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In Toronto CMA I am approaching several organizations/agencies who are researching their areas and asking them to partner with me in taking macro level CMA census tract data down to the micro level in order to understand what broad trends mean for specific groups of senior citizens.

- Woodgreen – East York
- Toronto Council on Aging Age Friendly City Project – Malvern/Rouge
Case selection rationales

- **East York** – an old Toronto inner suburb part of which will capture aging in place; another part will be high rises with newer immigrant groups – Woodgreen;

- **Malvern/Rouge** – suburban, high mixed ethno-racial (Chinese & Sri Lankan) – focus groups currently underway – TCA an Age Friendly City site
Ageing in Ontario

- People 65+ during the 1980-2006 era are not yet the baby boomers. The 2011 census sees the start of that cohort

- By 2036, the share of seniors in regions is projected to range from 21.3 per cent in the GTA to 30.5 per cent in the Northeast. Among census divisions, it is projected to range from 19.9 per cent in Peel to 43.8 per cent in Prince Edward. (p. 14)

- The share of seniors in census divisions located in and around the suburban GTA is projected to remain lower than the provincial average BUT the increase in the number of seniors in this area will be the most significant. The number of seniors is projected to almost triple (growth above 170 percent) in the three suburban GTA census divisions (York, Peel and Durham)

NB: for Toronto CMA the significance is the numerical increase, rather than percentage of population per se, AND the fact that a significant number of 65+ will be visible minorities.
Living Arrangements of Men and Women Age 65 and Over
Toronto Census Metropolitan Area, 1981 and 2006

Note: Couples are family households consisting of both married and common law situations. In Census 1981, couples are defined as opposite sex couples only. In Census 2006, couples include both opposite and same-sex couples. Update to 2011 is not possible due to untrustworthy data in the 2011 National Household Survey.

Source: Statistics Canada,
Census Custom Tabulation
EO2228 1981 and 2006
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Growth of 65+ population for selected ethno-racial groups 1980–2006

- Chinese population multiplied tenfold; the South Asian over 20 times

- At both time periods men lived as couples, similar to the dominant Caucasian population. Differences were amongst the women. Far fewer ethno-racial women lived alone than in dominant group
Living Arrangements of Chinese Men and Women Age 65 and Over, Toronto Census Metropolitan Area, 1981 and 2006

- **Men**
  - **Census 1981**
    - 82% Couple
    - 10% Alone
    - 9% Other
  - **Census 2006**
    - 85% Couple
    - 16% Alone
    - 36% Other

- **Women**
  - **Census 1981**
    - 52% Other
    - 16% Alone
    - 33% Couple
  - **Census 2006**
    - 9% Other
    - 6% Alone
    - 48% Couple

Note: Couples are family households consisting of both married and common law situations. In Census 1981, couples are defined as opposite sex couples only. In Census 2006, couples include both opposite and same-sex couples. Visible minority status for 1981 approximated by Statistics Canada in a custom dataset. Update to 2011 is not possible due to untrustworthy data in the 2011 National Household Survey.
Living Arrangements of South Asian Men and Women Age 65 and Over, Toronto Census Metropolitan Area, 1981 and 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Census 1981</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77% Couple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21% Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Census 2006</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% Couple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% Alone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Couples are family households consisting of both married and common law situations. In Census 1981, couples are defined as opposite sex couples only. In Census 2006, couples include both opposite and same-sex couples. Visible minority status for 1981 approximated by Statistics Canada in a custom dataset. Update to 2011 is not possible due to untrustworthy data in the 2011 National Household Survey.

