



A REPORT ON THE SENIORS COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION SURVEY

***PREPARED FOR: OFFICE OF SENIORS INTERESTS &
VOLUNTEERING***

***CLIENT CONTACTS: KAREN PURDY &
GEORGIE HALL***

PMR CONSULTANT: CARMEN GOODRIDGE

DATE: JUNE 2004

1st Floor, 47 Kishorn Road, Applecross, Western Australia 6153.

P O BOX 843A Canning Bridge WA 6153

Telephone (08) 9316 2322 Facsimile (08) 9316 9117

Email: answers@marketresearch.com.au

Web Site: www.marketresearch.com.au

Registered Company Name A.C.N. 058 380 000 Pty. Ltd. A.C.N. 058 380 000

ABN 81 058 380 000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.1	DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE.....	2
1.2	EDUCATION.....	3
1.3	PAID AND UNPAID VOLUNTARY WORK	4
1.4	PHYSICAL ACTIVITY	6
1.5	CULTURE ACTIVITIES AND VENUES.....	8
1.6	COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION	9
1.7	CARER FOR DEPENDENT ADULTS.....	12
1.8	BRINGING UP GRANDCHILDREN.....	12
1.9	BRINGING UP CHILDREN WHO ARE NOT YOUR OWN	14
1.10	ATTITUDES TOWARDS AGEING	14
1.11	CURRENT HAPPINESS.....	15
1.12	HEALTH & MOBILITY	15
1.13	TRANSPORT	16
1.14	PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY	17
1.15	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	17
1.16	VOTING METHODS.....	18
1.17	USE OF SENIOR CITIZENS CENTRES.....	18
1.18	SENIORS CARD	19
2.0	BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES	20
2.1	BACKGROUND	20
2.2	OBJECTIVES.....	21

TABLE OF CONTENTS - CONTINUED

3.0	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	22
3.1	SURVEY METHOD.....	22
3.2	DATA ANALYSIS & PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS	23
3.3	SAMPLE PROFILE & RELIABILITY	25
3.3.1	STANDARD BANNER VARIABLES SUMMARISED AS PROPORTIONS OF THE SAMPLE	28
4.0	DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE	32
4.1	AGE.....	32
4.2	INCOME SOURCES.....	34
4.3	TYPE OF DWELLING LIVED IN.....	36
4.4	OTHER HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS' RELATIONSHIP TO RESPONDENT	37
4.5	OTHER LANGUAGES SPOKEN.....	38
5.0	EDUCATION	39
5.1	DETAILS OF COURSES BEING COMPLETED BY RESPONDENTS.....	39
5.2	BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATING IN COURSES	42
5.3	HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED	45
6.0	PAID AND UNPAID VOLUNTARY WORK	47
6.1	CURRENT PAID EMPLOYMENT STATUS	47
6.2	UNPAID VOLUNTARY WORK IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS.....	52
6.3	BARRIERS TO DOING UNPAID VOLUNTARY WORK.....	56
6.4	CHILD-MINDING.....	60
7.0	PHYSICAL ACTIVITY	62
7.1	PARTICIPATION IN PHYSICAL ACTIVITY IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS	62
7.2	BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATING IN PHYSICAL ACTIVITY	66
7.3	ATTENDANCE AT SPORTING MATCHES IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS	70
7.4	BARRIERS TO ATTENDING SPORTING MATCHES	74

TABLE OF CONTENTS - CONTINUED

8.0	CULTURE ACTIVITIES AND VENUES.....	78
8.1	ATTENDANCE AT CULTURE/LEISURE VENUES IN THE LAST 3 MONTHS.....	78
8.2	BARRIERS TO ATTENDING CULTURE/LEISURE VENUES	84
9.0	COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION	89
9.1	CONTACT WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS.....	89
9.1.1	BARRIERS TO CONTACT WITH FAMILY AND FRIENDS	94
9.2	INVOLVEMENT IN CLUBS AND GROUPS.....	96
9.2.1	BARRIERS TO INVOLVEMENT IN CLUBS OR GROUPS	99
9.3	INVOLVEMENT IN BOARDS OR COMMITTEES	101
9.3.1	BARRIERS TO INVOLVEMENT WITH BOARDS OR COMMITTEES	103
9.4	INVOLVEMENT IN THE COMMUNITY.....	105
9.4.1	SATISFIED WITH AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT INVOLVED IN THE COMMUNITY	105
9.4.2	BARRIERS TO BEING MORE INVOLVED IN THE COMMUNITY	108
10.0	CARER FOR DEPENDENT ADULTS.....	110
11.0	BRINGING UP GRANDCHILDREN	111
12.0	BRINGING UP CHILDREN WHO ARE NOT YOUR OWN	115
13.0	ATTITUDES TOWARDS AGEING	116
13.1	FEELING OF BEING VALUED BY THE COMMUNITY	116
13.2	FEELING OF BEING RESPECTED BY THE COMMUNITY.....	118
13.3	IS AGEING A POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE STAGE OF LIFE?.....	119
13.4	IS AGEING A PRODUCTIVE OR UNPRODUCTIVE STAGE OF LIFE?.....	120
13.5	CURRENT HAPPINESS.....	121

TABLE OF CONTENTS - CONTINUED

14.0	HEALTH & MOBILITY	123
14.1	RESPONDENT RATING OF THEIR PHYSICAL HEALTH	123
14.2	RESPONDENT RATING OF THEIR LEVEL OF MOBILITY	125
14.3	CORRECTIVE AIDS USED BY RESPONDENTS.....	127
15.0	TRANSPORT	128
15.1	METHODS OF TRANSPORT USED IN THE LAST 3 MONTHS	128
15.2	BARRIERS TO RESPONDENTS GETTING AROUND THEIR LOCAL AREA.....	130
15.3	BARRIERS TO RESPONDENTS GETTING TO PLACES OUTSIDE OF THEIR LOCAL AREA...	132
16.0	PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY	134
16.1	SAFETY WHILE AT HOME ALONE.....	134
16.2	SAFETY WHEN GOING OUT.....	136
17.0	INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY	139
17.1	USE OF THE INTERNET.....	139
17.2	BARRIERS TO USING THE INTERNET	143
18.0	VOTING METHODS.....	145
19.0	USE OF SENIOR CITIZENS CENTRES	147
19.1	BARRIERS TO USING THE <i>LOCAL</i> SENIOR CITIZENS CENTRE	149
19.2	BARRIERS TO USING A SENIOR CITIZENS CENTRE IN GENERAL.....	150
20.0	SENIORS CARD.....	153

Appendix A – Questionnaire

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This survey was commissioned by the Department for Community Development, Office for Seniors Interests and Volunteering (referred to in this report as OSIV), to gather accurate information from WA seniors, with regards to their participation in the community.

The methodology comprised a telephone survey of a random sample of the Western Australian population of seniors (aged 60 years and over). In total, 800 interviews were completed, 600 among metropolitan residents and 200 among country residents. Further, within the 800 quotas for age (200 aged 60-64 years, 200 aged 65-69 years, 200 aged 70-74 years, 100 aged 75-79 years and 100 aged 80 years and over) and gender (400 men, 400 women) were also applied.

