

# LIVING IN SASKATCHEWAN COMMUNITIES: A QUALITY OF LIFE STUDY

---

THIS REPORT WAS COMMISSIONED BY  
THE **COMMUNITY INITIATIVES FUND.**

February  
2010



Report Compiled by  
Insightrix Research, Inc.  
Suite 104, 110 Research Drive  
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan  
T: 1-866-888-5640 F: 1-306-384-5655

# Executive Summary

## Purpose

The Community Initiatives Fund (CIF) was created in 1995 by authority of *The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Act* to distribute a portion of casino profits for the benefit of communities. Each year the CIF provides hundreds of grants for projects and activities benefiting communities across Saskatchewan.

Insightrix Research Inc. was commissioned by the Community Initiatives Fund Board of Trustees to conduct a study of Saskatchewan households to measure Saskatchewan residents' perceptions of access to, and use of, programs and services in their communities. It was also designed to assess residents' perceptions of the quality of life in their communities. The results of this research will provide valuable information for the CIF Board to work with community-based organizations and delivery partners to improve the impact of the CIF community grant programs.

This report presents the results from the survey of 4,069 Saskatchewan households that was conducted from May to August, 2009.

## Study Results

One-quarter (26.6%) of respondents were aware of the CIF and of those, 27.0% indicated that someone in their household has participated in a program or service that was funded by the CIF within the past three years (7.2% overall).

## Section 1: Participation in Leisure/Free-Time Activities

The first section of the survey included questions regarding respondents' participation in each of a list of 23 leisure/free-time activities as well as respondents reporting about participation in these activities by other members of their households. Over one-half (52.6%) of respondents reported engaging in two hours or more a day of "screen time" outside of school or work on a daily basis and about one-third (34.6%) indicated they walk, run or jog daily. In terms of overall participation, more than nine in ten respondents indicated that someone in their household participated at least once per year in other home activities (e.g., gardening, yard work, etc.) (98.5%), two hours or more a day of "screen time" outside of school or work (98.3%), walking, running or jogging (96.9%), visiting local/neighbourhood parks or open spaces (94.0%) and attending cultural events, festivals or other special events (93.4%).

## **Section 2: Barriers to Participation in Leisure/Free-Time Activities**

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement that each of a list of 17 items is a barrier to their participation in leisure/free-time activities. They were also asked to rate their level of agreement if those same items were a barrier to participation for other members of their household. Over one-half of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that being too busy with work or school (56.5% of Respondents (Resp), 51.4% Other Household Members (OHM)) was a barrier to their participation. Too busy with household responsibilities (48.0% of Resp and 41.1% of OHM), programs or activities are not scheduled at convenient times (39.3% of Resp and 35.4% of OHM) were also commonly reported by respondents as being a barrier to household participation in leisure/free-time activities.

## **Section 3: Facilities - Access and Use**

The majority of respondents (56.7%) agreed or strongly agreed they were satisfied with the overall quality of recreation and leisure facilities in their community.

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement that their households had access to a list of 13 types of facilities. They were also asked to report if anyone in their household had used that type of facility within the past year. The facilities most commonly identified by respondents as being accessible to household members were parks or open spaces (85.8%), a public library (84.7%) and schools (80.1%). Over two-thirds of respondents reported that at least one household member used parks and open spaces (84.2%), sidewalks near their home (78.6%), and multi-use paths or trails to engage in physical activity (67.0%) at least once in the past year.

## **Section 4: Program and Services - Access and Use**

In total, 60.5% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed they were satisfied with their access to programs or services that they needed. Over one-half of respondents were in agreement that they were satisfied with the overall quality of recreation and leisure programs and services in their community (56.5%) and that they were satisfied with the overall quality of other programs and services in their community (50.4%).

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement that their household has access to a list of 29 types of programs and services. They were also asked to report if anyone in their household had used that type of program or service within the past year. Programs and services for which respondents gave high agreement that their household had access included general health services (77.2%), protection services (77.2%) and dental services (67.2%). With regard to use, a majority of respondents reported that a household member had used general health services (81.5%), dental services (63.5%) and locally produced food (55.9%) at least once within the past year.

## **Section 5: Community Quality of Life**

Most respondents (84.7%) agreed or strongly agreed that the quality of life in their communities has either stayed the same (46.0%) or improved (38.7%) over the past three years.

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with each of a list of 28 items related to community quality of life. Most respondents (84.7%) agreed that their community is an attractive place to live (84.7%), that their community is home to people of diverse ethnicities and cultures (71.4%), that there are events or festivals to celebrate local history or culture (67.7%) and that residents have a strong sense that they belong here (64.3%).

## **Section 6: Personal Quality of Life**

Respondents were asked to rate their levels of agreement with each of a list of 25 items related to personal quality of life. Over three-quarters of respondents (79.0%) agreed that they were satisfied with their overall quality of life. Most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were generally satisfied with their family relations (86.4%), they were satisfied with their friendships (84.2%), and that they chose to live in their community (80.9%).

# Table of Contents

---

Executive Summary ..... i  
    Purpose ..... i  
    Study Results ..... i  
    Section 1: Participation in Leisure/Free-Time Activities..... i  
    Section 2: Barriers to Participation in Leisure/Free-Time Activities ..... ii  
    Section 3: Facilities - Access and Use ..... ii  
    Section 4: Program and Services - Access and Use ..... ii  
    Section 5: Community Quality of Life ..... iii  
    Section 6: Personal Quality of Life ..... iii  
Introduction and Methodology ..... vii  
    Project Background & Objectives..... vii  
    CIF Survey Instrumentation ..... vii  
        Instrumentation ..... vii  
        Participation in Leisure/Free-Time Activities.....viii  
        Barriers to Participation in Leisure/Free-Time Activities.....viii  
        Facility Access and Use .....viii  
        Program and Service Access and Use ..... ix  
        Quality of Life ..... ix  
        Community Quality of Life ..... ix  
        Personal Quality of Life ..... x  
        Demographics ..... x  
Methodology..... xi  
    Sample Plan ..... xi  
    Data Collection Methods .....xii  
    Weighting .....xiii  
    Future Work with the Survey Results .....xiii  
    Limitations and Opportunities .....xiv  
    Reporting Notes .....xiv  
Study Results ..... 1  
    Awareness of CIF ..... 1

Participation in CIF Programs .....	1
Section 1: Participation in Leisure/Free-time Activities .....	2
Factor 1: Sport, Recreation and Physical Activity .....	4
Factor 2: Arts, Culture and Heritage .....	5
Factor 3: Nature-based Recreation .....	6
Factor 4: Tourism .....	7
Factor 5: Other Activities .....	8
Section 2: Barriers to Participation in Leisure/Free-time Activities .....	9
Factor 1: Poor Health, Skill and Ability .....	10
Factor 2: Opportunities and Availability .....	11
Factor 3: Participation Cost .....	12
Factor 4: Busy with Other Responsibilities .....	13
Section 3: Facilities – Access and Use .....	14
Satisfaction with the Overall Quality of Recreation and Leisure Facilities in the Community ..	14
Facilities – Overall Access and Use .....	14
Factor 1: Indoor Sport and Recreation .....	16
Factor 2: Outdoor Sport and Recreation .....	17
Factor 3: Arts and Other Community Facilities .....	18
Section 4: Programs and Services – Access and Use .....	19
Satisfied with the Access and Quality of Programs and Services in the Community .....	19
Programs and Services – Overall Access and Use .....	20
Factor 1: Health .....	22
Factor 2: Other Basic Needs .....	23
Factor 3: Personal Development .....	24
Section 5: Community Quality of Life .....	25
Change in Community Quality of Life .....	25
Overall Community Quality of Life .....	26
Factor 1: Civic Engagement .....	27
Factor 2: Creativity, Diversity and Learning .....	28
Factor 3: Community Magnetism .....	29
Factor 4: Sustainable, Vibrant Community Environment .....	30
Factor 5: Community Hospitality and Belonging .....	31
Factor 6: Air and Water Quality .....	32

