First Nations/Métis/Inuit Mobility Study

Interim Report Two:
Draft One

Coordinated by the
Institute of Urban Studies

In Collaboration with
Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs
Manitoba Métis Federation

INSTITUTE OF
URBAN STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG

First Nations/Métis/Inuit Mobility Study
Interim Report Two:
Draft One

Principal Investigator:	**Jino Distasio**
Research Associates:	**Gina Sylvestre**
	Christa Jacobucci

A Caution to the Reader

The material contained in this report represents a summary of the second survey. Therefore, the findings, datasets and other materials highlighted in this ***Draft Interim Report*** are subject to change as the project proceeds into subsequent surveys. A final report will be submitted.

The Institute of Urban Studies has made every attempt to ensure that the data reported are accurate and reflective of the survey material. However, there may be changes and modifications as this project proceeds. The final report will note changes and/or corrections.

Executive Summary

The findings of the second survey reveal five key areas that should be considered when developing policy aimed at improving the mobility process. This includes mobility, housing and neighbourhood characteristics, residential status, service use, and socio-economic status. These factors present distinct issues that require further attention and understanding. The following provides a summary of the key findings related to each of the issues.

1) Housing and Neighbourhood Characteristics:
- A chronic shortage of housing has persisted over the course of two surveys.
- Nearly half of respondents continue to lack access to basic shelter and remain forced to live temporarily with friends and family.
- More than half of respondents indicated they planned to move within the next six months with nearly half citing housing as being the primary reason for moving.
- The overall size of households has increased substantially indicating that families and individuals are becoming increasingly reliant on others for shelter and potentially as a means to offset housing costs.
- In terms of crowding, 46% of 4+ households indicated their dwellings had some level of crowding.
- Just over two-thirds of persons in subsidized units indicated that they were on a waiting list prior to securing their present accommodation, with nearly half of these respondents waiting upwards of one year to access their current shelter.
- Newly-arrived Aboriginal persons, with limited financial resources have to have greater access to subsidized housing in order to achieve a more secure environment, and improve their adjustment and probability of remaining in the city.
- Although general satisfaction with overall housing displayed a marginal increase, the continued problems with lack of shelter, outweigh any gains observed in general ratings.
- For those respondents who regarded their neighbourhood favourably, they lived in close proximity to social support, had a safe home, accessed cultural and spiritual services, recreation, and public transportation. Positive neighbourhood characteristics appear to be crucial in the promotion of a positive transition to the city.
- A larger proportion of those who expressed uncertain or temporary plans for remaining in Winnipeg agreed that their home was safe but disagreed that their neighbourhood was safe.

2) Residential Status:
- Those in temporary accommodations tended to be single, male, between the ages of 14 and 24, and without children. Their income was generally lower; however, most were not on social assistance.
- Those in temporary accommodations lived with others and were more likely to experience an increase in the number of persons they live with thus signifying residential instability.

- Those who were living in temporary accommodation were less likely to have moved previously to Winnipeg, suggesting that newcomers require orientation to the city in order to assure a successful transition.
- Those in temporary accommodations were less likely to have accessed social, medical and education services.
- While those people who live in temporary accommodations are employed, .they tend to display residential instability and are unfamiliar with the city as they are less likely to have moved previously to Winnipeg.
- It is this sub-group of non-renters who are unsure of their plans for remaining in Winnipeg that must be focussed upon in order to ensure that newly-arrived Aboriginal persons are given the opportunities in which to thrive in the city.

3) Mobility:
- Mobility remains high with 60% of respondents having moved between surveys. The most common reasons for moving included family, housing and employment.
- Those who moved within the city did so primarily for housing, while those leaving the city cited family reasons.
- Those who were satisfied did move between surveys, but not out of Winnipeg. This suggests that out-of-city movements are an indicator of dissatisfaction, and perhaps, instability in the transition process.
- A higher proportion of respondents in temporary accommodation moved between surveys, and also left Winnipeg.
- Those who access social assistance did not move or leave Winnipeg between surveys.
- If education services were accessed, it was less likely that the respondent moved or left Winnipeg, suggesting residential stability.
- Those who left Winnipeg between surveys were less likely to have accessed employment services.

4) Services:
- Frequency of service use remained active with the 384 respondents (of Survey 2) accessing a total of 798 services through consecutive surveys.
- The most frequently accessed services were social, employment, medical, education, and housing (consistent with Survey 1).
- Over 60% of respondents became more satisfied with the services they had been accessing.
- **Social Services:**
  - Those who accessed social services tended to be female, between the ages of 25 and 44, with children. Access to social services was also correlated with lower income.
  - Between Survey 1 and Survey 2, 14.1% (or 54 respondents) went off social assistance, while 11.7% (or 45 respondents) began to receive benefits.
  - Those who accessed social services rented accommodations. This was correlated with expectations to remain in Winnipeg for a long-term period, possibly contributing to residential stability.

