired to be effective at work	48,627	14.9	18.4	41.5	12.5	8.9	2.3	1.6	2.95	1.31
My personal life drains me for energy for work	48,790	16.1	17.0	42.3	11.5	8.9	2.4	1.8	2.94	1.34
It is hard to work because of personal matters	48,623	21.0	20.7	37.1	10.1	7.6	1.6	1.9	2.75	1.36
My work suffers because of my personal life	48,697	20.7	20.8	40.5	7.9	6.9	1.2	2.0	2.71	1.32

^a Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect greater agreement.

Table G9b
Dimensions of Work-Life Balance

Dimensions of Work-Life Balance^a	n	Mean^b	Std. Dev.
Work interference with personal life	48,790	3.98	1.35
Work/personal life enhancement	48,790	3.74	1.11
Personal life interference with work	48,790	2.84	1.15

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

^b Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher agreement with balance in work-life dimension.

Experiences of Financial Insecurity

Table G10
Residents' Experiences of Financial Insecurity During the Past Year

Financial Insecurity Experience in Past Year	n	Percentage of Residents					Summary Statistics	
		Never	Some- times	Regu- larly	Quite often	All of the time	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
I did not have enough money to buy the things I <i>wanted</i>	53,517	56.3	9.1	11.4	6.6	16.6	2.18	1.55
I could not pay my bills on time (e.g., water, hydro, phone, credit card)	53,548	78.0	7.8	5.5	5.3	3.4	1.48	1.04
I did not have enough money to buy the things I <i>needed</i>	53,765	80.0	5.4	5.7	4.6	4.3	1.48	1.07
I could not afford to purchase nutritious foods (e.g., fresh vegetables, whole foods)	53,803	82.1	4.1	4.3	3.8	5.6	1.47	1.11
I ate less because there was not enough food or money for food	53,843	85.2	4.6	3.8	3.5	2.9	1.34	0.92
I could not pay my mortgage or rent on time	52,651	90.6	4.7	1.8	2.1	0.9	1.18	0.64
I could not afford to pay for transportation to get to where I needed to go	53,332	92.3	3.0	2.7	1.0	1.0	1.15	0.60
I used a local food bank	53,229	96.5	1.5	0.9	0.6	0.6	1.07	0.43

^a Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher incidence of these experiences.

Internet Access and Perceived Quality

Table G11a
Residents with Access to the Internet from Home

Internet Access at Home	n	Pct.
Have access	56,408	99.7

Table G11b
Residents' Perceptions of the Quality of Internet Access from Home^a

Quality of Internet Access from Home	n	Percentage of Residents					Summary Statistics	
		Poor	Fair	Good	Very good	Excellent	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Perceived quality	56,294	4.5	12.9	34.0	34.3	14.3	3.41	1.03

^a Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect higher perceived quality of internet service.

Table G11c
Residents' Frequency of Shopping Online in Past Year

Frequency of Online Shopping in Past Year	n	Percentage of Residents					Summary Statistics	
		Never	Some-times	Regu-larly	Quite often	All of the time	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Shopped online for food, clothes, other household items	56,555	6.9	7.9	15.0	23.6	46.5	3.95	1.25

^a Based on a 5-point scale where higher scores reflect greater frequency of shopping online.

Time Use

Time Providing Support to Others

Table H1a
Residents Providing Unpaid Care to Any Children

Unpaid Care to Children	n	Pct.
Those providing care	10,690	18.9

Table H1b
Weekly Hours Typically Spent by Residents
Providing Unpaid Care to Children

Hours of Unpaid Care Provided to:	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Children in your family	9,512	1	168	58.06	56.39
Children who are <i>not members</i> of your family	3,073	1	10	3.33	2.52

^a Includes only those residents who reported providing unpaid care to children.

Table H2a
Residents Providing Unpaid Care to Older or Dependent Adult(s)

Unpaid Care to Older/Dependent Adult	n	Pct.
Those providing care	3,497	6.2

Table H2b
Weekly Hours Typically Spent by Residents
Providing Unpaid Care to Older or Dependent Adult(s)

Hours of Unpaid Care Provided to:	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Older or dependent adult <i>in your family</i>	3,104	1	84	18.69	22.61
Older or dependent adult(s) who is a <i>neighbour or friend</i>	539	1	10	3.92	3.10

^a Includes only those residents who reported unpaid care to an older or dependent adult.