Section 6: Personal Quality of Life .....	33
Overall Personal Quality of Life .....	33
Factor 1: Life Satisfaction .....	35
Factor 2: Leisure Satisfaction .....	36
Factor 3: Satisfaction with Personal Health .....	37
Factor 4: Social Satisfaction.....	38
Factor 5: Personal Engagement in Community Stewardship .....	39
Factor 6: Personal Attachment to Community.....	40
Respondent Demographics .....	41
Gender .....	41
Age .....	41
Aboriginal Status (Self-Identified) .....	42
Aboriginal Identity (Self-Identified).....	42
Disability.....	43
Marital Status .....	43
Employment.....	44
Education.....	44
Place of Birth.....	45
Place Spent Majority of Childhood Years.....	45
Years Living in Saskatchewan and Community .....	46
Community Size.....	46
Reside on First Nations Reserve .....	47
Household Demographics.....	48
Number of People in Household .....	48
Households with Children.....	48
Number of Persons with a Disability in Household.....	49
Annual Household Income .....	50

# Introduction and Methodology

---

## PROJECT BACKGROUND & OBJECTIVES

The Community Initiatives Fund (CIF) was created in 1995 by authority of *The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation Act* to distribute a portion of casino profits for the benefit of communities. Each year the CIF provides hundreds of grants for projects and activities benefiting communities across Saskatchewan. CIF programming includes the Community Grant Program, the Urban Aboriginal Community Grant Program, the Problem Gambling Prevention and Treatment Program and the Physical Activities Grant Program.

Insightrix Research Inc. was commissioned by the CIF Board of Trustees to conduct a study of Saskatchewan households to measure Saskatchewan residents' perceptions of access to, and use of, programs and services in their communities. It was also designed to assess residents' perceptions of the quality of life in their communities. The results of this research will provide valuable information for the CIF Board to work with community-based organizations and delivery partners to improve the impact of CIF programming.

The public survey was the fourth and final phase of a research project conducted on behalf of the CIF. The first three phases of this research project were: Applicant Survey; Municipal Administrator Survey; and Adjudicator Survey. The reports from the first three phases of the research project can be viewed and downloaded from:  
[www.tpcs.gov.sk.ca/CIF-Research-Reports](http://www.tpcs.gov.sk.ca/CIF-Research-Reports).

In Saskatchewan, as in North America, the philanthropy of charities and foundations continues to be challenged by market impacts on endowments and donors, and by the growing need to enhance the capacity of community-based organizations. The CIF Board conducted this research project as an investment in the future success of Saskatchewan communities.

Insightrix worked with representatives from the Ministry of Tourism, Parks, Culture and Sport (TPCS), who developed the project collaboratively with the CIF Board of Trustees.

## CIF SURVEY INSTRUMENTATION

### Instrumentation

The CIF Public Survey was designed to capture information to improve the ability of local community groups to design and implement programs or services that positively impact the quality of life in their communities. TPCS staff conducted a literature review and consulted with stakeholders to develop the instrumentation included in the CIF Public Survey questionnaire. The majority of this instrumentation mirrored the three CIF stakeholder surveys that preceded the administration of the public survey.



## Participation in Leisure/Free-Time Activities

Respondents were asked to indicate how often they or other member(s) of their household had participated in 23 types of leisure/free-time activities in the past 12 months. There were five response options ranging from never to daily. It should also be noted that in the participation bar charts that follow, the *never* responses have not been included. These 23 items were designed to provide information on a variety of leisure activities that were categorized into five factors: (1) Sport, recreation and physical activity (six items); (2) Arts, culture and heritage (six items); (3) Nature-based recreation (four items); (4) Tourism (two items); and (5) Other activities (five items).

## Barriers to Participation in Leisure/Free-Time Activities

Leisure constraints/barriers are factors that shape people's leisure preferences, limit participation, or reduce the level of enjoyment and satisfaction. There are three types of barriers: (a) Intrapersonal (psychological states that shape leisure preferences); (b) Interpersonal (arise out of relationships with friends, family and others); and (c) Structural (factors intervening between leisure preferences and participation, such as cost, time and transportation)<sup>1</sup>.

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement on 17 items that were included to capture a range of intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural barriers that prevented them from participating in leisure/free-time activities in the past 12 months. Based on the responses, these 17 items were categorized into four factors: (1) Too busy with other responsibilities (two items); (2) Participation costs (three items); (3) Lack of opportunity or availability (six items); and (4) Poor health, skills or ability (five items). One item was removed due to poor reliability and factor loading.

## Facility Access and Use

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement that they or other member(s) of their household had access to 13 types of facilities. They were also asked if someone in their household had used these facilities in the past 12 months. These 13 items were designed to provide information on a variety of facility types that were categorized into three factors: (1) Indoor sport and recreation (three items); (2) Outdoor sport and recreation (five items); and (3) Arts and Other Community Facilities (five items).

---

<sup>1</sup> Jackson, E.L. (2005). Constraints to Leisure. State College: Venture Publishing.

## Program and Service Access and Use

Upon review of the CIF grant applications from the past two years several programs and services were identified as those being provided by the organizations CIF applicants represent and partner with. In addition, during survey development consultations requests to include specific program and service types were received from other ministries and stakeholders. This information will help the CIF Board and other stakeholders to understand the local context in which local community groups (LCG's) provide programs and services.

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement that they or other member(s) of their household had access to 29 types of programs and services. They were also asked if someone in their household had used these programs or services in the past 12 months. These 29 items were designed to provide information on a wide variety of programs and services that were categorized into three factors: (1) Health (nine items); (2) Other basic needs (nine items); and (3) Personal development (11 items).

## Quality of Life

Although academic journals have been created for the sole purpose of studying quality of life, there is little consensus in the definition. Researchers and policy makers have begun to demonstrate the value of balancing traditional objective measures of quality of life (e.g., GDP, income) with subjective measures that “reflect peoples own evaluation of their lives.”<sup>2</sup> It is important to include both place-centred (e.g., community conditions) and person-centred (e.g., personal experiences) aspects when measuring quality of life. This study incorporates a variety of subjective quality of life measures from the literature that explore respondents' perceptions of quality of life in their community.

## Community Quality of Life

Research has identified a variety of elements that measure community quality of life<sup>3456</sup>. Respondents were asked to indicate if the quality of life in their community changed during the previous three years. In addition, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with 28 items related to community quality of life. Based on the responses, these 28 items were

---

<sup>2</sup> Diener, E., Lucas, R., Schimmack, U., and Helliwell, J. (2009). Well-Being for Public Policy. London: Oxford University Press.

<sup>3</sup> Muhajarine, N., Labonte, R., Williams, A., and Randall, J. (2008). Person, perception, and place: What matters to health and quality of life. Social Indicators Research, 85, pp. 53-80.

<sup>4</sup> Baker, D. and Palmer, R. (2006). Examining the effects of perceptions of community and recreation participation on quality of life. Social Indicators Research, 75, pp. 395-418.

<sup>5</sup> Centre for Innovative and Entrepreneurial Leadership (2007). Community Vitality Initiative: Phase One Assessment Report. Brockville, Ontario.

<sup>6</sup> Florida, R. (2002). The Rise of the Creative Class and How it is Transforming Work, Leisure and Everyday Life. New York: Basic Books.

categorized into six interpretable factors: (1) Civic engagement (five items); (2) Creativity, diversity and learning (six items); (3) Community magnetism (five items); (4) Sustainable, vibrant community environment (five items); (5) Community hospitality and belonging (three items); and (6) Air and water quality (two items). Two items were removed due to poor reliability and factor loading.