- Those accessing social services did agree that there were adequate programs and services in the neighbourhood for cultural, spiritual and social needs. However, they also believed that their home or neighbourhood was unsafe. These findings suggest that those on social assistance require a more secure residential setting in order to make a better adjustment to living in an urban centre.
- **Employment Services:**
  - Employment services were accessed by 35.7% of respondents.
  - More males accessed employment services.
  - A higher proportion of those who accessed employment services lived in temporary accommodations.
  - Those who access employment services and are employed require assistance in obtaining appropriate housing accommodations that will allow them to maintain stable employment status.
- **Education Services:**
  - Between Survey 1 and Survey 2 there was a decrease in the proportion of students (11.2% in Survey 1 and 9.6% in Survey 2).
  - Of those who accessed education services, the highest proportion were between the ages of 14 and 24.
  - Access to education services was more probable for those who had never moved to Winnipeg, indicating that Aboriginal students may lack a familiarity with the city.
  - Those who accessed education services felt that they were far from family and friends and their cultural, spiritual and social needs were not met.
  - The findings suggest that they require orientation services as many students are unfamiliar with the city. They also require supports to replace their friends and families who live outside the city, as well as access to cultural, spiritual and social services and programs.
- **Medical Services:**
  - The highest proportion of those who accessed medical services were in the age groups of 25 to 34 and 45 and older. Those with children as well as those with lower incomes accessed medical services more frequently.
  - Single persons did not access medical services.
- **Housing Services:**
  - Those with an income greater than $10,000 were more likely to access housing services. Those on social assistance did not access housing services, but tended to be living in rental accommodations.

5) Socio-economic Status:
- Although the majority of respondents experienced no changes to their employment status, a key finding was that 88 persons (23.3%) became employed. In contrast, 7.7% of respondents changed from being employed in Survey 1 to unemployed.
- Between Survey 1 and Survey 2, 54 respondents went off social assistance.
- Those who reported an income of $15,000 or less increased by 10% to 82.6%. A second observation is that those reporting no income dropped to 4.2% (as compared to 12% in Survey 1).

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1.0 Introduction

The *First Nations/Métis/Inuit Mobility Study* examines the mobility patterns of Aboriginal persons moving into the city of Winnipeg. The intent is to interview the same persons, over successive periods, in order to examine issues and concerns arising as they adjust to living in the city. The intent of the study is to examine the reasons for migration to Winnipeg with the intent of better understanding the factors affecting mobility. A second concern is to identify potential gaps in the provision of services during the time of transition to the city and the subsequent adjustment. A strength of the study is that it examines changes in the circumstances of respondents who remain in the city for an extended period of time. To date, survey participants have been interviewed twice between May 2002 – February 2003. Thus far, approximately 900 interviews have been completed.

The *First Nations/Métis/Inuit Mobility Study* represents the collaborative efforts of the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs, the Manitoba Metis Federation, Western Economic Diversification, and the Institute of Urban Studies (the coordinating consultant). The study received further support from a steering committee comprised of representatives from a diverse set of government departments.

1.1 Report Structure

Interim Report Two examines the findings of the second survey of the *First Nations/Métis/Inuit Mobility Study*. The report commences with a review of the methodology/survey design, and then proceeds to discuss the specific results of the survey including measures of housing and neighbourhood characteristics, residential mobility, services accessed, as well as the socio-economic and demographic profile of the sample. The second section reviews the results of an analysis that was completed to investigate the mobility process and to identify those factors that are related to an Aboriginal person's transition to an urban centre.

Thus far two surveys have been completed and are reviewed in the present interim report. The third and final survey was conducted between April and August 2003, with a final report to be completed in 2004.

1.2 Methodology

The initial interview survey for the Aboriginal Mobility Study was completed in October of 2002. The research programme specified that respondents would be interviewed at four-month intervals during a one-year period. Therefore, the field study for the second survey began in November, 2002. This phase of the study was completed at the end of February, 2003.

For Survey 1, the prerequisite for participation in the study was residency in Winnipeg for a period of no greater than 12 months (May, 2001 or later). Therefore, the length of residence in Winnipeg for those who participated in Survey 2 ranged from five to 17

months. In addition, it was possible that, between surveys, respondents did leave Winnipeg. However, if they were residing in Winnipeg at the time of Survey 2, they were eligible to participate in the second phase of the study.

At the completion of the first survey respondents were told that a second survey would be conducted in four months. As many of the respondents were living in temporary accommodations, it was anticipated that in certain circumstances contact for the second survey would be difficult. Therefore, in addition to a contact number that was recorded on the interview, instructions were also provided to the respondent on how to contact the interviewer through the Institute of Urban Studies.

The interviewers from the first survey also conducted the interviews for the second phase. For the second survey, interviewers were provided with a list of names of those respondents they had interviewed in the previous phase. Some interviewers, however, were not able to continue with the study. In these cases, the interviews were assigned to other members of the study team. In order to ensure that all respondents were re-interviewed approximately four months after the first survey, the list specified the date when the second interview could be conducted with each particular respondent. The interviewers attempted to contact all respondents through the contact number provided previously, as well as through contacts in the community. In addition, many of the respondents were also put in touch with the interviewers through IUS. It should be noted that respondents were once again remunerated for their participation in the survey. This was an essential component to ensure sufficient numbers of participants for the second survey.

A total of 384 respondents, or 73.14% of the sample from the first phase of the study (n=525), completed the second survey. The remainder of the sample from the first survey (n=141) could not be located although interviewers attempted to contact all previous respondents on several occasions. This represents a non-response rate of 27%. It was demonstrated in the findings of the first survey that a large proportion of the Aboriginal population migrating to Winnipeg lives in temporary accommodations with a high level of residential mobility. Therefore, the relatively large number of non-responses in the second survey was not unexpected. As contact could not be made with these individuals, it was not possible to determine whether they continued to reside in Winnipeg or had returned to their home community. A profile of non-respondents has been outlined in Appendix A.