Overall, the survey result of 800 respondents provides data, which is accurate to within $\pm 3.5\%$ of the “real” figures at the 95% level of confidence. Interviewing took place between 19 and 30 March 2004. Prior to reporting the data was weighted to reflect the total population in terms of age, sex and region using the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data.

Section 3 provides a detailed overview of the methodology used, including explanation of data analysis processes. The following section provides a brief overview of the key findings for the overall sample. For a detailed analysis of the survey results, including sub-group analysis refer to Sections 4 to 20.

1.1 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Half (46%) of the sample were men and the other half (54%) were women. This even gender spread was applied to the total sample as well as within each of the age sub-groups (60-64 years 51%/49%; 65-69 years 49%/51%; and 70-74 years 45%/55%; 75 years and over 41%/59%). In relation to the age, 27% of respondents were in the youngest category of 60 to 64 years, 21% were aged 65 to 69 years, 25% were aged 70 to 74 years and 26% were aged 75 years and over. Other key attributes of the overall sample were:

- 31% earned \$400 to \$800 *net* per fortnight
- 70% were either married or in a defacto relationship
- 66% lived in a household with one other person (i.e. number of persons in household is two)
- 65% were Australian born and
- 64% were *not* of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander origin and 1% of respondents were (the residual were not born in Australia).

The most common income source for respondents was an “Australian Government pension or allowance” (69%). Other common income sources were: “

- 33% from investments
- 26% from savings
- 25% superannuation or annuity and
- 12% wages or salary.

Approximately 1 in 10 respondents were living in a retirement village. By far the most common type of dwelling respondents lived in was a “separate house” (78%). However, one fifth (19%) lived in a “unit or villa”. Two thirds (66%) of respondents lived with one other person while, a quarter (26%) of respondents lived by themselves. The majority (95%) of respondents who did *not* live alone indicated they lived with their “partner/spouse”.

Only 7% of all respondents speak a language other than English at home. “Other Eastern European languages” were the most common spoken by these respondents (27%), followed by “Italian” (26%), “French” (11%) and “German” (11%). Of respondents who spoke another language at home 70% reported they spoke English “very well” and 26% indicated “well”.

1.2 EDUCATION

Only 7% of respondents were doing any courses for interest, hobby or work purposes and of these respondents:

- 23% had approximately 3 to 5 hours of contact per week, while 21% had 2 to 3 hours and 19% had more than 5 hours of course contact.
- A quarter (25%) reported doing the course at a “local community centre” and 11% indicated it was a course at “University”.
- 88% were “attending classes” and 6% were completing their course by “correspondence” and 5% were doing it “online”.
- 32% were interested in doing more courses.

In total 93% of (N=743) respondents were not doing courses for interest, hobby or work purposes and the most common reasons for this follow:

- A lack of time was the most common barrier for these respondents as well, with “I don’t have enough time” mentioned by 39%.
- 26% reported “I have no interest”.
- 14% were “not well” or had “poor health”.

For the highest level of education respondents had completed the results showed considerably different levels of completion, with the most frequently mentioned (“Year 10”) at only 19%. The next most common levels completed were “Year 12” (14%), “Year 9” (12%) and “Certificate level” (11%).

1.3 PAID AND UNPAID VOLUNTARY WORK

Three-quarters (72%) of respondents indicated they were “retired from paid work and not looking”, while 8% were “not in the workforce” and another 8% were “employed part-time and working under 35 hours per week”.

Of the respondents who were working:

- 56% worked for an “employer” (56%) and
- 44% owned a business.

The majority (86%) of employed respondents were satisfied with the number of hours they work. The 21 respondents who indicated they were unhappy with the number of hours they work in a week were then asked to clarify if they wanted “more” or “less” hours. Half (48%) were dissatisfied because they wanted “more” hours and half (48%) wished to work “less” hours, while 4% (that is 1 respondent) were unsure.

The key reason why respondents who wanted to work more hours but could not was owing to there being insufficient work available (18%). However, those who wanted to work less hours commonly mentioned they had “too much work to be done” (21%) or that they cannot work less because they “need the money” (17%). Other reasons mentioned by respondents who were not happy with the number of hours they worked included:

- 17% Getting too old (mentioned by both respondents who wanted more and those who wanted less hours)
- 9% Can’t get enough staff/qualified staff (those who wanted less hours)
- 9% Employer not willing to reduce my hours (those who wanted less hours)
- 6% Employer not willing to increase my hours (those who wanted more hours)
- 4% (1 respondent) Health reasons (wanted less hours)
- 4% (1 respondent) Family member not well (wanted less hours).

Of all respondents 43% had done unpaid voluntary work in the last 12 months. Of those respondents who had done voluntary work:

- 34% did “more than 20 hours” of voluntary work per month; while a quarter (24%) did voluntary work between “10 to 20 hours per month”.
- Most did voluntary work “to help the community/give back to the community” (63%). However, other common reasons were for “personal reasons/personal satisfaction/growth” (30%) and “enjoy the task/type of volunteer work” (23%).
- 24% reported that they would like to do more voluntary work, but a lack of time (54%) was the most reason that prevented them from doing more unpaid work. Other factors that prevented them from doing more was because they “haven’t found any more suitable places to volunteer” (12%), “health reasons” (10%) and a “family member is not well” (5%).

A quarter (25%) of respondents who had *not* done voluntary work in the 12 months prior to the interview would like to do some voluntary work. The common reasons why respondents who would like to do voluntary work had not done so included:

- 38% “not enough time/too many other commitments”
- 35% “health reasons”
- 12% “haven’t found any suitable places to volunteer”.

Two-fifths (40%) of respondents reported they do child-minding, in that they look after children related (excluding their own children) or children *not* related to them. Following is a summary of the findings among this sub-group of respondents who child-mind:

- 36% did child-minding for “more than 15 hours” a month
- 93% were not paid child-minding and
- 93% of respondents were looking after their “grandchildren” or their “adopted grandchildren”.

1.4 PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

Prior to asking questions about participation in physical activity in the last 12 months all respondents were read out some examples of what was meant by “physical activity”.

- More than half (59%) of all respondents had participated in physical activity *outside their home and by themselves* during the last 12 months and of these 56% had done this type of physical activity for “more than 15 hours” a month.
- Half (50%) of all respondents had participated in physical activity *outside their home with other people* in the last 12 months and of these 50% reported they had done this type of physical activity for “more than 15 hours” a month.
- One-third (30%) of respondents who had done some physical activity in the last 12 months reported that they would like to do physical activity more often. A lack of time was the most common reason (mentioned by 49%) as to why these respondents could not do *more* physical activity. In addition 38% mentioned “health restrictions/disabilities” prevented them from participating more often.

In total 18% (N=146) of respondents had *not* participated in any form of physical activity in the last 12 months. The most common reason why respondents had not done any physical activity was because of “poor health” or being “disabled”, mentioned by 58% of these respondents. Other common reasons were:

- 24% “not enough time/other commitments”
- 19% “age” and
- 16% “not interested in doing physical activity”.