## Personal Quality of Life

Research identified a variety of elements that measure personal or individual quality of life<sup>789</sup>. Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with 25 items related to personal quality of life. These items included a life satisfaction/wellness scale (5 items)<sup>10</sup>. In addition, four items were included to measure leisure satisfaction. Based on responses, the remaining 16 items were categorized into four other factors: (1) Satisfaction with personal health (two items); (2) Social satisfaction (five items); (3) Personal engagement in community stewardship (five items); and (4) Personal attachment to community (four items).

## Demographics

Respondent demographics included Aboriginal status (including First Nations, Métis and Inuit), marital status, employment status, highest level of education, place of birth, where the majority of childhood years were spent and years of residency in Saskatchewan and current community. Household demographics included age, gender, and disability status of each household member, annual household income, the community size where the primary home is located and if the primary residence was located on a First Nations reserve.

---

<sup>7</sup> Muhajarine, N., Labonte, R., Williams, A., and Randall, J. (2008). Person, perception, and place: What matters to health and quality of life. Social Indicators Research, 85, pp. 53-80.

<sup>8</sup> Baker, D. and Palmer, R. (2006). Ibid

<sup>9</sup> Michalos, A. C., and Kahlke, P. M. (2008). Impact of arts-related activities on the perceived quality of life. Social Indicators Research, 89(2), pp. 193-258.

<sup>10</sup> Diener, E., Diener, M., and Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting the subjective well being well-being of nations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69(5), pp. 851-864.


## METHODOLOGY

### Sample Plan

The 10 Regional Intersectoral Committees (RICs) support community-based planning, sharing of strategies, interagency collaboration and sharing of resources, and coordinated and integrated action for human services.

CIF Community Grant Program applications are reviewed by the RICs who then provide funding recommendations to the CIF Board. The RICs also determine their regional funding priorities. RICs are made up of representatives from government departments, health districts, school divisions, Regional Colleges, SIAST, housing authorities, police, tribal councils, Métis organizations and from the community-based organization sector.

One research objective was to achieve a representative and random sample in each of the ten RIC regions. This would enable reporting within an acceptable level of statistical accuracy at the RIC region level. Thus, to meet this research objective, a target of 400 completed surveys was desired from each RIC region for a total of 4000 completed surveys province-wide.



A final composition of completed interviews is outlined below:

	Count (unweighted)	Percent (unweighted)	Count (weighted)	Percent (weighted)
<b>Southeast</b>	421	10.3%	604	14.9%
<b>West Central</b>	401	9.9%	118	2.9%
<b>Northeast</b>	379	9.3%	156	3.9%
<b>Moose Jaw-South Central</b>	399	9.8%	227	5.6%
<b>Northwest</b>	403	9.9%	349	8.6%
<b>Northern</b>	376	9.2%	186	4.6%
<b>Prince Albert</b>	390	9.6%	285	7.0%
<b>Regina</b>	425	10.4%	848	21.0%
<b>Saskatoon</b>	465	11.4%	1110	27.5%
<b>Southwest</b>	410	10.1%	161	4.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4069</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4041</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\* Note: Margin of error for the total sample is  $\pm 1.5$  based on a 95% confidence interval (19 times out of 20)

## Data Collection Methods

Given the number of interviews desired for this project and the length of the questionnaire, a multimode approach that included online surveys, mail out questionnaires and in-person techniques was utilized. Respondents were recruited via three methods:

- Insightrix's SaskWatch Research™ panel (comprised of over 4,500 Saskatchewan individuals who have agreed to participate in ongoing online research)
- Randomly-selected households, with data provided by a reputable Canadian-based sample vendor
- Randomly-selected households in communities in RICs where response rates were lower by the above two methods (in which case in-person interviews were conducted)

### *SaskWatch Research™ Panel*

A random selection of panel members was invited via email to participate in the research study. In the email message, a unique link was provided for potential respondents to access the online questionnaire. As many as six reminder emails were sent to respondents who did not complete the questionnaire. A total of 1,626 panel members participated in the research (see graph below).

### *Telephone Recruiting*


In addition to accessing the SaskWatch Research™ panel, a random selection of households was contacted by telephone to participate in the research. Given the length of the questionnaire, it was not effective to ask participants to complete the interview over the phone at that time. As such, respondents were offered three options as follows:

- Receive an email message with a unique link to access the questionnaire online. As many as six reminder email messages were sent to individuals who did not complete the online questionnaire. A total of 1,209 respondents participated by this method.
- Receive a paper copy of the questionnaire in the mail to complete at their leisure. Upon completing the questionnaire, respondents either waited for a phone call from Insightrix to relay their answers back to an interviewer or contacted Insightrix via a 1-800 number.
- Alternatively, respondents were free to participate over the phone at the time of the initial call. Between these latter two methods, a total of 901 respondents completed the survey.

### *Door to Door*

During data collection, some regions within the province (particularly the northern RICs) were identified as presenting a challenge in terms of gaining the desired number of completed interviews. As such, a team of interviewers were engaged to go door to door in these regions seeking participation from individuals. Interviewers administered the survey on site with respondents. A total of 333 respondents participated via this method.

A summary of the techniques used is outlined below:



## Weighting

Overall results were weighted by several factors to ensure the results would be representative of Saskatchewan residents as a whole. Weights were applied to match the 2006 census of gender within age, regional population, and ancestry.

## Future Work with the Survey Results

The CIF is committed to working with local community groups (LCGs) and stakeholders to help build capacity and increase the effectiveness of current and future programs and services. Further analysis of survey results will enable ten individual RIC PowerPoint reports and an overall provincial PowerPoint report to be produced. These individual reports provide LCGs and other stakeholders with data that are representative of the residents in their region.

The CIF Board and TPCS are working collaboratively to engage other stakeholders in more detailed analyses that will provide a better understanding of the needs of sub-groups based on comparisons such as demographics (e.g. Households with Children) and participation groups (e.g. Sport, Recreation and Physical Activity participants).

The CIF and TPCS are working with the Human Services Integration Forum (HSIF) to engage LCGs, Regional Intersectoral Committees (RICs), municipal administrators and other stakeholders in workshops or training sessions that build the capacity to use research information from the CIF and other sources.

## Limitations and Opportunities

The survey presented to respondents contained a multitude of questions that explored several facets of life in Saskatchewan communities. The results of this study contain an excellent overview of the perceptions of Saskatchewan residents. Because it is not possible to directly measure many aspects of peoples' lives, nor is it feasible to include exhaustive lists of survey questions, an indirect measure or proxy must be designed that will explore the area of interest. In order for this to be the case, the proxy measure must have a close correlation to the item(s) of interest. For example, this survey included a question that asked respondents to report if they or other members of their household had participated in *Organized Sports* as a proxy for all the possible organized sporting activities that could be listed.

Results from this survey will provide starting points for dialog and collaboration among those who wish to utilize this information. Results also provide potential areas for future investigation and opportunities for partnerships and capacity building.

## Reporting Notes

This study utilized multiple modes to collect information. Our experience in conducting tandem studies via multimode methods illustrates that respondents tend to offer different answers depending on the response mode they select. Specifically, those who participate in research with an interviewer present (such as over the phone or in person) tend to offer more positive or higher ratings than those who complete a questionnaire on paper or online. However, this difference is minimised when asking questions related to behaviours versus attitudes (i.e. if someone engages in a specific activity weekly, he or she tends to provide the same answer regardless of the data collection mode, whereas asking for their agreement to a statement can differ). Therefore, one of the advantages of utilizing different methods of data collection is that the potential bias from any one method of data collection can be reduced.


## Study Results

---

### Awareness of CIF

In total, one-quarter (26.6%) of respondents were aware of the Community Initiatives Fund (CIF).