As there was a high rate of attrition, it was important to compare the Survey 1 (n=525) and Survey 2 (n=384) samples. The comparative tables found in Appendix B demonstrate that the structure of the sample remains relatively consistent for both surveys. There was a slight increase in the proportion of females, as well as persons of First Nations status in Survey 2. In addition, the ratio of single respondents decreased in Survey 2 as more were in common-law or married relationships. And, finally, there was a notable increase in Survey 2 of the number of respondents reporting incomes of less than $20,000. This increase can be attributed to the high proportion of respondents who did not report an income in Survey 1.

The data analyzed in this report have been drawn from the interviews conducted with 384 participants who completed the second survey of the study. It should be noted that the comparison developed in this report between Survey 1 and Survey 2 is based exclusively on the data for the 384 respondents who completed both surveys. Additionally, in some cases where the data contains missing values, valid percentages are reported.

The report of the Survey 2 results is divided into two sections. The first section provides a description and comparison of the findings from both Survey 1 and Survey 2. The second section provides an overview of a bivariate analysis that was conducted to determine the factors related to the adjustment of newly-arrived Aboriginal persons to Winnipeg. This section also outlines the significance of the findings for the development of policy that will more adequately address the needs of Aboriginal persons when relocating to an urban centre.

1.3 Survey Description

Survey 2 consisted of 35 open and closed-ended questions (see Appendix F). The majority of the questions, along with the accompanying thematic sections, remained consistent with Survey 1 to allow for the comparison of the samples. Survey 2 was divided into seven sections that collected information concerning the selection criteria, general background, housing characteristics, neighbourhood characteristics, expectations of remaining in Winnipeg, service perception/availability, and socio-economic and demographic profile. In some instances, the question format was modified from Survey 1 to ensure greater clarity in the structure of the questions. Finally, while some questions were added to Survey 2, several questions were not repeated as they related to stable attributes of the respondents.

2.0 A Description of the Survey 2 Sample

The following section provides an overview of the findings of the second survey. It begins with an examination of the socio-economic composition of the sample, and then proceeds to discuss mobility and housing characteristics. The first section concludes with a review of service usage.

2.1 Socio-Economic/Demographic Composition

As noted in the methodology section, the socio-economic and demographic composition of the sample remained consistent between surveys. As in Survey 1, the majority of the Survey 2 sample (61%) remained single, with 16.7% of the respondents being single parents. It should be noted that there was a substantial increase (12.4%) in the proportion of those in common-law or married relationships. However, the validity of this increase is difficult to determine as marital status was derived indirectly in Survey 1. Therefore, the significance of this change cannot be inferred as it potentially reflects coding inaccuracies encountered in Survey 1. (See Tables C1- C4 in Appendix C).

The income and employment composition of the sample experienced slight changes between surveys. With respect to income, there was a substantial decrease in the proportion of those reporting no income in Survey 2. As a result, there was a corresponding increase in those reporting either an income of up to $10,000 (3.8%) or an income between $10,000 and $15,000 (6.4%). It is important to note that the proportion of those earning up to $10,000 remained consistently high in both surveys.

Table 1: Annual Household Income, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Household Income	**Survey 1** **n = 384**	**Survey 2** **n = 384**
Up to $10,000	58.3	62.1
$10,001 to $15,000	14.1	20.5
$15,001 to $20,000	9.9	8.7
$20,001 to $25,000	4.2	3.2
$25,001 to $30,000	0.3	0.8
$30,001 to $35,000	0.9	0.3
$35,001 to $40,000	0.0	0.0
$40,001 to $45,000	0.3	0.3
$45,001 to $50,000	0.0	0.0
No Income	12.0	4.2
Total	100.0	100.0

A Profile of Single Parents

A total of 64 respondents (16.7%) were categorized as single parents, with the majority being female (89.1%). Similar to Survey 1, a high proportion of single parents were between the ages of 20 and 29, with just over 50% being over the age of 30 (Table 2).

Table 2: Single Parent Age Breakdown, Survey 2, Percentages	
Age Categories	**Survey 2**
18 to 19 years	6.5
20 to 29 years	41.9
30 to 39 years	29.0
40 to 49 years	19.4
50 to 59 years	1.6
60+ years	1.6

The majority of single parents reported having two children under their care (40.6%) while 29% had one child. The number of single parents with three or more children was 29.7%.

In terms of the employment status of single parents, 65.1% were unemployed, 19.0% were employed, and 12.7% indicated they were students.

The number of single parents reporting incomes of less than $15,000 was 77% (as compared to 60% in Survey 1). A total of 73.4% of single parents received social assistance (compared to 63.8% in Survey 1).