Some 13% of all respondents had been to a sporting match in the last 12 months as a spectator *by themselves*. One-fifth (20%) of these respondents had attended two sporting matches, 18% had gone 6 to 10 times and 15% had gone 11 to 15 times. A third (34%) of all respondents had been to a match *with other people* and these respondents were more likely to have been to “6 to 10” events (20%). In addition, 14% of respondents had attended “more than 25” sporting matches *with other people*, 13% had been twice and 12% had only been once.

Some 36% of respondents who had been a spectator at sporting matches in the last 12 months reported they would like to attend *more* of these events. The main reasons that prevented respondents from attending *more* sporting matches were:

- 40% “not enough time/other commitments” and
- 39% the “costs involved”.

In total 60% (N=482) of respondents had not attended a sporting match as a spectator in the 12 months prior to the interview. Their reasons for non-attendance included:

- 44% “not interested in sports/attending sporting matches”
- 16% “health restrictions”
- 15% “not enough time/other commitments” and
- 14% “prefer to watch it on TV”.

1.5 CULTURE ACTIVITIES AND VENUES

Some 70% of all respondents had been to an *indoor* culture or leisure venue during the three months prior to the interview. Of these respondents:

- 71% had always attended with other people
- 20% had been with “both” others and by themselves and
- 9% had “always” been by themselves.

Some 57% of all respondents had been to an *outdoor* culture or leisure venue in the 3 months prior to the interview. Of these respondents:

- 73% had been “with others”
- 21% had been “both” by themselves and with others
- 6% had only been by themselves.

Almost half (46%) of respondents who had been to cultural and leisure venues in the 3 months prior to the interview indicated that they would like to go to these venues more often. The common reasons that prevent respondents who have been to leisure venues and would like to go more often from doing so were:

- 44% “not enough time/other commitments”
- 20% “costs involved”
- 15% “health issues” and
- 10% “no venues locally/not much on locally”.

The most frequently mentioned reason why one-fifth (20%) of respondents had *not* been to any cultural or leisure venues in the 3 months prior to the interview was because they were “not interested in going to these places” (32%). Other common barriers to attending such venues were:

- 24% “health restrictions/disabilities” and
- 22% “not enough time/other commitments”.

1.6 COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

The majority (97%) of respondents had seen family or friends who do not live with them in the 3 months prior to the interview. Further:

- Of those who had seen family or friends in the last 3 months, the majority (96%) had seen them as recently as in the month prior to the interview.
- 88% of respondents who had seen family or friends who do not live with them in the month prior to the interview had actually seen them as recently as in the last week.

The majority (98%) of all respondents had contact through telephone, mail or email with their family or friends who did not live with them during the 3 months prior to the interview. Further:

- 98% of those who had other forms of contact in the last 3 months had this contact as recently as one month prior to the interview.
- Of those respondents who had other types of contact with family or friends in the last month 94% had this contact as recently as one week prior to the interview.

Some 29% of all respondents would like to have more contact with their family and friends they do not live with. The common reasons why respondents do not have more contact with their family and friends, even though they would like to, included:

- 65% “live too far away” and
- 27% “they don’t have enough time to see me”.

Some 57% of all respondents belong to a club or group of some kind. Of these respondents:

- 52% were in only one club or group
- 31% were a board or committee member of their club or group.

Some 71% of respondents who were a board or committee member were only doing this for one club or group. Of these respondents 45% had “more than 20 hours a month” of personal contact with members of the club or group.

Some 17% of respondents who did *not* belong to a club or group would like to belong to one. A lack of time was the most common barrier to belonging to a club or group, mentioned by 39% of respondents who were interested in being in a club or a group. Other common barriers included:

- 19% “not finding a suitable club or group”
- 11% “a lack of transport”
- 9% respondents’ “poor health”
- 7% “family member’s poor health” and
- 7% “the expense of joining”.

Some 16% of all respondents were a board or committee member for an organisation. Of these respondents:

- Two-thirds (66%) were doing this for only one organisation
- 27% had “more than 3 hours and up to 7 hours” contact per month with other board and committee members and
- 22% had “more than 20 hours a month” of contact with other board and committee members.

Only 7% of respondents who were *not* on a board or committee for an organisation would like to be involved in this way. Common reasons why these respondents were not involved in a board or committee for an organisation, even though they would like to be, included:

- 31% “not enough time/too many other commitments”
- 13% “health reasons” (personal)
- 9% “no transport to attend meetings” and
- 7% “family member not well”.

Of all respondents 86% were either “very” or “fairly” satisfied with the amount of time they spend involved in the community. However, 4% were dissatisfied to some degree with their involvement in the community.

A logistic regression analysis (‘enter’ method) was carried out to determine which, if any, of the analysis variables could be used to predict respondent satisfaction with the amount of time they spend involved in the community and *Gender* and *Birthplace* were found to be significant predictors. That is to say, women and those born in non-English speaking countries were more likely to be satisfied with the amount of time they spend involved in the community.

The common reasons why 12% (N=98) of respondents were *not* satisfied with the amount of time they spend involved in the community were:

- 30% “not enough time spent with others”
- 19% “my health or disabilities prevent me being involved” and
- 10% “family member not well”.

Over half (55%) of the respondents who were *not* satisfied with the amount of time they spend in the community would like to be more involved in the community. Common reasons why these respondents were not more involved in the community, even though they would like to be, included:

- 50% “not enough time/too busy”
- 20% “health restrictions”
- 12% “family member not well”
- 11% “physical restrictions” and
- 11% “lack of motivation/lazy”.

1.7 CARER FOR DEPENDENT ADULTS

In total 15% of all respondents reported they are a carer of dependent adults who need care. Of these respondents:

- 57% cared for their “spouse or partner”
- 19% cared for an “adult child” and
- 16% cared for a “parent”.

1.8 BRINGING UP GRANDCHILDREN

In total 87% of all respondents were grandparents. The majority (93%) of these grandparents were *not* responsible for bringing up their grandchildren, either currently or in the past. However, of the 8% of grandparents who were responsible for bringing up their grandchildren¹:

- 51% were responsible for raising “one” grandchild
- 18% were bringing up “two” grandchildren
- 6% were bringing up “three”
- 11% were bringing up “four” and
- 14% were bringing up “more than four” grandchildren.

¹ Reference made to respondents who were “bringing up grandchildren” includes respondents who had previously done so.

Respondents who were bringing up grandchildren were asked to specify what ages the grandchildren were when they *started* bringing them up and the following were the responses:

- 62% under 1 year
- 22% 1 to 4 years
- 22% 5 to 9 years
- 16% 10 to 14 years
- 14% 15 to 19 years.

Respondents who were bringing up grandchildren were then asked to specify how many years they had been raising the grandchildren for and the following were the responses:

- 14% up to 1 year
- 18% 2 to 3 years
- 17% 4 to 5 years
- 5% 6 to 7 years
- 2% 8 to 9 years
- 3% 10 to 11 years
- 9% 14 to 15 years
- 4% 16 to 17 years
- 29% 18 to 19 years
- 2% “Don’t know/unsure/can’t remember”.

1.9 BRINGING UP CHILDREN WHO ARE NOT YOUR OWN

No respondents were currently bringing up any other children who were not their grandchildren or their child.