#### Awareness of CIF




Base: All respondents

### Participation in CIF Programs

Among respondents who were aware of the CIF, one-quarter (27.0%) indicated someone in their household had participated in a program funded by the CIF within the past 3 years. This works out to 7.2% overall.

#### Participation in CIF Programs



Base: Those who are aware of the Community Initiatives Fund, excluding don't know n=645



## SECTION 1: PARTICIPATION IN LEISURE/FREE-TIME ACTIVITIES

Respondents were asked to indicate how often they or other member(s) of their household had participated in 23 types of leisure/free-time activities in the past 12 months. There were five response options ranging from never to daily. It should be noted that in the participation bar charts that follow, the *never* responses have not been included. The activities in Table 1.1 are as they appeared in the questionnaire.

The most commonly reported daily participation was two hours or more of “screen time” outside of work or school. Nearly all households (98.3%) engaged in this activity at least once in the past year and the majority (52.6% of Respondents (Resp) and 57.9% of Other Household Member (OHM)) engaged daily in this activity. The next most commonly reported activities in terms of daily participation among respondents were other home activities (e.g., gardening, yard work, etc.) (37.9%) and walking, running or jogging (34.6%).

**Table 1.1 – Participation in Leisure/Free-time Activities**

	At least once per year anyone in the household	Respondent (Resp)				Other Household Members (OHM)			
		Daily	Once per week or more often	Once per month or more often	At least once per year	Daily	Once per week or more often	Once per month or more often	At least once per year
Other Home Activities (e.g., gardening, yard work, etc.)	98.5%	34.1%	75.9%	87.7%	93.6%	29.7%	73.6%	85.7%	93.4%
Two Hours or More a Day “Screen Time” Outside of School or Work (e.g., T.V., computers, video games)	98.3%	51.6%	79.9%	88.3%	95.1%	57.2%	82.6%	90.0%	94.8%
Walking, Running or Jogging	96.9%	33.5%	68.1%	82.3%	91.8%	33.0%	65.9%	81.2%	89.8%
Visiting Local/Neighbourhood Parks or Open Spaces	94.0%	7.3%	33.6%	61.8%	89.0%	8.3%	37.6%	62.0%	87.3%
Attending Cultural Events, Festivals, Performances, Fairs, Concerts or Other Special Events	93.4%	0.5%	3.1%	31.4%	87.4%	.4%	3.0%	28.4%	85.4%
Overnight Trips for Pleasure in Saskatchewan	89.9%	0.4%	3.3%	24.9%	81.6%	.1%	3.2%	24.4%	81.8%
Other Physical Activities or Fitness (e.g., biking, fitness classes, gym, etc.)	88.7%	13.4%	42.1%	56.8%	73.6%	17.7%	47.6%	63.9%	75.9%
Visiting Saskatchewan Provincial Parks	87.6%	1.0%	5.4%	25.8%	78.5%	1.3%	5.9%	27.3%	78.3%
Nature-Based Recreation in Water (e.g., fishing, swimming, boating, water skiing, etc.)	87.2%	2.8%	19.4%	43.9%	72.7%	3.6%	23.6%	49.0%	76.5%
Attending Sporting Events	86.5%	0.7%	10.7%	35.5%	74.5%	.9%	13.2%	38.3%	75.1%
Overnight Trips for Pleasure outside Saskatchewan	86.1%	0.2%	0.7%	9.2%	76.4%	.1%	0.5%	9.5%	75.9%
Other Nature-Based Recreation Activities (e.g., hiking, camping, hunting, ATVing, horseback riding, etc.)	83.3%	2.9%	14.7%	38.7%	69.2%	2.9%	16.6%	42.2%	72.2%

Table 1.1 continued on next page; shading reflects the proportion of respondents who participated in each activity, with darker shadings representing higher proportions.

**Table 1.1 – Participation in Leisure/Free-time Activities (continued)**

	At least once per year anyone in the household	Respondent (Resp)				Other Household Members (OHM)			
		Daily	Once per week or more often	Once per month or more often	At least once per year	Daily	Once per week or more often	Once per month or more often	At least once per year
Visiting Historic Sites or Heritage Places	81.6%	0.3%	1.3%	12.5%	71.6%	.4%	1.0%	10.4%	70.1%
Visiting Museums or Galleries	79.0%	0.2%	1.6%	11.9%	68.5%	.3%	1.2%	9.7%	65.5%
Unorganized Sports (does not involve typical program structure, coaching, instructors or officials)	75.8%	4.4%	21.2%	34.8%	54.0%	5.9%	27.8%	44.0%	60.6%
Volunteer with Local Community Group in Leadership Role (e.g., committee member, event organizer, etc.)	74.7%	3.5%	17.6%	36.5%	59.8%	2.2%	13.8%	29.9%	51.0%
Organized Club or Group Programs	73.1%	1.6%	15.7%	32.3%	54.8%	1.9%	19.0%	36.1%	55.5%
Nature-Based Recreation Activities in Winter (e.g., XC skiing, snowmobiling, snowboarding/downhill skiing)	69.9%	2.3%	13.3%	28.0%	50.3%	2.1%	17.4%	34.1%	56.5%
Organized Sports (involves program structure such as registration process, a coach or instructor or official(s))	62.3%	1.4%	16.1%	22.2%	33.8%	4.2%	31.2%	39.6%	49.1%
Gambling at a Casino or VLTs in Saskatchewan	53.6%	0.2%	2.5%	10.8%	37.4%	.5%	2.3%	8.5%	32.3%
Engaged in the Practice/Production of Visual Arts or Crafts (e.g., painting, pottery, sculpture, photography, textiles, etc)	52.9%	3.0%	10.1%	19.1%	31.9%	3.1%	9.7%	19.2%	33.6%
Engaged in the Practice/Production of Performing Arts (e.g., theatre, music, dance, etc)	37.7%	1.4%	5.2%	9.3%	18.5%	2.0%	10.4%	15.4%	24.9%
Engaged in the Practice/Production of Literary Arts (e.g., writing, publishing, etc.)	31.0%	2.3%	4.8%	8.5%	17.4%	1.5%	3.6%	6.7%	16.4%


Shading reflects the proportion of respondents who participated in each activity, with darker shadings representing higher proportions.

## Factor 1: Sport, Recreation and Physical Activity

Approximately one-third (33.5% Respondents (Resp), and 33.0% Other Household Members (OHM)) participated in walking, running or jogging on a daily basis during the past year and a smaller proportion (13.4% Resp and 17.7% OHM) participated in other physical activities or fitness (e.g., biking, fitness classes, gym, etc.) on a daily basis. Almost one-half (42.0% Resp and 47.6% OHM) visited local or neighbourhood parks or open spaces on a weekly basis.

Over one-third participated in unorganized sports (34.8% of Resp and 44.1% of OHM) and attended sporting events (35.5% of Resp and 38.3% of OHM) at least once per month during the past year. A smaller proportion (22.2% of Resp and 39.5% of OHM) participated in organized sports (involves program structure such as registration process, a coach or instructor or official) at least once per month.

**Figure 1.1 – Participation in Sport, Recreation and Physical Activity**




## Factor 2: Arts, Culture and Heritage

Over one-quarter (31.4% of Respondents (Resp) and 28.4% of Other Household Members (OHM)) attended cultural events, festivals, performances, fairs, concerts or other special events at least once per month during the past year. Smaller proportions of respondents reported participation in the practice or production of visual arts or crafts (19.1% of Resp and 19.2% of OHM), performing arts (9.3% of Resp and 15.4% of OHM) and literary arts (8.6% of Resp and 6.7% of OHM) at least once per month.

A large majority of respondents visited an historic site or heritage place (71.6% of Resp and 70.1% of OHM) or visited a museum or gallery (68.5% of Resp and 65.5% of OHM) at least once in the past year.