> Comments made by single parents reflect the problems and issues facing persons as they search for the necessary supports:
>
> *Some single parents have difficulty accessing services they require. "Child care and daycare services- I can't afford their services financially."* (Single mother, 20-29 years of age)
>
> *"I need legal advice and legal aid because I just received custody documents and I don't know where to go to apply for both legal services."* (Single mother, 20-29 years of age)
>
> *This parent speaks about the neighbourhood that she lives in. "There's been two killings in the neighbourhood this past spring and summer, that makes the area unsafe but I like living in a house instead of an apartment."* (Single mother, 40-49 years of age)
>
> *Others offered advice to those who may move to the city. "Find employment/housing before moving into the city."* (Single mother, 20-29 years of age)

A Profile of Aboriginal Students

A total of 37 respondents (9.6%) indicated that they were students (compared to 11.2% in Survey 1). The majority of students were single (59.5%) with just over 20% being single parents.

Slightly more than 10% of students indicated they worked. These students were either self-employed, or employed on a casual or part-time basis. Approximately 38% of students received band sponsorship, while 24.3% depended on social assistance and 8.1% received a student bursary or loan. Nearly half (47.2%) of students reported an income of less than $10,000.

The proportion of students who rent accommodations increased from 58.1% to 73% at the time of Survey 2, with the remainder (27%) living temporarily with friends and family.

Almost half (45.7%) of students planned on moving in the next six months. The reasons given for moving were related to housing issues, family reasons, and education.

With regard to housing, a high number of students (94.6%) were either somewhat or very satisfied with their housing. However, in terms of affordability of housing, a high number (48.5%) found it either very or somewhat difficult to make their shelter payments, while 51.5% had no problem.

As of Survey 2, students indicated that they accessed 105 services, with the most common being education (29.5%), medical (17.1%), and social (10.5%).

Seventeen respondents (4.5%) became students in Survey 2, while 22 respondents (4.5%) who were students in Survey 1, were no longer by the time of Survey 2.

Of the seventeen respondents who became students, 88.2% were unemployed in Survey 1, while two worked on a full-time basis. As well, ten respondents were collecting social assistance benefits, and two had no income. During Survey 2 all students reported having some income, but twelve, but twelve had incomes of less than $10,000 annually with the remaining five earning over $10,000.

> Comments made by students reflect some of the challenges facing students who move to the city to access educational opportunities:
>
> > *"Student[s] have to accept that this is where you are for ten months, [you] may get lonely. Use Aboriginal resources (counsellors), alcohol may heighten the loneliness (abstain)."* (Female, single parent, unknown age)
> >
> > *"[Doesn't] feel like coming to school, education is not what she expected, not what the outline said."* (Female, married or common-law, 20-29 years of age)
> >
> > *"Tutoring- can't get access because of feelings of inadequacy, doesn't want to feel that she's [not] at grade level. Doesn't feel comfortable, would be more comfortable if Aboriginal run."* (Female, single, 20-29 years of age)

2.2 Residential Mobility

A high level of mobility continued during the course of the second survey. This mobility can be characterized by continued volatility in the frequency and reasons for moving during the four month period between surveys. Mobility was measured by asking respondents how many times they moved, where they moved to, and the primary reasons for each move.

The following discussion describes the reasons for moving for the entire sample, and then separates respondents into a number of sub-groups including those who moved once, those who moved two or more times, those who moved only within Winnipeg, and those who left the city but moved back between surveys. These sub-groups provide a useful breakdown of persons who moved, while examining for differences between the groups.

Overall, a an extremely high proportion of respondents (59.1%) indicated they changed residences since Survey 1 (n=277). The extent of this mobility is highlighted by the finding that almost 70% of those respondents who changed residences, moved two or more times between surveys (Table 3). Furthermore, of the 277 respondents who moved, 61% had relocated outside of Winnipeg, and subsequently moved back.

Table 3: Number of Times Respondents Moved Between, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages	
Number of Moves	**Percentages**
1	30.8
2	58.6
3	10.1
4+	0.4

This high level of mobility helps to underscore the chronic housing situation facing persons as the arrive in the city and are left will little options other than living with friends and family. This has contributed significantly to the high incident of mobility.

2.2.1 Reasons for Moving

The high degree of mobility remains the result of numerous factors. As presented in Table 4, family and housing issues were the primary reasons for moving, followed by employment, health, safety and education. With respect to housing, a number of sub-categories are presented. These categories help illustrate the complexity of the housing issues facing persons as they adjust to city life.

Table 4: Reasons for Moving Between Surveys, Percentages	
Reason for Moving	**Percentage**
Family Reasons	34.9
Housing Issues	28.2
Entered subsidized housing	(1.7)
Changed subsidized housing	(0.3)
Housing – Other	(2.6)
Can't pay rent	(1.2)
Evicted	(2.6)
Moved to bigger, better housing	(4.3)
Roommate/share expenses	(2.6)
Unhealthy (bugs, crowded)	(2.3)
Reserve housing issues	(1.7)
Residence receiving repairs	(0.9)
Accommodations with friends/family no longer available	(5.5)
Wanting/looking for own place	(2.3)
Employment Opportunities	16.9
Health	5.5
Education Opportunities	4.7
Safety	4.7
Justice/Corrections	3.8
Socio-political	0.3

2.2.2 Who Moved

Given the considerable variability in the frequency of moves (and reasons), the factors listed in Table 4 were further examined based on: (1) those who moved once, (2) those who moved two or more times, (3) those who moved only within Winnipeg, (4) and those who left the city but returned. The rationale for undertaking this comparison was to determine if differences could be observed between the sub-groups (Table 5).