1.10 ATTITUDES TOWARDS AGEING

- Over half (59%) of respondents felt valued by the community to some extent. Specifically, 18% perceived they were “very valued” and 41% indicated they were “valued”. However, 12% of respondents indicated they felt to some extent “unvalued” by the community.
- Three-quarters (76%) of respondents felt either “very respected” or “respected” by the community, while only 5% indicated they felt “disrespected” to some degree.
- A quarter (26%) of respondents perceived that ageing is a “very positive” stage of life, while a third (32%) indicated it was “fairly positive”. However, 18% of respondents specified it was “neither” positive nor negative, 7% felt it was “fairly negative” and 5% indicated it was “very negative”.
- More than half (58%) of all respondents considered ageing to be a productive stage of life. Specifically, 22% perceived it was “very productive” and 35% indicated it was “fairly productive”. In contrast 13% of respondents considered ageing to be unproductive.

1.11 CURRENT HAPPINESS

All respondents were asked to rate how happy they were in their current life stage using a rating out of 10, where 1 is “very unhappy” and 10 is “very happy”.

- A quarter (26%) of respondents indicated they were “very happy”, with these respondents significantly more likely to be aged 70 years and over. Only 1% of respondents (which is 9 respondents) indicated they were “very unhappy”.
- A logistic regression analysis (‘enter’ method) was carried out to determine which, if any, of the analysis variables could be used to predict respondents’ current happiness. No variables were found to be significant predictors. However, age was close to being significant with a probability of 0.054, indicating that younger seniors *may* be happier than older seniors.

1.12 HEALTH & MOBILITY

- One-fifth (20%) of all respondents rated their physical health as “excellent”, while half (49%) considered their health to be “good”.
- One-quarter (23%) of all respondents considered their health to be “fair” and 8% rated their physical health as “poor”.
- One-third (31%) of all respondents rated their level of mobility as “excellent” and 42% considered it to be “good”.
- One-fifth (19%) rated their mobility as “fair” and 8% considered it to be “poor”.
- The majority (92%) of all respondents had corrective glasses. Other aids commonly used were walking (12%) and hearing (10%) aids.

1.13 TRANSPORT

All respondents were asked to indicate the methods of transport that had used within the three months prior to the interview, with multiple methods obviously accepted.

- The majority (83%) had driven a car and 67% had travelled as a passenger in a car.
- Some 60% of all respondents reported walking.
- Finally, buses and trains were also commonly used forms of transport with a third (32%) and a quarter (26%) of respondents, respectively, reporting they had travelled this way in the three months prior to the interview.

The majority (91%) of respondents perceived it was either “very” or “fairly” easy for them to get around their *local* area, while only 6% perceived it was to some degree difficult to travel around their *local* area. The reasons why the 47 respondents found it difficult to travel around their *local* area included:

- 61% “I’m sick/ill health/disabled/lack mobility”
- 24% “poor public transport service”
- 16% “too far to local facilities”
- 8% “hilly neighbourhood”.

All respondents were asked to “*consider all the other places you need to go to, outside your local area, by car or other transport such as by train, taxi, walking etc*” and then rate how easy or difficult it is for them to get to places they need to go. The majority (85%) of respondents indicated it was either “very” or “fairly” easy for them to travel to places *outside* their local area. However, 10% of respondents found it difficult, to some degree. The common reasons why respondents found it difficult to travel to places *outside* of their local area included:

- 38% “not mobile/I am sick”
- 30% “inadequate public transport”
- 12% “driving issues”.

1.14 PERCEPTIONS OF SAFETY

- The majority (92%) of respondents felt either “very” or “fairly” safe at home alone during the day. Only 2% of respondents felt unsafe to some degree, while another 2% indicated the question was not relevant as they were “never home alone during the day”.
- In relation to feeling safe at home alone after dark, 85% of respondents indicated they felt either “very” or “fairly” safe and 7% felt “unsafe” to some degree.
- The majority (94%) of respondents felt either “very” or “fairly” safe going out during the day time. In contrast, only 2% of respondents indicated they felt “unsafe”, to some degree.
- Half (51%) of the respondents felt either “very” or “fairly” safe going out after dark, while one fifth (20%) felt unsafe. Further, 22% of all respondents specified they would “never go out after dark”.

1.15 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Of all respondents 36% had used the Internet before. However, of these respondents 6% had not used it in the last 12 months, while:

- 39% had used it “once a week”
- 36% had used it “more than once a week”
- 10% had used it “less than once a month”
- 5% had used it “once a fortnight” and
- 4% had used it “once a month”.

The third (34%) of respondents who *had* used the Internet during the 12 months prior to the interview (N=284) were asked where they use the Internet and the majority reported using the Internet “at home”. Other common places where respondents had used the Internet included:

- 9% “work”
- 6% “at friend’s/family’s” home
- 4% “at the library”.

The two most common reasons why respondents used the Internet were for “communication with family and friends” (68%) and “searching the World Wide Web” (63%). One-fifth (22%) of respondents used the Internet for “online services” and 16% reported using it for “work or business purposes”.

One-fifth (22%) of respondents who had *not* used the Internet were interested in using it. The common reasons that prevented respondents who are interested in using the Internet from actually using it were:

- 46% “don’t know how to use a computer”
- 34% “don’t have access to a computer”
- 15% “too costly”
- 10% “no need to use it at present”.

1.16 VOTING METHODS

- Almost all (96%) respondents voted at a polling place in State Elections.
- When asked for their preference for polling versus postal vote if they had a choice between always using a polling place *or* always being sent a postal vote two-thirds (65%) of respondents indicated their preference was to use the polling place always, while a quarter (24%) preferred a postal vote.

1.17 USE OF SENIOR CITIZENS CENTRES

One-fifth (22%) of respondents had used a Senior Citizens Centre during the 12 months prior to the interview. Of these respondents:

- 85% had used their local Centre
- 2% had used both their local and another Senior Citizens Centre and
- 13% had *not* used their local Centre.

The most common reasons why respondents had not used their local Senior Citizens Centre was because they had “no interest in it” (33%) or simply “don’t like the local one” (29%) and therefore use another Centre. However, other reasons of interest included:

- 15% mentioned they “don’t know where it is”
- 10% “people aren’t in my age group”
- 8% “there isn’t one” and
- 8% “inadequate facilities/courses”.

Some 16% of respondents who had *not* used a Senior Citizens Centre in the 12 months prior to the interview had used one before. However, 82% of respondents had never used a Centre. The most common reasons why 521 seniors, of the 800 interviewed, had never used a Senior Citizens Centre were:

- 49% “I have no interest in it”
- 16% “not enough time to visit a centre”
- 9% “too young”
- 7% “don’t know where it is”
- 7% “don’t feel I need it/no reason to go” and
- 7% “people aren’t in my age group”.

1.18 SENIORS CARD

Of all respondents 84% had an OSIV WA Seniors Card, while 15% did not have this card and the remaining 1% of respondents were not sure.

2.0 BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

2.1 BACKGROUND

The Department for Community Development, Office for Seniors Interests and Volunteering (referred to in this report as OSIV) is a State Government agency whose primary focus is Western Australian seniors (people aged 60 years or more). The mission of OSIV is to enhance the lifestyles of seniors by promoting positive ageing; encouraging the community to plan for the ageing of the population; and encouraging individuals to plan for their own ageing.