**Figure 1.2 – Participation in Arts, Culture and Heritage**




### Factor 3: Nature-based Recreation

Almost one-half (43.9% of Respondents (Resp) and 49.0% of Other Household Members (OHM)) participated in nature-based recreation activities in the water (e.g., fishing, swimming, boating, water skiing, etc.) at least once per month in the past year. Smaller proportions of respondents reported participation in nature-based recreation in the winter (e.g., XC skiing, snowmobiling, snowboarding/downhill skiing) (28.0% of Resp and 34.1% of OHM) and other nature-based recreation (e.g., hiking, camping, hunting, ATVing, horseback riding, etc.) (38.7% of Resp and 42.2% of OHM) during the same time period.

Over three-quarters (78.5% of Resp and 78.3% of OHM) visited Saskatchewan provincial parks at least once during the past year and just over one-quarter (25.8% of Resp and 27.3% of OHM) visited Saskatchewan provincial parks at least once per month.


**Figure 1.3 – Participation in Nature-based Recreation**



## Factor 4: Tourism

Eight in ten (81.6% of Respondents (Resp) and 81.8% of Other Household Members (OHM)) took at least one overnight trip for pleasure in Saskatchewan within the past year, while three-quarters (76.4% of Resp and 75.9% of OHM) took at least one trip overnight trip for pleasure outside of the province within the same period. In total, it was reported that one-quarter of respondents (24.9%) and other household members (24.4%) travelled within the province for pleasure at least once per month.

**Figure 1.4 – Participation in Tourism Activities**




## Factor 5: Other Activities

More than one-half (51.6% of Respondents (Resp), 57.2% of Other Household Members (OHM)) indicated they engaged in two or more hours per day of “screen time” outside of work or school. Nearly all (95.1%) respondents were involved in this activity at least once in the past year.

Over one-half of respondents volunteered with local community groups in a leadership role (59.8% of Resp and 51.0% of OHM) or participated in an organized club or group program (54.8% of Resp and 55.5% of OHM). Over one-third (37.4% of Resp and 32.3% of OHM) of respondents reported gambling at a casino or VLTs in Saskatchewan at least once in the past year.

Additionally, more than nine in ten (93.6% of Resp and 93.4% of OHM) reported participation in other home activities (e.g., gardening, yard work, etc.) at least once in the past year, and one-third (34.1% of Resp and 29.7% of OHM) in other home activities on a daily basis.

**Figure 1.5 – Participation in Other Activities**



## SECTION 2: BARRIERS TO PARTICIPATION IN LEISURE/FREE-TIME ACTIVITIES

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement on 17 items that were included to capture a range of intrapersonal, interpersonal and structural barriers that prevented them from participating in leisure/free-time activities in the past 12 months. Based on the responses, these 17 items were categorized into four factors: (1) Too busy with other responsibilities (two items); (2) Participation costs (three items); (3) Lack of opportunity or availability (six items); and (4) Poor health, skills or ability (five items). The items in Table 2.1 are as they appeared in the questionnaire.

The majority (56.5% of Respondents (Resp) and 51.7% of Other Household Members (OHM)) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that being too busy with work or school was a barrier to participation in leisure/free-time activities. Being too busy with household responsibilities (48.0% of Resp and 41.1% of OHM) was the second-highest reported barrier.

**Table 2.1 – Barriers to Participation in Leisure/Free-time Activities**

	% agree or strongly agree	
	Resp	OHM
Too busy with work or school	56.5%	51.7%
Too busy with household responsibilities	48.0%	41.1%
Programs/ activities not available at convenient times	39.3%	35.4%
Registration/ admission/ license fees are too expensive	36.2%	34.7%
Lack of energy	33.8%	27.0%
Cannot afford the other costs to participate (e.g., equipment, clothing, transportation, etc.)	31.6%	30.0%
Difficult to find others to participate with	29.2%	21.3%
Programs/ activities of interest were not available	28.4%	26.3%
No opportunities near home	25.9%	25.4%
Do not know where to find information about programs/activities	22.2%	18.7%
Disability or injury	22.0%	17.2%
Poor health/ health concerns	19.0%	15.3%
Lack skills to participate	17.2%	13.6%
Feel uncomfortable or unwelcome	14.8%	11.3%
Do not feel safe where activities take place	14.8%	13.5%
Afraid of getting hurt	12.8%	10.5%
Lack transportation	8.9%	8.0%


Darker shading reflects higher proportions.



## Factor 1: Poor Health, Skill and Ability

Of the five poor health, skill and ability barriers to participation in leisure/free-time activities, lack of energy (33.8% of Respondents (Resp) and 27.0% of Other Household Member (OHM)) received the highest level of agreement from respondents. About two in ten (22.0% of Resp and 17.2% of OHM) respondents reported that a disability or injury was a barrier to household participation in activities. Poor health or health concerns (19.0% of Resp and 15.3% of OHM), lack of skills to participate (17.2% of Resp and 13.6% OHM) and afraid of getting hurt (12.8% of Resp and 10.5% OHM) received agreement from between one and two in ten respondents.


**Figure 2.1 – Barriers to Participation: Poor Health, Skill and Ability**



## Factor 2: Opportunities and Availability

Inconvenience of times of programs or activities (39.3% of Respondents (Resp) and 35.4% of Other Household Members (OHM)) received the highest level of agreement among respondents with respect to opportunities and availability barriers. Between two and three in ten respondents agreed that it is difficult to find others with whom to participate (29.2%), that programs or activities of interest are not available (28.4%), that there are no opportunities near their home (25.9%), or that they do not know where to find information (22.2%) are a barrier to their participation. A total of 14.8% agreed that feeling uncomfortable or unwelcome was a barrier to their participation.


**Figure 2.2 – Barriers to Participation: Opportunities and Availability**



### Factor 3: Participation Cost

About one-third (36.2% of Respondents (Resp) and 34.7% of Other Household Members (OHM)) agreed or strongly agreed the cost of registration, admission or license fees is a barrier to household participation in leisure/free-time activities. A similar percentage of respondents (31.6% of Resp and 30.0% of OHM) agreed they could not afford the other costs to participate (e.g., equipment, clothing, transportation, etc.). Lack of transportation was reported to be a barrier for less than one in ten (8.9% of Resp and 8.0% of OHM).


**Figure 2.3 – Barriers to Participation: Participation Costs**



## Factor 4: Busy with Other Responsibilities

A majority (56.5% of Respondents (Resp) and 51.7% of Other Household Members (OHM)) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that being too busy with work or school was a barrier to household participation in leisure/free-time activities. A large proportion (48.0% of Resp and 41.1% of OHM) also agreed that being too busy with other household responsibilities was a barrier to household participation.

**Figure 2.4 – Barriers to Participation: Busy with Other Responsibilities**




## SECTION 3: FACILITIES – ACCESS AND USE

### Satisfaction with the Overall Quality of Recreation and Leisure Facilities in the Community

Over one-half (56.7%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed they were satisfied with the overall quality of recreation and leisure facilities in their community. By contrast, 18.1% disagreed and the remainder (25.2%) were neutral.

**Figure 3.1 – Satisfaction with Recreation and Leisure Facilities in the Community**



### Facilities – Overall Access and Use

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement that they or other member(s) of their household had access to 13 types of facilities. They were also asked if someone in their household had used these facilities in the past 12 months. These 13 items were designed to provide information on a variety of facility types that were categorized into three factors: (1) Indoor sport and recreation (three items); (2) Outdoor sport and recreation (five items); and (3) Arts and Other Community Facilities (five items). The items in Table 3.1 are as they appeared in the questionnaire.