Table 5 Reasons for Moving by Sub-Groups, Percentages				
Reasons for Moving	**Moved Once**	**Moved Two or More Times**	**Moved Only Within City**	**Moved Outside City**
Health	4.8	5.7	4.4	6.1
Employment	1.2	21.8	1.8	24.3
Family	31.3	36.0	21.2	41.7
Housing	49.4	21.5	54.9	15.2
Education	1.2	5.7	0.9	6.5
Socio-Political	1.2	0.0	0.9	0.0
Safety	10.8	4.2	10.6	3.0
Justice	0.0	5.0	5.3	3.0

As illustrated, Table 5 notes that respondents who moved once did so primarily for housing (49.4%), family (31.3%), or safety (10.8%) reasons. In contrast, those who moved two or more times did so for reasons related to family (36%) and, to a lesser extent, employment (21.8%) and housing (21.5%). A key difference between these two groups is that those who moved only once did so primarily for housing reasons while those moving more frequently did so for family. Interestingly, those who moved more frequently did not consider safety as prominently as those who moved once.

8

Some important observations can also be drawn between those who moved within the city and those who moved outside the city and returned. The critical difference between these two sub-groups was, once again, in relation to housing and family as reasons for moving. While housing was the primary reason given for those who moved within Winnipeg (54.9%), it was reported as a reason for only 15.2% of those who left Winnipeg. And while family was the central reason for moving outside of Winnipeg (41.7%), it was a factor for only 21.2% of those who moved within Winnipeg.

Furthermore, there were notable differences between these sub-groups with respect to employment and safety. A far higher proportion of those who moved outside the city (24.3%) than intra-city respondents (1.8%) stated employment as their reason for moving. Conversely, those who moved within the city were much more likely to report safety as a reason for moving.

The observations drawn from Table 5 clearly indicate that the reasons for moving remain complex and varied based on both the frequency of moves, and whether respondents remained in the city. The most obvious differences are in housing, employment, family, and safety. Those remaining in the city, and moving only once, are more likely to move as a result of housing, family and safety issues, while those who moved more frequently, and outside of the city, did so more for family and employment reasons.

The Geography of Mobility

A high percentage of respondents changed locations between surveys. The location of respondents at the time of the first and second survey was analyzed using GIS software[1]. What is evident in the preliminary analysis is that, although a significant number of persons moved, the changes remained concentrated within central locations. This pattern reflects the fact that the concentration of movers remained central. The direction of the moves also demonstrated a higher incidence of inward movement. This was characterized by persons moving towards central locations from areas located both within and at the periphery of the inner city. Further analysis of spatial data is currently being completed.

---

[1] GIS analysis is presently being completed and will form part of the final report submitted.

Reason For Moving

Respondents' comments on moving indicate that housing shortages and quality accommodation still remain difficult to secure

> *"I want to be closer to downtown because of the amenities (to be close to them)."* (Male, single, 60+ years of age)

> *"I am in a wheelchair and my place doesn't have wheelchair accessibility."* (Male, single, 30-39 years of age)

> *"I don't like living in a rooming house, the other tenants drink too much."* (Male, single, 30-39 years of age)

> *"There was a police standoff in my building, so we moved for a safer place to live."* (Female, single parent, 30-39 years of age)

> *"I had to go to live in my community temporarily as a regulation of work, a requirement, if I wanted to work for a few months."* (Male, single, 40-49 years of age)

> *This respondent needs a place of his own for him and his family because they are expecting another baby.* (Male, married or common-law with children, 30-39 years of age)

> *This respondent has "[f]inished [her] education, and moving back home because there are more natives there (The Pas)."* (Female, single, 40-49 years of age)

> *"I'm waiting to move into a house that will become vacant at month's end."* (Female, married/common-law with children, 60+ years of age)

2.2.3 Potential for Remaining in the City

The high rate of mobility among respondents points to significant variability in the decision to remain in the city. To help clarify this point, respondents were asked specifically whether they expected to remain in the city, and for approximately how long (Table 6).

Table 6: Expected Length of Stay in Winnipeg, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Expected Length of Stay	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
0 to 3 months	4.4	1.8
3 to 6 months	6.3	3.9
6 to 12 months	11.2	5.2
Permanently	21.4	15.7
Not sure	56.7	73.4
Total	100.0	100.0

As noted in the table above, few respondents are certain of their decision to remain in the city. Moreover, the proportion of those who are unsure of how long they will remain in Winnipeg increased substantially since Survey 1. In addition, those expecting to remain permanently decreased slightly. These findings highlight that a significant number of persons remain unsure as to whether they will continue to live in Winnipeg.

2.2.4 Plans to move in near future

At the time of Survey 1, three-quarters of respondents (75.4%) indicated they planned to move in the near future (within one year). For Survey 2, the time frame was reduced from one year to six months to measure for more immediate plans to move. Even with this adjustment, a high number of persons (56.8%) still indicated they planned to move within the next six months. The reasons for moving remain diverse (Table 7).

Housing continues to be the most often cited reason for moving. The proportion of those citing housing as the primary reason for moving increased to 46% in Survey 2. The diversity of housing responses mitigated the creation of sub-categories which included requiring a bigger/better home and expectations to enter subsidized housing. In general, the proportion of those reporting other reasons for moving remained consistent between surveys. The exception was a substantial decrease in those reporting safety as a reason for moving.