This mission is underpinned by three strategic goals:

1. Informed community planning: - *To ensure that organisations and community groups are informed, actively plan and are prepared to meet the challenges and opportunities of an ageing population.*
2. Positive ageing: - *To assist older persons to live fulfilling lives through their ability to optimise choices for their lifestyle and by feeling valued within the community.*
3. Heightened status and awareness: - *To promote improved community attitudes towards older people and acceptance of the various stages of ageing, and an increase in the positive perceptions we have of ourselves in our later years.*

In 2004 one of OSIV's key aims is to investigate what seniors spend their time doing in the community and to explore possible barriers to the community participation of seniors. Accordingly, OSIV appointed Patterson Market Research (PMR) to conduct research to gather accurate information from seniors, with regards to their participation in the community.

2.2 OBJECTIVES

The community participation survey aimed to gather accurate information from seniors about their participation in:

- Education
- Paid and unpaid work
- Sports
- Cultural activities
- The general community (i.e. family, friends, clubs and boards)
- Information technology and
- Seniors centres.

Further the research gathered detailed information from seniors on their:

- Attitudes toward ageing and being a senior
- Modes of transport used
- Health and mobility
- Feelings of safety and
- Forms of income.

As well as collecting details on seniors' participation in the above the barriers to participation were explored. Finally demographic information (e.g. marital status, number of persons in their household etc) was also obtained from seniors who participated in the research.

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 SURVEY METHOD

In order to preserve objectivity in the data collection process PMR was commissioned by OSIV to conduct the survey.

The survey was structured to provide a representative sample of people aged 60 years of age and over throughout Western Australia.

The research design was by way of a high quality telephone survey. The sample of households was randomly selected from the WA Electoral Roll and cross-matched with the most current version of the White Pages on CD Rom, in order to obtain the phone numbers.

As part of the data collection program, PMR implemented a “multi phase” call back procedure to maximise the opportunity of producing a very high standard sample of both the more sedentary and more active members of the survey population. This call back routine is effectively applied by using Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI).

Each number in the sample frame was called up to four times over varying days and time shifts in an endeavour to secure an interview. In connection with this, answering machines were treated as a “non answer” and were called back over subsequent days, with a message to contact PMR being the last resort.

Engaged numbers were called back on 15-minute intervals in an attempt to secure an interview. Once contact was made with a household, a “within household” random selection of respondent was made, and up to two further calls were made (to appointment) in an attempt to interview the randomly selected household member. The call results are summarised in Table 3.1 and the response rate for the survey was 20% (calculated by the total number of interviews as a proportion of the number of *contact* calls).

Table 3.1 Call Results from Survey

Call Result		N
Interviews		800
Language		197
Refused		1,830
Terminations	Incorrect age (i.e. under 60 years)	1,128
	Not a permanent resident of WA	5
	Refused to provide age group	2
Call Backs		8
Quota Failure		14
Business Number		49
Total Contact Calls		4,033
Total Non-contact Calls (e.g. no answer, disconnected etc)		1,032

Interviews were conducted by fully trained (IQCA accredited) and experienced market research interviewers from PMR's in-house (CATI) telephone room and took place between 19 and 30 March 2004. The survey was conducted on PMR's CATI telephone interviewing system, but a hard copy of the questionnaire is attached (see Appendix A).

3.2 DATA ANALYSIS & PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The majority of the data analysis was undertaken using the Surveycraft suite of analysis packages. Regression analysis was completed using SPSS for Windows.

To enable a true picture of the seniors' participation and their attitudes to be assessed from the survey, the survey data was weighted to accurately reflect the total population in terms of age, gender and location using the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) data. The result is that the "weighted sample" is an accurate reflection of the profile of the total population. Copies of both the weighted and the unweighted data analysis tables have been provided under a separate cover.

In the summary tables presented in the body of this report *weighted* data has been used. In the body of the report, statistically significant sub-group differences are focused on (refer to Tables 3.2a and 3.2b for detailed outline of the sub-groups). Significance testing was based on 95% confidence level and was conducted on the *unweighted* sample. Note, from hereon the term "significant" and "significantly" will only be used where a difference was found to be *statistically* significant.

In all tables the number of respondents being considered is indicated. The percentages presented in the tables are a measure of the ratio of the total number of responses to the total number of respondents being considered. All presented percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole figure. For example, a result of 15.6% would be reported as 16%. Similarly, a result of 1.4% would be reported as 1%. A result of 0% means that the result was 0.4% or lower and has been rounded down. The percentages in all single response tables may not add to 100% due to rounding (this includes “NET” results which combined “very satisfied and “satisfied for example). Some questions allowed for respondents to offer multiple responses. Consequently, results for these tables may add to more than 100%.

Results from various logistic regressions are also included in the body of the report. These regressions aim to predict the variables which significantly impact on certain results. For example, the regression tests whether variables such as age have an impact on respondents’ current happiness. The ‘enter’ method was used for completing the regressions. The variables tested were entered in the following order:

- Location
- Gender
- Age
- Work Status
- Saw family or friends in the last week
- Health
- How safe respondent feels going out in day
- Income
- Marital Status
- Birthplace.

All regressions are completed using unweighted data. Throughout the report the findings of the logistic regressions detail a ‘beta coefficient’ statistic as well as whether or not the variable has a statistically significant ($p < 0.05$ or less) impact on the result being tested. The coefficient statistic demonstrates whether the trend is positive or negative, based on which codes (higher or lower) had the significant impact.

To assist with interpreting these results, following is an overview of the *high bound* (positive coefficient) and *low bound* codes (negative coefficient) used for each of the questions used as variables in the regression testing. For example, if the impact of gender was significant and there was a negative coefficient this means that females (code 2) were the key sub-group the significant results relate to. In opposition a positive coefficient refers to men. Note, all codes within the range (for instance with income codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) were included in the regression analysis. Codes representing “don’t know/unsure” and “other” are removed from the analysis.

Beta Coeff.	Location	Gender	Age	Work Status*	Family or friends	Health	Safety going out in day	Income	Marital Status	Birth-place
+	1 (Metro)	1 (Male)	1 (60-64yrs)	1 (Yes, in paid or voluntary)	1 (Yes, seen in last week)	1 (Excellent)	1 (Very Safe)	1 (Nil)	1 (Married)	1 (Aust.)
-	2 (Country)	2 (Female)	3 (70+ yrs)	10 (No, not in paid or voluntary)	10 (No, not seen in last week)	4 (Poor)	5 (Very unsafe)	4 (\$1000+ each fortnight)	6 (Never married)	3 (Non-English)

*Note, this is a constructed question based on responses to BQ1 and BQ3

3.3 SAMPLE PROFILE & RELIABILITY

A target of 800 completed interviews was set for this project. Within this, quotas for age (200 aged 60-64 years, 200 aged 65-69 years, 200 aged 70-74 years, 100 aged 75-79 years and 100 aged 80 years and over), gender (400 in each) and location (country 200 / metropolitan 600) were applied. Overall, the survey result of 800 respondents provides data, which is accurate to within $\pm 3.5\%$ of the “real” figures at the 95% level of confidence.