Of the 13 listed facility types, respondents were more likely to agree or strongly agree that they or other members of their household had access to parks or open spaces (85.8%), a public library (84.7%) and schools (80.1%). In terms of use, 84.2% of respondents indicated that someone in their household used parks or open spaces, sidewalks near their home (78.6%) and multi-use paths or trails to engage in physical activity (67.0%) at least once in the past year.

**Table 3.1 – Access and Use of Recreation and Leisure Facilities**

	Access	Used
Parks or open spaces	85.8%	84.2%
A public library	84.7%	63.8%
Schools	80.1%	51.9%
Safe playgrounds or places for children to play	79.0%	56.9%
Indoor sport facilities (e.g., rink, pool, gym, etc.)	76.6%	63.0%
Outdoor sport facilities (e.g., soccer, softball, baseball, etc.)	74.5%	46.0%
Sidewalks near your home	70.2%	78.6%
Multi-use paths or trails to engage in physical activity (e.g., walking, running, cycling, etc.)	67.7%	67.0%
Other facilities for community programming (e.g., community centres, town halls, etc.)	65.5%	45.4%
Heritage places (e.g., museum, historic sites)	65.4%	47.2%
Other facilities for residents to engage in physical activity or fitness	62.7%	42.7%
Facilities to participate in arts activities (e.g., theatre, music, dance, etc.)	50.2%	31.6%
Sport, recreation and cultural facilities accessible to people with disabilities	49.1%	32.2%

Access: % agreed or strongly agreed that the household had access

Use: Someone in the household used at least once in the past 12 months


Darker shading reflects higher proportions.

## Factor 1: Indoor Sport and Recreation

Three-quarters (76.6%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed they or other members of their household had access to indoor sports facilities, and just over six in ten (63.0%) indicated that someone in their household had used a facility of this type at least once in the past year. About one-half (49.1%) of respondents agreed their household had access to sport, recreation and cultural facilities accessible to people with disabilities and one-third (32.2%) reported someone in their household having used a facility of this type within the past year.

Six in ten (62.7%) respondents agreed their household has access to other facilities for physical fitness while a smaller proportion (42.7%) indicated that a household member has used this type of facility within the past year.


**Figure 3.2 – Access and Use of Indoor Sport and Recreation Facilities**



## Factor 2: Outdoor Sport and Recreation

Between two-thirds (67.7%) and nine tenths (85.8%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they or other members of their household had access to each of the five listed outdoor sport and recreation facilities. Parks or open spaces were reported to have been used by 84.2% of households at least once in the past year while 78.6% have used sidewalks near their home. Multi-use paths or trails to engage in physical activity (67.0%) and safe playgrounds or places for children to play (56.9%) were also reported to be commonly used. A total of 46.0% of respondents indicated that a household member used outdoor sport facilities within the past year.

**Figure 3.3 – Access and Use of Outdoor Sport and Recreation Facilities**






### Factor 3: Arts and Other Community Facilities

Eight in ten or more respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their household has access to schools (80.1%) and a public library (84.7%) while more than one-half of respondents reported a household member having used each of these types of facilities (51.9% and 63.8%, respectively) at least once within the past year.

Two-thirds (65.4%) of respondents agreed that their household has access to heritage places while 47.2% of households have used this type of facility at least once within the past year. One-half (50.2%) of respondents agreed that their household has access to facilities to participate in arts activities and three in ten (31.6%) households have used those facilities within the past year. Less than one-half (45.4%) of households reported having used other facilities for community programming while two-thirds (65.5%) agreed that they have access to them.

**Figure 3.4 – Access and Use of Arts and Other Community Facilities**




## SECTION 4: PROGRAMS AND SERVICES – ACCESS AND USE

### Satisfaction with the Access and Quality of Programs and Services in the Community

Overall, six in ten (60.5%) respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their access to the programs and services they need. Respondents indicated satisfaction was slightly lower with the overall quality of recreation and leisure programs (56.5%) and the overall quality of other programs and services in their community (50.4%).

**Figure 4.1 – Satisfaction with the Access and Quality of Programs and Services in the Community**



## **Programs and Services – Overall Access and Use**

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement that they or other member(s) of their household had access to 29 types of programs and services. They were also asked if someone in their household had used these programs or services in the past 12 months. These 29 items were designed to provide information on a wide variety of programs and services that were categorized into three factors: (1) Health (nine items); (2) Other basic needs (nine items); and (3) Personal development (11 items). The items in Table 4.1 are as they appeared in the questionnaire.

A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their household has access to general health services (77.2%), protection services (77.2%), dental services (67.2%), spiritual or faith-based activities (64.1%) and locally produced food (59.2%). General health services were reported to be used by 81.5% of households, dental services by 63.5% of households and locally produced food by 55.9% of households.

About one in six agreed that their household has access to volunteer management training (17.7%) and young adults' leadership development or engagement (18.6%).

**Table 4.1 – Access and Use of Programs and Services in the Community**

	Access	Used
General health services	77.2%	81.5%
Protection services (e.g., police or fire department)	77.2%	18.1%
Dental services	67.2%	63.5%
Spiritual or faith-based activities	64.1%	39.4%
Locally produced food	59.2%	55.9%
Senior services (e.g., home care)	57.6%	6.4%
Pregnancy, pre-natal or post-natal counselling or services	48.8%	9.2%
Public transportation	47.3%	22.4%
Alcohol abuse counselling or services	46.3%	2.9%
Mental health counselling or services	44.3%	8.7%
Substance abuse counselling or services	42.5%	2.9%
Healthy families/ family wellness programming	42.3%	10.0%
Employment opportunities for youth or young adults	42.2%	11.1%
Crisis intervention counselling or services	42.1%	6.0%
Affordable housing program or agency	41.2%	8.2%
Affordable food program or agency	39.2%	8.4%
Early childhood development programs	37.2%	7.9%
Career planning or job preparation	37.2%	10.4%
Child abuse or neglect prevention services	36.1%	3.0%
Problem gambling counselling or services	35.2%	1.3%
Violence prevention services	33.2%	2.6%
Affordable childcare	31.7%	12.0%
Tutoring or homework help for school-aged children	28.6%	5.4%
Teen (13-18 yrs) leadership development or engagement	24.5%	5.7%
Volunteer leadership development	24.1%	10.9%
Tutoring or homework help for adults	22.8%	3.6%
First Nations or Métis leadership development or engagement	20.7%	4.8%
Young adults (19-29 yrs) leadership development or engagement	18.6%	3.5%
Volunteer management training (e.g., board governance)	17.7%	6.5%

Access: % agree or strongly agree that the household has access


Use: Someone in the household has used

Darker shading reflects higher proportions.

## Factor 1: Health

A majority of respondents reported their household having used general health services (81.5%) and dental services (63.5%) at least once within the past year. Access to these two services was also reported the highest of all services in this category (77.2% and 67.2%, respectively). One in ten or fewer respondents reported that someone in their household used any of the eight remaining services in this category.

**Figure 4.2 – Access to Programs and Services Related to Health**




1A	Problem gambling counselling or services
1B	Healthy families/ family wellness programming
1C	Substance abuse counselling or services
1D	Mental health counselling or services
1E	Alcohol abuse counselling or services
1F	Pregnancy/ pre-natal/ post-natal counselling or services
1G	Senior services
1H	Dental services
1I	General health services

## Factor 2: Other Basic Needs

Over one-half (55.9%) of respondents reported that someone in their household used locally produced food and three-quarters (59.2%) agreed or strongly agreed that their household has access to this service. Protection services were reported being used by 18.1% of households and a majority (77.2%) of respondents agreed that it is accessible. Less than one-half of respondents were in agreement that any of the other program or service types in this category were accessible to them.