In terms of subsidized housing, it should be noted that 9.3% of respondents were on a waiting list for subsidized housing at the time of Survey 2, with the majority (68%) having waited for 6 months or less.

Table 7: Reasons for Moving in the Near Future, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Reasons	**Reasons for moving in the next year**	**Reasons for moving in the next 6 months**
	Survey 1	Survey 2
Housing Issues	35.4*	46.3
Looking for own place	(N/A)	(20.6)
Require bigger/better housing	(N/A)	(8.3)
Expecting to Enter subsidized housing	(N/A)	(5.8)
Housing- other	(N/A)	(4.7)
Reserve housing issues	(N/A)	(3.2)
Can't pay rent/share expenses	(N/A)	(1.8)
Change subsidized housing	(N/A)	(1.1)
Accommodation with friends/family no longer available	(N/A)	(0.7)
Family Reasons	23.3	21.3
Employment Opportunities	15.7	16.6
Safety Issues	15.2	6.5
Education Opportunities	4.8	4.0
Health	3.0	3.6
Employment/education	1.8	N/A
Justice/corrections	N/A	1.1
Spiritual/cultural	N/A	0.4
Other	0.8	0.4

*denotes that sub-categories were not created in Survey 1.

The above discussion demonstrates that residential mobility continued to be an important issue for newly arrived Aboriginal persons to Winnipeg. A high proportion of the sample moved between surveys, with many individuals leaving Winnipeg during this period. Furthermore, three-quarters of the respondents planned to move in the next six months. These findings suggest that residential mobility is an important determinant of the transition to an urban centre. Furthermore, the importance of housing as being a primary determinant for moving must be emphasized as being a critical area for policy direction and concern. This becomes evident in the fact that there was a high percentage of intra-city mobility coupled with a chronic shortage of housing (as measured by the 50% of respondents who live temporarily with friends and family).

2.3 Housing Characteristics

As has been clearly evident in the previous sections, housing remained one of the most significant areas raised by respondents, highlighting the continued lack of affordable housing and the fact that there has been no significant change in the number of persons living temporarily.

For respondents, their satisfaction levels for housing and the neighbourhood, along with issues relating to affordability, crowding, and general neighbourhood characteristics remained prominent issues, and point to a deepening pessimistic view of potential options for improvement to their current situation.

Table 8 clearly illustrates that little change occurred in the living arrangements of respondents. This is emphasized by the fact that more than half of respondents continued to live temporarily with friends and family as opposed to renting accommodations (see Profile of those Living Temporarily). The most common type of residence remained consistent, with the majority of respondents continuing to live in centrally located apartments (See Appendix C).

Table 8: Living Arrangements, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Living Arrangements	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Rent	44.8	49.0
Living temporarily with friends/family	54.9	50.8
Other	0.3	0.3

Respondents were asked to list the number of persons with whom they currently lived. Table 9, which examines the size of the household (exclusive of bedrooms), substantiates the claim that larger households are forming. In particular, households of 5+ persons increased substantially from 12.3% to 28%, while the number of 2 persons households decreased from 36.2% to 20.6%.

The trend emerging appears to be the formation of larger households, most likely in smaller apartments, with fewer bedrooms. For example, the number of households with four or more persons living in two bedroom or less, more than doubled (11.7% to 27.4%). (See Appendix C). This points to a extreme shortage of suitable housing options for larger households along with increased crowding of residences (most likely from an increased number of households having persons living temporarily). This situation remains a pressing concern as more and more individuals and families are resorting to "doubling up" as a means of securing housing that is affordable. However, it is important to not that this doubling up does not necessarily provide a suitable housing option and in fact may contribute to a less healthful environment for individuals.

Table 9: Total Number of Persons in Household, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Number of Persons	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
1	12.2	13.2
2	36.2	20.6
3	21.1	20.1
4	18.2	18.2
5+	12.3	28.0
Total	100.0	100.0

2.3.1 Shelter Costs and Subsidy Programs

Just under 10% of respondents indicated they currently lived in subsidized accommodations, with Manitoba Housing being the most commonly listed program (Table 10). A critical finding was that 76.5% of persons in subsidized units indicated that they were on a waiting list prior to securing their present accommodation, with nearly half of respondents waiting upwards of one year.

Table 10: Housing Subsidy Programs, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Subsidy Program	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Manitoba Housing Authority	69.4	78.6
Winnipeg Rehab. Housing Corp.	16.7	4.8
Kinew Housing	11.1	9.5
DOTC Housing	2.8	4.8
SAFER	0.0	2.4

Table 11: Length on Waiting List for Subsidized Housing, Survey 2, Percentages	
Wait Length	**Survey 2**
1 month	11.5
2 to 5 months	23.0
6 months	11.5
7 to 12 months	46.1
Over 1 year	7.7

2.3.2 Rental Agreement

Of those in rental accommodations, 75.8% reported that their lease agreement was month-to-month (compared to 63.5% in Survey 1), while a smaller group (24.2%) specified they had signed a one-year lease (compared to 33.5% in Survey 1). Respondents were also asked to state the amount of rent they pay. In Survey 2, respondents were paying an average rent of $355.85, up nearly 4% from the $342.79 paid at the time of Survey 1. In both Survey 1 and Survey 2, only a small proportion of respondents paid less than $200 in rent (Table 12).