Source: Statistics Canada, Census Custom Tabulation EO2228 1981 and 2006
Living Arrangements of Chinese Men and Women Age 65 and Over, Scarborough, 1981 and 2006

Note: Couples are family households consisting of both married and common law situations. In Census 1981, couples are defined as opposite sex couples only. In Census 2006, couples include both opposite and same-sex couples. Visible minority status for 1981 approximated by Statistics Canada in a custom dataset. Update to 2011 is not possible due to untrustworthy data in the 2011 National Household Survey.
Living Arrangements of South Asian Men and Women Age 65 and Over, East York, 1981 and 2006

Note: Couples are family households consisting of both married and common-law situations. In Census 1981, couples are defined as opposite sex couples only. In Census 2006, couples include both opposite and same-sex couples. Visible minority status for 1981 approximated by Statistics Canada in a custom dataset. Update to 2011 is not possible due to untrustworthy data in the 2012 National Household Survey.

some interesting figures over the 25 year period*

- 1981 – 40,000 couples rented; 16% of 65+
- 2006 – 45,000 couples rented; 8% of 65+

- 1981 – 94,000 couples owned; 37% of 65+
- 2006 – 294,000 couples owned; 51% of 65+

- 1981 – 16,000 visible minorities; 6% of 65+
- 2006 – 159,000 visible minorities; 28% of 65+
Let’s take a look at where people live
Homeowners Age 65 and Over Living as a Couple, Toronto Census Metropolitan Area, 2006

Notes:
1. Data is from Statistics Canada, Census 2006 Custom Tabulation EC2228. Couples are family households consisting of both married and common law situations. In Census 1981, couples are defined as opposite sex couples only. In Census 2006, couples include both opposite and same-sex couples.
2. Statistics Canada census tract and municipal boundaries are for 2006.
3. Update to 2011 is not possible due to untrustworthy data in the 2011 National Household Survey.

Persons Age 65 and Over
Who Live as a Couple and Own Housing by Census Tracts

- Less than 50% of Persons Age 65 and Over
- 50% to 69.9% of Persons Age 65 and Over
- 70% to 100% of Persons Age 65 and Over
- No Data Available
Visible Minority Population Age 65 and Over, Toronto Census Metropolitan Area, 1981

Notes:
(2) Statistics Canada census tract and municipal boundaries are for 1981.
(3) Update to 2011 is not possible due to untrustworthy data in the 2011 National Household Survey.

Visible Minority Population Age 65 and Over by Census Tracts
- Less than 20% of Persons Age 65 and Over
- 20% to 39.9% of Persons Age 65 and Over
- 40% to 83% of Persons Age 65 and Over
- No Data Available
- No census tracts defined in 1981
Visible Minority Population Age 65 and Over,
Toronto Census Metropolitan Area, 2006

Notes
(1) Data is from Statistics Canada,
Census 2006 Custom Tabulation E02228.
(2) Statistics Canada census tract and municipal
boundaries are for 2006.
(3) Update to 2011 is not possible due to untrustworthy
data in the 2011 National Household Survey.
Visible Minority Population Age 65 and Over, Scarborough, 2006

Scarborough
36,500 visible minorities age 65 and over,
46% of all persons age 65 and over

Notes
(1) Data is from Statistics Canada, Census 2006 Custom Tabulation EO2228.
(2) Statistics Canada census tract boundaries are for 2006.
(3) Update to 2011 is not possible due to untrustworthy data in the 2011 National Household Survey.
Visible Minority Population Age 65 and Over, East York, 2006

East York
3,400 visible minorities age 65 and over, 24% of all persons age 65 and over

Visible Minority Population Age 65 and Over by Census Tracts

- Less than 20% of Persons Age 65 and Over
- 20% to 39.9% of Persons Age 65 and Over
- 40% to 57% of Persons Age 65 and Over

Notes
(1) Data is from Statistics Canada, Census 2006 Custom Tabulation EQ2228.
(2) Statistics Canada census tract boundaries are for 2006.
(3) Update to 2011 is not possible due to untrustworthy data in the 2011 National Household Survey.
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Income Disparities

- The recent 2006 income tables done looking at the column of income ratio to baseline: For 65+ if you rent in the Toronto CMA you are in a bad way compared to your cohort whether you are a women, single men or a couple.