The survey results have quoted sample sizes in each of the tables and figures to provide a guide to the reader on the accuracy or the reliability of the data. Survey accuracy is a function of both the sample size and (to a lesser extent) the distance that the result is from 50% (broadly, the further a survey estimate is from 50%, the more accurate it will be). Hence, whilst the exact confidence limits will vary according to the survey result itself, PMR have quoted some broad tolerance limit guidelines to provide the reader a guide as to the accuracy of the survey results.

Summarised in Table 3.2a and Table 3.2b are the sample sizes (unweighted and weighted) and statistical survey error for each of the sub-groups that are included in the data tables. These are the sub-groups on which significant differences will be outlined, where relevant (testing completed on the unweighted data at the 95% confidence level).

Table 3.2a Sample Reliability of Analysis Variables (first “Banner”² of Tables)

		Sample Size (Unweighted)	Sample Size (Weighted)	Margin of error at the 95% level of confidence*
Gender	Male	400	372	± 4.9
	Female	400	428	± 4.9
Location	Metropolitan Perth	600	593	± 4.0
	Country WA	200	207	± 6.9
Age Group	60-64 years	201	216	± 6.9
	65-69 years	202	172	± 6.9
	70-74 years	196	201	± 7.0
	75 years or over	201	211	± 6.9
Income (weekly)	Less than \$400	231	231	± 6.5
	\$400-800	247	247	± 6.2
	\$800 plus	115	114	± 9.1
Marital Status	Married/Defacto	567	557	± 4.1
	Widowed	147	154	± 8.1
	Divorced/Separated	61	63	± 12.6
Number of people in household	One person	200	206	± 6.9
	Two	537	530	± 4.2
	More than two people	52	52	± 13.6
Country of Birth	Australia	517	523	± 4.3
	Other English speaking	206	202	± 6.8
	Non-English speaking	75	73	± 11.3
Indigenous Status	Not of ATSI ³ origin	509	515	± 4.3
	ATSI origin	7	7	± 37.0
TOTAL SAMPLE*		800	800	± 3.5

* Based on a 50% result for unweighted sample sizes.

* Results for the total sample are weighted using latest Census data.

² “Banner” refers to the variables making up the columns that are cross-tabulated against each question in the data tables.

³ Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander.

Table 3.2a Sample Reliability of Analysis Variables
(second “Banner” of Tables)

		Sample Size (Unweighted)	Sample Size (Weighted)	Margin of error at the 95% level of confidence*
Current Happiness	Very Happy	348	345	± 5.3
	Fairly Happy	327	324	± 5.4
	Fairly Neutral	94	96	± 10.1
	Unhappy	20	23	± 21.9
Health	Excellent	160	157	± 7.8
	Good	400	393	± 4.9
	Fair	179	187	± 7.3
	Poor	60	61	± 12.7
Mobility	Excellent	246	245	± 6.3
	Good	340	338	± 5.3
	Fair	148	150	± 8.1
	Poor	64	65	± 12.3
Safety going out in the day	Safe	754	752	± 3.6
	Less than safe	29	30	± 18.2
Paid or Voluntary Work	Paid	80	82	± 11.0
	Voluntary	283	279	± 5.8
	Neither	372	371	± 5.1
	Both	65	68	± 12.3
Saw family or friends in the last week	Yes	658	659	± 3.8
	No	90	90	± 10.3
Contact with family or friends in the last week	Yes	727	731	± 3.6
	No	45	42	± 14.6
TOTAL SAMPLE*		800	800	± 3.5

* Based on a 50% result for unweighted sample sizes.

* Results for the total sample are weighted using latest Census data.

NB. In some cases the number of respondents being considered is small (<50). In these instances the data is presented as a guide only and caution should be exercised in drawing conclusions.

3.3.1 STANDARD BANNER VARIABLES SUMMARISED AS PROPORTIONS OF THE SAMPLE

As summarised in Table 3.3a, approximately half (46%) of the sample were men and the other half (54%) were women. This even gender spread was applied to the total sample as well as within each of the age sub-groups (60-64 years 51%/49%; 65-69 years 49%/51%; and 70-74 years 45%/55%; 75 years and over 41%/59%). A quota of three-quarters (74%) metropolitan interviews and one-quarter (26%) country WA interviews was achieved, and again was consistent within each of the age groups (60-64 years 72%/28%; 65-69 years 72%/28%; 70-74 years 77%/23%; and 75 years and over; 74%/26%).

In relation to the age groups upon which sub-group analysis will be based, 27% of respondents were in the youngest category of 60 to 64 years, 21% were aged 65 to 69 years, 25% were aged 70 to 74 years and 26% were aged 75 years and over. Within each gender the age group proportions were close to the overall proportions, with 30% of men in the youngest age group and 25% of women in this same age group. For the age groups of 65 to 69 years and 75 years and over a slightly larger proportion of men were in the middle age group (23% versus 20% of women) and a greater proportion of women were in the eldest group (29% versus 23% of men). The gender split was almost equal within the 70 to 74 year age bracket (men 24% and women 26%). Other key attributes of the overall sample, from the “first banner”, were:

- 31% earned \$400 to \$800 *net* per fortnight
- 70% were either married or in a defacto relationship
- 66% lived in a household with one other person (i.e. number of persons in household is two)
- 65% were Australian born and
- 64% were *not* of Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander origin.

For each of the analysis variables on the first banner the age and gender differences are summarised in Table 3.3a, with the statistically significant differences marked by an “*” symbol⁴.

⁴ Differences for gender, location and age are not shown as these were “corrected” by the data weighting process.

Table 3.3a Analysis Variables (“first Banner”) as a Proportion of the Sample (BASE: All Respondents)

	TOTAL** N=800 %	GENDER		AGE GROUPS			
		Male N=400 %	Female N=400 %	60-64yrs N=201 %	65-69yrs N=202 %	70-74yrs N=196 %	75+yrs N=201 %
GENDER							
Male	46	100	-	51	49	45	41
Female	54	-	100	49	51	55	59
LOCATION							
Metro	74	72	76	72	72	77	74
Country	26	28	24	28	28	23	26
AGE							
60-64 years	27	30	25	100	-	-	-
65-69 years	21	23	20	-	100	-	-
70-74 years	25	24	26			100	-
75 years and over	26	23	29			-	100
INCOME #							
<\$400	29	25	32	27	29	32	28
\$400-\$800	31	31	30	*22	30	33	39
\$800 Plus	14	*21	*8	*27	*14	9	6
MARITAL STATUS							
Married / Defacto	70	*81	*60	*80	*75	73	52
Widowed	19	*9	*28	*4	*14	17	41
Divorced / Separated	8	*6	*9	*11	7	7	6
Never Married	2	3	1	3	*4	1	0
NUMBER IN HOUSEHOLD							
One	26	*18	*33	*17	*21	20	44
Two	66	*75	*59	72	68	75	51
> Two	6	7	6	*10	*10	3	3
COUNTRY OF BIRTH							
Australia	65	65	66	68	65	65	64
Other English Speaking	25	26	25	24	24	24	28
Non-English Speaking	9	9	9	7	11	11	8
INDIGENOUS STATUS##							
Not of ATSI origin	64	64	65	67	64	64	63
ATSI origin	1	1	1	1	1	0	1

** The totals may not equal 100% as they are based on the total population, even where questions were only asked of a subset of the sample (for example “Indigenous Status” only relevant to Australian born respondents).