**Figure 4.3 – Access to Programs and Services Related to Other Basic Needs**




2A	Affordable childcare
2B	Violence prevention services
2C	Child abuse or neglect prevention services
2D	Affordable food program or agency
2E	Affordable housing program or agency
2F	Crisis intervention counselling or services
2G	Public transportation
2H	Locally produced food
2I	Protection services

### Factor 3: Personal Development

Spiritual or faith-based services (39.4%) were reported by respondents as the most commonly used personal development service of the 11 listed items. Two-thirds (64.1%) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that this type of service is available to their household. Smaller proportions of respondents agreed that their household has access to the other personal development services, and about one in ten households have used them.

**Figure 4.4 – Access to Programs and Services Related to Personal Development**




3A	Volunteer management training
3B	Young adults (19-29 yrs) leadership development or engagement
3C	First Nations or Métis leadership development or engagement
3D	Tutoring or homework help for adults
3E	Volunteer leadership development
3F	Teen (13-18 yrs) leadership development or engagement
3G	Tutoring or homework help for school-aged children
3H	Career planning or job preparation
3I	Early childhood development programs
3J	Employment opportunities for youth or young adults
3K	Spiritual or faith-based activities

## SECTION 5: COMMUNITY QUALITY OF LIFE

### Change in Community Quality of Life

Most respondents (84.7%) reported that the quality of life in their community had either stayed the same (46.0%) or had improved (38.7%) over the past three years. One in ten respondents (10.8%) reported that the quality of life in their community had become worse over the same time period.

**Figure 5.1 – Change in Community Quality of Life over the Past Three Years**





## Overall Community Quality of Life

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with each of a list of 28 items related to community quality of life. Overall there was considerable variation in the level of agreement with the statements regarding respondents' community quality of life. Most respondents (84.7%) agreed that their community is an attractive place to live (84.7%), that their community is home to people of diverse ethnicities and cultures (71.4%), that there are events or festivals to celebrate local history or culture (67.7%) and that residents have a strong sense that they belong here (64.3%). The items in Table 5.1 are as they appeared in the questionnaire.

By contrast, less than one in five respondents agreed that youth (under 19 years) think their community is an ideal place to live (18.4%). About one-quarter agreed that there is excellent communication between residents and the local government (27.4%) and that residents are encouraged to actively participate in local government decision-making (28.9%).

**Table 5.1 – Perceptions of Community Quality of Life**


	% Agree or Strongly Agree
Residents have access to safe drinking water	88.7%
The air is clean	84.8%
It is an attractive place to live	84.7%
This community is home to people of diverse ethnicities and cultures	71.4%
There are events and festivals for residents to celebrate local history or culture	67.7%
Residents have a strong sense that they belong here	64.3%
Residents making visitors or tourists feel welcome	64.1%
The future for this community looks bright	61.8%
People want to move here from other places	60.2%
Many residents actively recycle	59.5%
There are a lot of things to do with family or friends	57.8%
Residents accept people from all ethnicities and cultures	56.0%
Residents appreciate the historic places	55.6%
Environmental sustainability is an important consideration in community planning	55.0%
This community is home to artists or cultural leaders	54.5%
There is a vibrant town/city centre	51.9%
There are a lot of positive activities for children and youth	50.6%
Schools are actively involved in meeting community needs	49.0%
There are many good leaders	47.6%
Residents work together to get things done	46.0%
Leaders encourage people from all backgrounds to participate	44.2%
Residents are motivated to learn new skills or develop existing ones	35.4%
There are excellent volunteer opportunities for local youth (under 19 yrs)	35.2%
Neighbourhoods are free of litter or vandalism	35.2%
There are affordable activities for low income residents	33.8%
Residents are encouraged to actively participate in local government decision-making	28.9%
There is excellent communication between residents and the local government	27.4%
Youth (under 19 yrs) think this is an ideal place to live	18.4%

Darker shading reflects higher proportions.

## Factor 1: Civic Engagement

Less than one-half of respondents agreed or strongly agreed there are many good leaders in their community (47.6%); that residents work together to get things done (46.0%); and that leaders encourage people from all backgrounds to participate (44.2%). A total of 28.9% of respondents agreed that residents are encouraged to actively participate in local government decision-making and 27.4% agreed that there is excellent communication between residents and the local government.


**Figure 5.2 – Community Quality of Life: Civic Engagement**



## Factor 2: Creativity, Diversity and Learning

The majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their community is home to people of diverse ethnicities and cultures (71.4%) and that there are events or festivals to celebrate local history or culture (67.7%). About one-half agreed that their community is home to artists or cultural leaders (54.5%) and that schools are actively involved in meeting community needs (49.0%). Over one-third of respondents were in agreement that residents are motivated to learn new skills or develop existing ones (35.4%) and that there are excellent volunteer opportunities for local youth under 19 years of age (35.2%).


**Figure 5.3 – Community Quality of Life: Creativity, Diversity and Learning**



### Factor 3: Community Magnetism

A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed the future for their community looks bright (61.8%), that people want to move there from other places (60.2%), that there are a lot of things to do with family or friends (57.8%) and that there are a lot of positive activities for children and youth (50.6%). Few respondents (18.4%) agreed that youth under 19 years of age think that it is an ideal place to live.


**Figure 5.4 – Community Quality of Life: Community Magnetism**



## Factor 4: Sustainable, Vibrant Community Environment

More than eight in ten (84.7%) respondents agreed or strongly agreed that their community is an attractive place to live. Between five and six in ten respondents were in agreement that many residents actively recycle (59.5%), that residents appreciate the historic places (55.6%), that environmental sustainability is an important consideration in community planning (55.0%) and that there is a vibrant town or city centre (51.9%).


**Figure 5.5 – Community Quality of Life: Sustainable, Vibrant Community Environment**



## Factor 5: Community Hospitality and Belonging

A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that residents have a strong sense that they belong here (64.3%), residents make visitors or tourists feel welcome (64.1%) and residents accept people from all ethnicities and cultures (56.0%).


**Figure 5.6 – Community Quality of Life: Community Hospitality and Belonging**



## Factor 6: Air and Water Quality

Most respondents agreed or strongly agreed that residents have access to safe drinking water (88.7%) and that the air is clean (84.8%).

**Figure 5.7 – Community Quality of Life: Air and Water Quality**



## SECTION 6: PERSONAL QUALITY OF LIFE

### Overall Personal Quality of Life

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement with 25 items related to personal quality of life. These items included a life satisfaction/wellness scale (five items)<sup>11</sup>. In addition, four items were included to measure leisure satisfaction. Based on responses, the remaining 16 items were categorized into four other factors: (1) Satisfaction with personal health (two items); (2) Social satisfaction (five items); (3) Personal engagement in community stewardship (five items); and (4) Personal attachment to community (four items). The items in Table 6.1 are as they appeared in the questionnaire.

More than eight in ten respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they are generally satisfied with their family relations (86.4%), that they are satisfied with their friendships (84.2%) and that they chose to live in their community (80.9%). By contrast, less than one-half of respondents reported being satisfied with their level of fitness (37.8%).

---

<sup>11</sup> Diener, E., Diener, M., and Diener, C. (1995). Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 69(5), pp. 851-864.