- If you are a visible minority member you live in the poorer areas – note changes 1980, 2005, 2012
Census Tract Average Individual Income of Persons Age 65 and Over, Toronto Census Metropolitan Area, 2012

Notes
(1) Data is from Canada Revenue Agency 2012. Taxfiler income is from all sources, before-tax
(2) Statistics Canada census tract and municipal boundaries are for 2011.

Very High - 140% to 807%
(90 CTs, 8% of the region)
High - 120% to 140%
(45 CTs, 4% of the region)
Middle Income - 80% to 120%
(267 CTs, 25% of the region)
Low - 60% to 80%
(367 CTs, 34% of the region)
Very Low - 35% to 60%
(303 CTs, 28% of the region)
No Data Available
Census Tract Average Individual Income of Persons Age 65 and Over, Toronto Census Metropolitan Area, 2005

Notes:
1. Data is from Statistics Canada, Census 2006 Custom Tabulation ED2228. Income is from all sources, before-tax.
2. Statistics Canada census tract and municipal boundaries are for 2006.

Census Tract Average Individual Income of Persons Age 65 and Over compared to the Toronto CMA Average of $40,737 (persons 15 and over)

- Very High - 140% to 1121% (75 CTs, 8% of the region)
- High - 120% to 140% (25 CTs, 3% of the region)
- Middle Income - 80% to 120% (230 CTs, 23% of the region)
- Low - 60% to 80% (316 CTs, 32% of the region)
- Very Low - 32% to 60% (347 CTs, 35% of the region)
- No Data Available
Figure: Census Tract Average Individual Income of Persons Age 65 and Over, Toronto Census Metropolitan Area, 1980

Notes:

1. Data is from Statistics Canada, Census 1981 Custom Tabulation E02228. Income is from all sources, before-tax.
2. Statistics Canada census tract and municipal boundaries are for 1981.
Census Tract Average Individual Income of Persons Age 65 and Over, East York, 2012

Notes:
(1) Data is from Canada Revenue Agency T1FF 2012. Taxfiler income is from all sources, before-tax
(2) Statistics Canada census tract boundaries are for 2011.

Census Tract Average Individual Income of Persons Age 65 and Over versus the Toronto Metropolitan Average of $46,666 (persons 15 and over)

- Very High - Above 140%
- High - 120% to 140%
- Middle Income - 80% to 120%
- Low - 60% to 80%
- Very Low - Below 60%
- No Data Available
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Census Tract Average Individual Income of Persons Age 65 and Over, Scarborough, 2012

Census Tract Average Individual Income of Persons Age 65 and Over versus the Toronto Metropolitan Average of $46,666 (persons 15 and over)

- **Very High - Above 140%**
- **High - 120% to 140%**
- **Middle Income - 80% to 120%**
- **Low - 60% to 80%**
- **Very Low - Below 60%**
- **No Data Available**

Notes

1. Data is from Canada Revenue Agency T1FF 2012. Taxfiler income is from all sources, before-tax.
2. Statistics Canada census tract boundaries are for 2011.
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East York

- Sample: 360
- Sample collection strategy: Random
- Streets covered: 430
- Houses visited: Appx. 3420 (1:20)
- Units visited: Appx. 2845 (1:15)
Primary Question:

- How does neighbourhood and housing form affect social connections or isolation among older adults?
# Housing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Age (n=360)</th>
<th>Gender (n=360)</th>
<th>Racial Identity (n=360)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65–75</td>
<td>76–85</td>
<td>86+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single House N=171</td>
<td>101 (59.1)</td>
<td>45 (26.3)</td>
<td>25 (14.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment N=189</td>
<td>110 (58.2)</td>
<td>61 (32.3)</td>
<td>18 (9.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Living Arrangement (n=314)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Housing Tenure yrs. (n=360)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live Alone</td>
<td>Couple</td>
<td>With Family</td>
<td>Unrelated</td>
<td>0–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single House</td>
<td>47 (29.7)</td>
<td>63 (39.9)</td>
<td>29 (18.4)</td>
<td>19 (12.0)</td>
<td>27 (15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>52 (33.3)</td>
<td>38 (24.4)</td>
<td>48 (30.8)</td>
<td>18 (11.5)</td>
<td>93 (49.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Housing Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Income (n=360)</th>
<th>Self–Health Rating (n=360)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low in &gt; $15K</td>
<td>Moderate $16–$45K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=171</td>
<td>7 (4.15)</td>
<td>51 (29.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=189</td>
<td>50 (26.5)</td>
<td>85 (45.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Living Arrangement (n=314)</th>
<th>Housing Tenure yrs. (n=360)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live Alone</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N=222</td>
<td>76 (39.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N=138</td>
<td>23 (19.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Income (n=360)</th>
<th>Self-Health Rating (n=360)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low in &gt; $15K</td>
<td>Moderate $16-$45K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>N=222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36 (16.2)</td>
<td>85 (38.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N=138</td>
<td>21 (15.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus group areas
7 groups; 92 participants

- Outdoor Spaces and Buildings
- Transportation
- Housing
- Social Participation
- Respect and Social Inclusion
- Civic Participation and Employment Opportunities
- Communication and Information
- Community Support and Health Services
- Safety and Security
- Independence
Extra slides
# Housing Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Form</th>
<th>Age (n=360)</th>
<th>Gender (n=360)</th>
<th>Racial Identity (n=360)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65–75</td>
<td>76–85</td>
<td>86+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>157 (61.3)</td>
<td>66 (25.8)</td>
<td>33 (12.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Housing</td>
<td>54 (51.9)</td>
<td>40 (38.5)</td>
<td>10 (9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Form</th>
<th>Living Arrangement (n=314)</th>
<th>Housing Tenure yrs. (n=360)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live Alone</td>
<td>Couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing N=256</td>
<td>62 (26.6)</td>
<td>83 (35.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidize Housing N=104</td>
<td>37 (45.7)</td>
<td>18 (22.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Form</th>
<th>Income (n=360)</th>
<th>Self–Health Rating (n=360)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low &gt; $15K</td>
<td>Moderate $16-$45K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Housing</td>
<td>24 (9.4)</td>
<td>83 (32.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized Housing</td>
<td>33 (31.7)</td>
<td>53 (51.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age (n=360)</th>
<th>Racial Identity (n=360)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65–75</td>
<td>76–85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=222</td>
<td>121 (54.5)</td>
<td>68 (30.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=138</td>
<td>90 (65.2)</td>
<td>38 (27.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Significance

- Randomly selected samples represent 13,975 persons age 65 and over in East York
- Primary data has collected through one-on-one interview (approx. 1.5 hours person)
- Selection was made through careful judgments (e.g. very frail, cognitive patients were excluded)
- Observational judgment was also applied during data collection period
Housing Tenure Status of Population Age 65 and Over, East York, 2006

East York
13,975 persons age 65 and over, 64% are homeowners, 36% are renters

Notes
(1) Data is from Statistics Canada Census 2006 Custom Tabulation E02228.
(2) Statistics Canada census tract boundaries are for 2006.
(3) Update to 2011 is not possible due to unreliable data in the 2011 National Household Survey.
East York: Stratified Cluster Sampling

Cluster 1
- Crescent Town
- Thorncliffe
- High-rises

Cluster 2
- Broadview North
- Broadview
- Woodbine Heights
- Woodbine Lumsden
- Mixed
- Bungalows, Low-rises

Cluster 3
- Bennington Heights-Governors’ Bridge
- Danforth
- O’Connor -Parkview Hills
- Leaside
- Detached homes (Higher income)
Sample Size: 360 older adults (65+)

[Map showing older-adult density distribution with various density ranges indicated by color shading and dot markers.]

Older-Adult Density Distribution

- Density (Person/sq. km)
  - 123 - 293
  - 294 - 524
  - 525 - 653
  - 654 - 827
  - 828 - 1653

Participant's Location

Total population of Older-adults: 15,130