Table 12: Amount Paid in Rent, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Rent Categories	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Less than $200	9.2	4.8
$200 to $299	34.1	34.2
$300 to $399	25.4	24.6
$400 to $499	15.6	20.9
$500 to $599	12.7	13.9
$600 to $699	2.9	1.6
Total	100.0	100.0

Profile of Persons Living Temporarily

At the completion of Survey 2. 195 respondents (50.8%) remained living temporarily with friends or family.

This high percentage is a critical concern as finding shelter appears to be the one of the most significant issue facing persons.

- 72.7% of those people living temporarily with friends and family plan on moving in the next six months. The most common reason for planning to move was because of wanting or looking for their own place (28.8%).
- 68.7% of those living temporarily with friends and family had an annual income of up to $10,000.
- 72.2% were single persons, 7.2% were single parents, 10.8% were married or common-law with no children, and 9.8% were married or common-law with children.

Table 13: Marital Status by Tenancy Status, Survey 2, Percentage		
Marital Status	Rent %	Temporary %
Single	49.5	72.2
Single parent	26.6	7.2
Married with no children	7.4	10.8
Married with children	16.5	9.8
Total	100.0	100.0

Of the 195 respondents who are living temporarily with friends and family, 124 (63.6%) contributed to the monthly rent. On average, respondents contributed $92.97 per month to the rent with the majority (78.9%) contributing over $100 per month.

> *"I don't have my own place here nor do I have a job either. To get money to eat or to get a room for the night, I panhandle with my friends, and sleep over at different places of my friends or their friends."* (Male, single, 20-29 years of age)

> *"I'm less satisfied with housing services as I cannot get an apartment of my liking. The affordable ones are in rooming houses but I would rather have a room in my family home til I can afford a decent place."* (Female, single, under 20 years of age)

2.4 Housing Satisfaction

Housing satisfaction was measured through five questions that had respondents rate and discuss various aspects of their current shelter circumstances (Table 14 to 17).

With respect to condition of the residence (Table 14), those indicating the unit was in good condition declined, while those rating the unit as fair increased by just over 15%. A positive finding was a decrease of almost 10% in the number of respondents reporting that the unit was in poor condition. However, these findings do not indicate that there has been improvement in the rating of housing and in fact, they further suggests that securing quality housing remains an enormous problem of the majority of respondents.

Table 14: Condition of Residence, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Condition of Residence	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Good	40.3	33.7
Fair	44.4	60.3
Poor	15.3	6.0
Total	100.0	100.0

With regard to housing affordability, the results indicate that a greater number of persons stated that they had no trouble making monthly housing payments. However, it is important to note that while the "no trouble making monthly payments" category increased, this does not necessarily indicate that the housing situation has improved. In fact, it may simply indicate that with more people sharing the unit and contributing to the rent has reduced the level of difficulty (Table 15).

Table 15: Housing Affordability, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Housing costs	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
No trouble making payment	50.0	58.2
Some difficulty making payments	38.6	37.9
Very difficult making payments	11.4	3.9
Total	100.0	100.0

Previously, it was observed that a substantial increase had occurred in the formation of larger households. When asked specifically about crowding in the dwelling[2], nearly one third of respondents reported that some level of crowding presently exists. Furthermore, there was a slight increase in the somewhat crowded category (Table 16).

---

[2] Crowding is a subjective variable that is based on the perceptions and experiences of respondents. The findings of this report clearly indicate that household size has risen sharply between surveys which may provide a more accurate picture of the changing housing circumstances of respondents. This change is characterized by more persons sharing a residence and contributing to the monthly rent.

This situation remains significant as there does not appear to be evidence suggesting that the crowding situation will be alleviated for the nearly one third of respondents. This situation also remains linked to the high level of persons living temporary with friends and family. Therefore, helping to alleviate the crowding situation must involve a reduction in the number of persons living temporally (which will also reduce the high number of persons per bedroom). However, this must also be accompanied by the provision of more affordable housing so families and individuals don't have to rely on others to help offset the monthly shelter costs.

Table 16: Residence Crowding, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Crowding	Survey 1	Survey 2
Not crowded	66.2	69.4
Somewhat crowded	23.7	27.7
Very crowded	10.1	2.9
Total	100.0	100.0

Perhaps the most important finding in Table 17 is the fact that only 11% of respondents are very satisfied with their current housing situation[3]. This low rating, and a more than 50% decrease from Survey 1, is indicative of the difficulties facing Aboriginal persons in finding quality housing. Furthermore, the "somewhat satisfied" category should be viewed as being viewed as *somewhat* negative in that again respondents are less than very satisfied with their current home and thus indicates that the situation could be improved.

Table 17 also reveals a positive finding in that those who stated they were unsatisfied decreased from 26.4% to 11.7%. However, there was also rather significant increase in the proportion of respondents stating they were somewhat satisfied with their housing (Table 17).

Table 17: Housing Satisfaction Levels, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Satisfaction Levels	Survey 1	Survey 2
Very satisfied	20.3	11.0
Somewhat satisfied	53.3	77.3
Unsatisfied	26.4	11.7
Total	100.0	100.0

---

[3] The measurement of satisfaction is a subjective measure based on the experiences of respondents and what they consider to be "good housing". The term *somewhat* satisfied should be taken in the context of being a negative finding in that it suggests respondents are presently *less than very satisfied* with their housing and improvements could be made (either a better home or a neighbourhood).