**Table 6.1 – Perceptions of Personal Quality of Life**


	Agree or Strongly Agree
Satisfied with...My family relations, generally	86.9%
Satisfied with...My friendships	84.2%
I regularly vote in local elections	83.4%
I chose to live in my community	80.9%
Satisfied with...My house, apartment or mobile home	80.5%
Satisfied with...My overall quality of life	79.0%
Satisfied with...My overall standard of living	78.8%
I am proud to tell others where I live	77.8%
I try to help those who are less fortunate	77.3%
So far I have gotten the important things I want in life	73.8%
I do things during my leisure/free time that are fulfilling	73.5%
Satisfied with...My job or main activity	71.6%
I am committed to making the community a better place to live	70.4%
The conditions of my life are excellent	66.7%
I think this is an ideal place to live	64.9%
Satisfied with...The way I spend my leisure/free time	63.3%
I would not want to move away from my community	63.2%
In most ways my life is close to my ideal	61.7%
Overall, the way I spend my leisure time is close to my ideal	61.0%
Satisfied with...My access to programs or services that I need	60.6%
Satisfied with...The overall quality of my health	58.6%
Satisfied with...The overall quality of recreation/leisure facilities in my community	56.7%
Satisfied with...The overall quality of recreation/leisure programs and services in my community	56.5%
I participate in leisure/free time activities as often as I would like	53.9%
Satisfied with...The overall quality of other programs and services in my community	50.4%
I know where to get help in order to solve community problems	50.0%
I do volunteer work on a regular basis	44.8%
If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing	42.8%
Satisfied with...My level of fitness	37.8%

Darker shading reflects higher proportions.

## Factor 1: Life Satisfaction

A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they are satisfied with their overall quality of life (79.0%), that so far they have gotten the important things they want in life (73.8%), the conditions of their life are excellent (66.7%) and in most ways their life is close to ideal (61.7%). About four in ten (42.8%) agreed that if they could live their life over, they would change almost nothing.


**Figure 6.1 – Personal Quality of Life: Life Satisfaction**



## Factor 2: Leisure Satisfaction

A majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with each of the four items regarding leisure satisfaction. Three-quarters (73.5%) agreed that they do things during their leisure or free time that are fulfilling, while 63.3% agreed that they are satisfied with the way they spend their leisure or free time. Additionally, six in ten (61.0%) agreed that overall, the way they spend their leisure time is close to their ideal. Over one-half (53.9%) of respondents were in agreement that they participate in leisure or free time activities as often as they would like.


**Figure 6.2 – Personal Quality of Life: Leisure Satisfaction**



### Factor 3: Satisfaction with Personal Health

Over one-half (58.6%) of respondents reported being satisfied with the overall quality of their health while over a third (37.8%) indicated they are satisfied with their level of fitness.


**Figure 6.3 – Personal Quality of Life: Satisfaction with Personal Health**



## Factor 4: Social Satisfaction

Most respondents agreed or strongly agreed they are generally satisfied with their family relations (86.9%), that they are satisfied with their friendships (84.2%) and that they are satisfied with their house, apartment or mobile home (80.5%). Smaller proportions of respondents were in agreement that they are satisfied with their overall standard of living (78.8%) and that they are satisfied with their main job or activity (71.6%).


**Figure 6.4 – Personal Quality of Life: Social Satisfaction**



## Factor 5: Personal Engagement in Community Stewardship

More than eight in ten (83.4%) respondents agreed or strongly agreed they regularly vote in local elections. A majority of respondents were also in agreement they try to help those who are less fortunate (77.3%) and that they are committed to making the community a better place to live (70.4%). One-half of respondents agreed they know where to get help in order to solve community problems and 44.8% reported doing volunteer work on a regular basis.


**Figure 6.5 – Personal Quality of Life: Personal Engagement in Community Stewardship**



## Factor 6: Personal Attachment to Community

Eight in ten (80.9%) respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they chose to live in their community and 77.8% agreed that they are proud to tell others where they live. Almost two-thirds of respondents indicated they think that their community is an ideal place to live (64.9%) and that they would not want to move away from their community (63.2%).

**Figure 6.6 – Personal Quality of Life: Personal Attachment to Community**




## RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS

### Gender

In all, 53.0% of respondents were female and 47.0% are male.


**Figure 7.1 - Gender**



### Age

On average (mean<sup>12</sup>), respondents were 46 years of age. The age of most respondents (38.3%) was between 35 and 54 years. A total of 32.7% were 55 years or older, while the remainder (29.0%) were between 18 and 34 years of age.

**Figure 7.2 – Age of Respondents**




<sup>12</sup> Mean – the mathematical average of the scores/responses.



## Aboriginal Status (Self-Identified)

In total, 14.7% of respondents self-identified as Aboriginal.


**Figure 7.3 – Aboriginal Status**



## Aboriginal Identity (Self-Identified)

Results were weighted by Aboriginal identity to match the Saskatchewan population. Six in ten (60.5%) were First Nations and 39.3% were Métis (weighted).

**Figure 7.4 – Aboriginal Identity**




Base: Respondents who said that they are Aboriginal, excluding prefer not to say, n=529

## Disability

Slightly less than one in five (18.5%) respondents indicated they have a disability.


**Figure 7.5 – Disability**



## Marital Status

Nearly two-thirds (63.0%) of respondents indicated being married while smaller proportions reported they were single and never married (14.9%), were living common-law (9.4%) or were divorced (8.1%).


**Figure 7.6 – Marital Status**



## Employment

One-half (48.6%) of respondents reported they were employed full-time, 19.5% were retired and 16.0% were self-employed. A total of 17.2% of respondents selected multiple categories.


**Figure 7.7 – Employment Status**



## Education

In terms of education, 72.3% of respondents reported having at least some post-secondary training.


**Figure 7.8 – Highest Level of Education**



## Place of Birth

Over three-quarters (77.2%) of respondents reported they were born in Saskatchewan while a further 17.5% reported being born in another Canadian province or territory. Only a small proportion, one in twenty (5.3%), indicated they were born outside of Canada.


**Figure 7.9 – Place of Birth**



## Place Spent Majority of Childhood Years

More than eight in ten (82.4%) respondents reported spending the majority of their childhood years in Saskatchewan.


**Figure 7.10 – Place Where Respondents Spent Majority of Childhood Years**



## Years Living in Saskatchewan and Community

In all, 64.2% of respondents indicated they have lived in Saskatchewan for more than 30 years, and 29.9% of respondents indicated living in their current community for the same amount of time.

**Figure 7.11 – Years Living in Saskatchewan and Community**



## Community Size

In total, over one-third (35.0%) of respondents reported living in a community of over 50,000 people. Just more than one in ten (13.9%) reported they live on a farm or acreage.


**Table 7.1 – Community Size**

	Count	Percent
<b>Farm or Acreage</b>	532	13.9%
<b>Community up to 499 people</b>	327	8.6%
<b>Community between 500 and 1,999 people</b>	497	13.0%
<b>Community between 2,000 and 4,999 people</b>	319	8.3%
<b>Community between 5,000 and 14,999 people</b>	339	8.9%
<b>Community between 15,000 and 50,000 people</b>	472	12.3%
<b>Community over 50,000 people</b>	1335	35.0%
<b>Total</b>	3820	100.0%

## Reside on First Nations Reserve

A total of 3.6% of respondents indicated their primary residence is on a First Nations reserve.

**Figure 7.12 – Reside on a First Nations Reserve**




## HOUSEHOLD DEMOGRAPHICS

### Number of People in Household

Most commonly, respondents reported living in a multi-person household (64.0%). One-third (36.0%) of respondents indicated they are the only person living in their household while 29.9% live in a two-person household.


**Figure 8.1 – Number of People in Household**




### Households with Children

Overall, one-quarter (27.8%) of respondents indicated they have children in their household. A total of 10.0% reported they had high school aged children (13 to 17 years old), 15.9% had elementary school aged children (6 to 12 years old) and 13.6% had preschool aged children (0 to 5 years of age).

**Figure 8.2 – Households with Children**




**Figure 8.3 – Households with Children by Age Category**



### Number of Persons with a Disability in Household

One-quarter (26.8%) of respondents indicated that at least one person in their household has a disability.

**Figure 8.4 – Number of Persons with a Disability in Household**






## Annual Household Income

The median<sup>13</sup> annual household income reported by respondents was between \$60,000 and \$79,999.

**Figure 8.5 – Annual Household Income**



<sup>13</sup> **Median** – the middle number in a given sequence of numbers, or the point below which 50% of the scores/responses fall.