#The remaining 26% refused to report their income.

##The remaining 35% were not born in Australia.

Table 3.3b outlines the key analysis variables on the “second banner” as a proportion of the overall sample as well as summarising these within the sub-groups of gender and age. As was done in Table 3.3a, the statistically significant differences marked by an ‘*’ symbol. The key attributes of the overall sample, from the “second banner”, were:

- 43% were “very happy” in their current stage of life
- 49% rated their health as “good”
- 42% rated their mobility as “good”
- 94% felt safe going out during the day
- 46% were not in paid work *and* had not done any voluntary work in the last 12 months
- 82% had seen family or friends in the week prior to the interview and
- 91% had other types of contact with family or friends in the week prior to the interview.

As summarised in Table 3.3b, men and younger seniors (60 to 64 years) were significantly more likely to rate their health as “excellent”. A significant age trend also emerged in relation to mobility, where the younger the respondent the more likely they were to rate their mobility as “excellent”. Further, the older the respondent the more likely they were to indicate their mobility was “poor”.

The other area in which age had a significant impact was in relation to being active in paid and/or unpaid work. Younger respondents (60 to 64 years) were significantly more likely to be in paid work, as well as participating in “both” paid and voluntary unpaid work. However, a significantly larger proportion of older respondents (aged 65 years and over) had completed only unpaid voluntary work in the last 12 months.

Although there were no statistically significant differences in relation to seeing family or friends, women were significantly more likely to have other forms of contact with family or friends in the week prior to the interview. Respondents aged 65 to 69 years were the least likely to have had such contact, with those aged 60 to 64 years and 70 years and over significantly more likely to do so.

Table 3.3b Analysis Variables (“second Banner”) as a Proportion of the Sample (BASE: All Respondents)

	TOTAL** N=800 %	GENDER		AGE GROUPS			
		Male N=400 %	Female N=400 %	60-64yrs N=201 %	65-69yrs N=202 %	70-74yrs N=196 %	75+yrs N=201 %
CURRENT HAPPINESS							
Net Unhappy	3	3	2	4	3	4	1
Fairly Neutral	12	*10	*14	14	10	9	15
Fairly Happy	41	*45	*37	37	45	40	42
Very Happy	43	41	45	45	41	45	41
HEALTH							
Excellent	20	*25	*15	*29	18	16	15
Good	49	48	51	*46	*56	55	41
Fair	23	21	26	*18	20	24	31
Poor	8	7	8	7	6	6	12
MOBILITY							
Excellent	31	31	30	*40	*35	28	19
Good	42	44	41	46	38	41	43
Fair	19	17	20	*10	*18	23	24
Poor	8	8	9	*3	*8	6	15
SAFETY GOING OUT IN DAY							
Safe	94	95	93	96	92	96	91
Less than Safe	4	3	4	3	*7	1	4
PAID / VOLUNTARY WORK							
Paid	10	13	8	*29	*8	2	1
Voluntary	35	30	39	*23	*37	46	35
Neither	46	46	47	29	46	51	61
Both	8	11	6	*20	*9	1	3
SAW IN LAST WEEK[#]							
Yes	82	81	84	84	81	85	79
No	11	11	11	9	11	11	14
CONTACT IN LAST WEEK^{##}							
Yes	91	*89	*94	*93	*86	93	92
No	5	*7	*4	4	8	5	4

* The totals may not equal 100% as they are based on the total population, even where questions were only asked of a subset of the sample.

[#]The remaining 7% indicated “don’t know.”

^{##}The remaining 4% were indicated “don’t know.”

4.0 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

In addition to the summary of the standard banner variables in Section 3.3.1, the following demographic details are provided to profile the sample of 800 seniors. Most demographic information was collected in the final stages of the interview.

4.1 AGE

As can be seen in Table 4.1, one-quarter (27%) of respondents were aged 60 to 64 years and another quarter (25%) were aged 70 to 74 years. The next largest proportion of respondents were aged 65 to 69 years (21%) followed by just over 10% of respondents in the two oldest categories (13% 75-79 years and 13% aged 80 years and over). The age groups represented was similar among men and women as well as among the metropolitan and country samples. This is not surprising given the post-weighting that was applied to the data in order to make the sample representative of the current age, gender and location profile.

Table 4.1 Age Group
(Question S4)
(BASE: All respondents)

	TOTAL	GENDER		LOCATION	
		Male	Female	Metro	Country
	N=800 %	N=400 %	N=400 %	N=600 %	N=200 %
60 to 64 years	27	30	25	26	29
65 to 69 years	21	23	20	21	23
70 to 74 years	25	24	26	26	22
75 to 79 years	13	11	15	14	11
80 years and over	13	12	14	12	16
TOTAL*	99	100	100	99	101

* Totals do not equal 100% due to rounding.

The following sub-groups were significantly *more likely* to be in the youngest age group, of 60 to 64 years:

- those earning \$800 or more *net* per fortnight
- those who were married or in a defacto relationship
- respondents who rated their health and mobility as “excellent”
- those who were in paid work or who did “both” paid and unpaid work.

In contrast, the following sub-groups were significantly *more likely* to be in the eldest age group, of 80 years or more:

- those earning less than \$800 *net* per fortnight
- respondents who were widowed and living by themselves
- those who rated their health and mobility as “poor” and
- respondents who did only voluntary work or “neither” paid nor unpaid work.

Note, several of the aforementioned significant differences relating to the eldest age sub-group also applied in relation to those who were aged 75 to 79 years, as follows these respondents were more likely to be those who:

- earned \$400 to \$800 *net* per fortnight
- were widowed and living by themselves
- did only voluntary work or “neither” paid nor unpaid work.

4.2 INCOME SOURCES

Table 4.2 summarises the sources from which respondents receive their income, with the most common source identified being an “Australian Government pension or allowance” (69%). Other common income sources were “from investments” (33%), “from savings” (26%) and from “superannuation or annuity” (25%). Note that 12% of respondents were still receiving “wages or salary” as their income.

Men were significantly more likely to be earning from “superannuation or annuity”, “investments”, “savings” and “business profits”. A significant age trend is apparent in relation to “pensions or allowances”, where the older the respondent the more likely they were to report they received income from the “Australian government” or from an “Overseas Government”. In contrast, younger seniors were significantly more likely to receive “wages or a salary”.

Table 4.2 Income Sources
(Question MQ1)
(BASE: All Respondents)

	TOTAL N=800 %	GENDER		AGE GROUPS			
		Male N=400 %	Female N=400 %	60-64yrs N=201 %	65-69yrs N=202 %	70-74yrs N=196 %	75+yrs N=201 %
Australian Government pension or allowance	69	64	73	40	69	79	87
Income from investments	33	38	29	34	40	32	27
Income from savings	26	29	24	26	27	24	28
Superannuation or annuity	25	30	19	22	37	25	16
Overseas Government pension or allowance	14	13	16	5	17	18	18
Wages or salary	12	13	12	34	11	2	1
Business profits	8	12	4	17	6	5	3
Partner still works	2	1	3	4	3	0	0
Child support or maintenance	0	0	-	-	1	-	-
Other regular service	0	-	0	0	-	-	-
Rent	0	-	0	0	1	-	-
No, none of these	0	0	0	-	1	-	-
Refused	1	1	2	1	2	2	0

* The totals may not equal 100% due to multiple responses.