Table H3
Residents' Perceptions of the Adequacy of Supply of Childcare Services in the Community

Supply of Childcare Services Adequate?	n	Pct.
Yes	9,826	17.4
No	20,916	37.0
Not sure / don't know	25,857	45.7

Feeling the Time Crunch

Table H4
How Often Residents *Feel Rushed*

Feelings of Being Rushed	n	Percentage of Residents					
		Never	Less than once a month	About once a month	About once a week	A few times per week	Everyday
Frequency of feeling rushed	56,569	6.5	8.8	10.7	25.3	28.8	19.8

Table H5
How Often Residents Have Free Time

Having Time on Your Hands	n	Percentage of Residents					
		Never	Less than once a month	About once a month	About once a week	A few times per week	Everyday
Frequency of time on your hands that you do not know what to do with	56,571	34.4	18.2	15.5	16.7	11.9	3.4

Perceptions of Time Adequacy

Table H6
Residents' Perceptions of Time Adequacy

Adequate time to:	n	Percentage of Residents										Summary statistics	
		Not enough	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Always enough	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Be yourself	55,658	6.7	4.3	5.8	7.6	10.4	8.0	11.0	12.0	6.0	28.3	6.72	2.90
Be with the children you live with	29,405	10.1	3.4	6.1	5.4	9.6	11.1	10.7	13.5	6.3	24.0	6.50	2.95
Complete chores or errands	55,572	5.4	4.2	5.4	8.6	13.3	11.2	15.5	11.0	6.5	19.0	6.42	2.65
Prepare or eat healthy meals	55,317	5.8	5.1	7.4	8.8	11.3	9.7	12.0	10.7	7.7	21.5	6.42	2.81
Be with your partners or spouse	46,711	8.4	3.2	7.1	9.6	9.8	10.0	12.0	10.9	7.2	21.9	6.38	2.88
Get enough sleep/rest	55,905	11.9	5.1	7.8	8.5	8.3	9.6	8.9	8.4	4.7	26.8	6.19	3.17
Socialize	55,323	6.1	6.2	9.3	7.3	13.0	12.1	11.2	10.7	4.4	19.8	6.14	2.80
For and sustain serious relationships	51,751	10.2	5.3	8.5	8.7	9.9	9.4	11.7	9.1	5.7	21.5	6.08	3.01
Be together with you family	49,073	11.7	6.4	8.5	6.8	10.3	10.0	12.2	9.6	6.4	18.3	5.90	3.01
Keep in shape	55,450	8.9	7.9	9.2	8.5	12.8	10.8	9.4	8.5	4.6	19.3	5.84	2.95
Nurture your spiritual and/or creative side	50,110	13.2	8.7	7.6	7.7	11.0	13.1	9.2	7.0	4.1	18.3	5.59	3.05
Participate in/be active in community	53,638	12.4	8.8	7.7	8.6	13.9	11.9	9.3	8.5	3.7	15.3	5.47	2.93

^a Based on a 10-point scale where higher scores reflect more adequate amounts of time perceived by respondent. Based on responses to at least 10 of the 12 items, the residents' ($n = 56,079$) overall sense of time adequacy averaged 6.16 ($SD = 2.37$).

Table H7
Usual Hours of Sleep per Day^a

Hours of Sleep per Day	n	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Dev.
Usual hours of sleep	56,295	4	15	6.59	1.16

^a Includes both night-time sleep and naps.

Table H8
Frequency of Family Meals in Past Week

Number of Family Meals in Past Week	n	Pct.
0 times	3,936	7.7
1 to 2 times	10,667	21.0
3 to 4 times	9,815	19.3
5 to 6 times	11,971	23.5
7 or more times	14,480	28.5

^a Family meals including residents' children and/or partner.

Overall Wellbeing

Life Satisfaction (OECD measures)

Table I1
Extent to Which Residents Feel the Things They Do in Life are Worthwhile

Worthwhile Life	n	Percentage of Residents										Summary statistics	
		Not at all	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Complete-ly	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Things I do in life are worthwhile	56,500	4.3	1.3	3.0	4.1	5.5	11.1	17.3	20.0	10.4	23.1	7.32	2.37

^a Based on a 10-point scale where higher scores reflect higher levels of satisfaction with feeling that things done in life are worthwhile.

Table I2
Residents Level of Satisfaction with Life in General

Life Satisfaction	n	Percentage of Residents										Summary statistics	
		Very dissatis-fied	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Very satisfied	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
Satisfaction with life in general	56,506	4.1	1.5	5.3	4.3	7.4	12.9	15.3	22.1	9.8	17.4	7.00	2.38

^a Based on a 10-point scale where higher scores reflect higher levels of satisfaction with life in general.

Satisfaction with Aspects of Wellbeing (from CIW Framework)

Table I3: Residents' Level of Satisfaction with Aspects of Wellbeing

Aspects of Wellbeing	n	Percentage of Residents							Summary Statistics	
		Very strongly disagree	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly agree	Very strongly agree	Mean ^a	Std. Dev.
My neighbourhood as a place to live	56,196	3.6	3.9	6.3	14.7	22.6	27.6	21.2	5.16	1.56
The access to <i>parks and recreational</i> opportunities in the community	56,101	2.1	3.7	5.6	19.7	24.2	26.6	18.1	5.13	1.44
The environmental quality of my neighbourhood	55,922	4.3	5.4	7.2	18.1	24.2	25.1	15.8	4.91	1.58
My personal relationships	56,294	5.1	5.9	7.7	20.6	20.0	23.2	17.6	4.84	1.66
My <i>mental</i> wellbeing	56,334	6.9	6.3	10.6	18.2	20.4	19.5	18.2	4.70	1.76
My work situation	56,167	8.9	6.9	7.1	16.7	20.7	24.3	15.4	4.68	1.80
My financial situation	56,368	10.1	7.1	8.5	15.2	22.0	21.1	16.1	4.60	1.85
My leisure time	56,248	7.2	8.6	14.2	22.0	21.9	15.0	11.2	4.32	1.69
The way I spend my time	56,055	7.0	7.6	12.8	26.5	21.9	14.0	10.2	4.31	1.63
My <i>physical</i> wellbeing	56,368	8.1	8.7	13.4	22.0	24.0	14.1	9.7	4.26	1.68
The access to <i>arts and cultural opportunities</i> in the community	56,058	6.0	9.6	10.5	31.4	20.2	14.6	7.7	4.25	1.56
My sense of belonging to the community	56,294	7.9	8.5	12.4	29.4	18.3	13.8	9.7	4.22	1.65
The balance of activities in my daily life	56,087	6.9	9.4	15.9	26.2	19.8	13.9	7.9	4.16	1.61
My access to educational opportunities in the community	56,155	8.2	9.1	13.3	31.8	18.3	12.2	7.0	4.07	1.59
How well democracy is working in our community	56,119	8.2	11.6	14.7	32.6	15.6	12.3	4.9	3.93	1.56
The way my local government responds to community needs	56,131	10.6	11.5	15.4	31.6	16.8	9.3	4.9	3.80	1.58

^a Based on a 7-point scale where higher scores reflect higher levels of satisfaction with aspect of wellbeing.

Table I3 Summary
Residents' Satisfaction with Domains of Wellbeing based on CIW Framework

Wellbeing Domain^a	n	Mean	Std. Dev.
Environment	56,294	5.04	1.47
Living Standards	56,368	4.64	1.65
Leisure and Culture	56,368	4.56	1.27
Community Vitality	56,294	4.53	1.46
Healthy Populations	56,368	4.48	1.54
Time Use	56,294	4.23	1.53
Education	56,155	4.07	1.59
Democratic Engagement	56,260	3.86	1.49
Overall Wellbeing^b	56,368	4.43	1.14

Notes: ^a Based on 7-point scale where higher scores reflect greater satisfaction with domain of wellbeing.
^b Overall mean score based on combining scores on all eight domains.

The *Canadian Index of Wellbeing* conducts rigorous research related to, and regularly and publicly reports on, the quality of life of Canadians; encourages policy shapers and government leaders to make decisions based on solid evidence; and empowers Canadians to advocate for change that responds to their needs and values.



For more information about the Canadian Index of Wellbeing, visit www.ciw.ca
© 2019 Canadian Index of Wellbeing