Other statistically significant differences in relation to income sources were:

- Metropolitan respondents were significantly more likely to receive income from either “superannuation or annuity” or from “savings”.

- Respondents with lower incomes (less than \$800 *net* per fortnight) were significantly more likely to be receiving an “Australian Government pension or allowance”, while those with a higher income were more likely to be getting “wages or a salary”.
- Further, significantly larger proportions of respondents earning more than \$800 *net* per fortnight indicated they received income from “superannuation or annuity”, from “business profits” or from “investments”.
- Respondents who were married or in a defacto relationship were significantly more likely to be receiving “superannuation or annuity”, compared to those who were divorced or separated.
- Single person householders were significantly more likely to be receiving income from an “Australian Government pension or allowance”.
- Significantly larger proportions of respondents born in Australia and in other English speaking countries reported receiving income from their “superannuation or annuity”.
- Respondents in “excellent” or “good” health were more likely to be receiving “wages or a salary”, while those with “fair” or “poor” health were significantly more likely to be receiving an “Australian Government pension or allowance”. This pattern was also apparent in relation to respondents’ mobility.

4.3 TYPE OF DWELLING LIVED IN

Approximately 1 in 10 respondents were living in a retirement village and these respondents were significantly more likely to be women and those aged 70 years and over. By far the most common type of dwelling respondents lived in was a “separate house” (78%). However, one fifth (19%) lived in a “unit or villa”. Women were significantly more likely to be living in a “unit or villa”, while a significantly larger proportion of men lived in a “separate house”. The younger the respondent was the significantly more likely they were to live in a “separate house”, while older respondents were significantly more likely to live in a “unit or villa”.

Table 4.3 Dwelling
(Question NQ2A & NQ2B)
(BASE: All Respondents)

	TOTAL N=800 %	GENDER		AGE GROUPS			
		Male N=400 %	Female N=400 %	60-64yrs N=201 %	65-69yrs N=202 %	70-74yrs N=196 %	75+yrs N=201 %
LIVE IN A RETIREMENT VILLAGE							
Yes	9	4	13	3	4	7	21
No	91	95	87	96	96	93	79
TOTAL*	100	99	100	99	100	100	100
TYPE OF DWELLING LIVE IN							
Separate house	78	83	73	86	88	83	57
Unit or villa	19	14	22	10	11	15	38
Duplex	2	1	2	1	1	1	4
Other	1	1	1	1	-	1	1
Caravan park/Holiday home	1	1	1	1	1	0	0
Cared accommodation for seniors	0	0	0	0	-	-	0
Refused	0	0	-	0	-	-	-
TOTAL**	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

* Note, 0% of respondents indicated “don’t know” and 0% “refused”. **Totals do not equal 100% due to rounding.

In addition, respondents who were significantly more likely to live in a “separate house” were those who were:

- earning less than \$400 or more than \$800 *net* per fortnight
- married or in a defacto relationship
- living with one person or more
- born in a non-English speaking country
- “very happy” with their current life stage
- able to rate their health as “good” and their mobility as “good” or “excellent”
- in paid employment.

4.4 OTHER HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS' RELATIONSHIP TO RESPONDENT

A quarter (26%) of respondents lived by themselves and interestingly these respondents were significantly more likely to be women and those aged 75 years and over. Two thirds (66%) of respondents lived with one other person, while 4% lived with two other people, 1% with three others and the final four respondents lived in households including five or more persons.

The majority (95%) of respondents who did not live alone (N=543) indicated that they lived with their “partner or spouse”. As shown in Table 4.4, approximately 1 in 10 respondents who did not live alone were living with their child (that is “son/daughter” at 9%).

Table 4.4 Household
(Question NQ4)
(BASE: Other Householders
Relationship to you)

	TOTAL N=543 %	GENDER		AGE GROUPS			
		Male N=290 %	Female N=253 %	60-64yrs N=149 %	65-69yrs N=148 %	70-74yrs N=146 %	75+yrs N=100 %
Partner/Spouse	95	98	91	97	95	93	93
Son/Daughter	9	7	12	10	10	9	10
Grand Child	3	2	4	3	3	2	2
Unrelated	2	1	3	3	3	-	3
Mother/Father	1	1	1	2	1	1	-
Brother/Sister	0	-	1	-	-	-	3
Other Relative	0	1	0	1	1	-	-
Other	0	-	0	1	-	-	-

* The totals may not equal 100% due to multiple responses.

Respondents living with their “partner/spouse” were significantly more likely to be:

- men
- earning less than \$400 or more than \$800 *net* per fortnight
- those who indicated they were “fairly happy” or “very happy” in their current life stage and
- those with “fair” health (compared to those with “poor” health).

4.5 OTHER LANGUAGES SPOKEN

As presented in Table 4.5 only 7% of all respondents speak a language other than English at home. These respondents were significantly more likely to be from the metropolitan area of WA, born in a non-English speaking country, rate their health as “fair” or “poor” and be in paid work. “Other Eastern European languages” were the most common languages spoken (27%), followed by “Italian” (26%), “French” (11%) and “German” (11%). Of respondents who spoke another language at home 70% reported they spoke English “very well” and 26% indicated “well”.

Table 4.5 Summary of Non-English Speaking Background (Question NQ7a, NQ7B & NQ8)

	TOTAL	GENDER		AGE GROUPS			
	N=800 %	Male N=400 %	Female N=400 %	60-64yrs N=201 %	65-69yrs N=202 %	70-74yrs N=196 %	75+yrs N=201 %
SPEAK LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH AT HOME (ALL RESPONDENTS)							
No	93	93	94	93	92	94	94
Yes	7	7	6	7	8	6	6
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
WHICH LANGUAGE(S) DO YOU SPEAK?							
BASE: Speak Language other than English at Home**	N=56* %	N=31 %	N=25 %	N=16 %	N=16 %	N=12 %	N=12 %
Other Eastern European languages	27	23	31	19	25	21	45
Italian	26	22	30	13	24	41	28
French	11	15	7	13	24	-	7
German	11	10	12	13	-	14	17
Other Western European languages	9	9	8	-	18	-	17
Other South-East Asian languages	7	14	-	25	-	-	-
Dutch	6	-	12	6	7	10	-
Cantonese	5	3	7	13	-	-	7
Malay	5	6	4	6	6	-	7
Middle-Eastern languages	5	6	4	6	6	-	7
Aboriginal / Noongar	3	-	7	-	14	-	-
Mandarin	3	3	4	6	-	-	7
Chinese (not-specified)	3	6	-	-	-	13	-
Other South-Asian languages	3	7	-	6	-	7	-
Greek	2	-	4	6	-	-	-
SPEAK ENGLISH VERY WELL, WELL OR NOT WELL							
Very well	70	68	72	81	76	66	55
Well	26	28	23	12	24	34	35
Not well	4	4	5	6	-	-	11
TOTAL***	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

*Small sub-sample size, results should be viewed as indicative.

** The total does not equal 100% due to multiple responses.

*** The total does not equal 100% due to rounding.