In an open-ended question, respondents were asked to raise any concerns with their present housing situation. For the most part, respondents indicated that their concerns were either looking for a place of their own or wanting a bigger and better place. To a lesser extent, respondents listed concerns with the building, including the need for repairs, difficulties with landlords, and a lack of safety and privacy. Overall, the comments of respondents echoed the chronic housing shortage which exists and the fact that many simply want to find a place of their own or to live in a place that is affordable, clean and safe.

2.4.1   Rating of Housing by Household Size

As noted above, the five housing variables point to a continued pessimistic view of housing. To further examine these data, cross-tabulations were conducted between these variables and the number of persons in the household to determine if larger households correspond with a more negative rating.

With respect to general condition of the dwelling, those persons in larger households (4 or more) rated the condition in a manner consistent with the other groups. In terms of affordability, households of four or more had the second highest rating for "no trouble making monthly payments" at 63% (second only to single person households at 72%). This finding suggests that large households have less difficulty with rent as more people contribute to household finances. Again, this finding should be taken in the context that being able to make monthly payments is by no means a positive finding. In fact, this should be viewed as a more negative finding in that in order for the rent to be "affordable" requires the support of additional persons.

In terms of crowding, larger households did report a higher incidence of crowding. This is evident in the 46% of 4 or more person households who indicated their dwellings were somewhat crowded (this was the highest such rating). This finding is compared to 92% for both one and two person households, and 76% for three person households who did not find their households crowded.

Overall, housing satisfaction showed a high level of consistency by household types with the majority being somewhat satisfied (again this does not indicate a positive finding). Interestingly, only 9.7% of households of four or more were unsatisfied with their present housing, while the remaining groups ranged between 12% and 14% in this category.

The final question which asked whether respondents had any concerns with their present housing showed very consistent findings with the majority of households stating they wanted a bigger and better place of their own.

Comments on Housing

General comments from respondents comparing their current housing situation point to several issues, ranging from accessibility to health concerns:

> *This respondent "[l]ives on third floor, would like to live on the main floor or a house or [have an] elevator so that taking groceries upstairs isn't so difficult."* (Female, single, 50-59 years of age)

> *"I can't find suitable housing in the city, and we don't know too many people or know of services and programs for help in adjusting to this city."* (Male, single, 30-39 years of age)

> *"I need wheelchair accessibility."* (Male, single, 30-39 years of age)

> *"Can't afford housing/tenant insurance."* (Male, married or common-law with children, 30-39 years of age)

> *"Health concerns with the housing (mold in apartment)."* (Female, single parent, 20-29 years of age)

> *"Affordable housing for bachelors [is needed]."* (Male, single, 20-29 years of age)

> *"It is hard to find accommodations especially for large families."* (Female, single, 40-49 years of age)

2.5 Neighbourhood Characteristics

Respondents were asked to rate various elements of the neighbourhood based on whether they agreed or disagreed with a statement. In Tables 18 and 19, various characteristics of the neighbourhood have been rated. The tables help illustrate the changes in ratings that occurred between Survey 1 and Survey 2. For the most part, ratings remained consistent between surveys. A few notable changes include a drop in the overall rating for neighbourhood safety. This characteristics was included in the analysis that follows as it was determined that an individual's perception of the neighbourhood could have important implications for a positive adjustment to living in the city (see section 3.0).

Table 18: Neighbourhood Characteristics, Survey 2, Percentages				
Neighbourhood Characteristics	**Strongly Agree**	**Somewhat Agree**	**Somewhat Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
Safe Neighbourhood	10.8	37.3	45.7	6.3
Close to Schools	34.1	52.6	10.6	2.6
Good Public Transit	91.1	8.4	0.5	0.0
Near Family/Friends	17.4	52.5	25.3	4.7
Large Grocery Store	27.2	46.7	22.2	4.0
Adequate Shopping	55.3	34.5	7.9	2.4
Adequate Daycare	25.5	47.1	21.6	5.8
Close to Medical Centre	31.1	59.8	6.6	2.4
Access to Laundry	26.4	66.7	5.9	1.1
Parks Nearby	45.8	39.4	12.7	2.1
Safe Home	18.2	42.0	35.1	4.7
Recreation Nearby	20.5	57.7	19.9	1.9
Cultural/Spiritual Needs	12.8	41.5	41.5	4.2
Like the Neighbourhood	15.4	58.8	23.4	2.4

Table 19: Neighbourhood Characteristics, Survey 1, Percentages				
Neighbourhood Characteristics	**Strongly Agree**	**Somewhat Agree**	**Somewhat Disagree**	**Strongly Disagree**
Safe Neighbourhood	18.8	38.7	27.2	15.3
Close to Schools	46.1	32.4	13.2	8.3
Good Public Transit	76.2	18.0	4.5	1.3
Near Family/Friends	35.1	32.7	20.4	11.7
Large Grocery Store	36.2	30.6	17.7	15.4
Adequate Shopping	38.4	40.3	14.9	6.5
Adequate Daycare	23.4	23.9	26.1	26.6
Close to Medical Centre	42.8	35.6	15.2	6.3
Access to Laundry	46.3	34.2	10.3	9.1
Parks Nearby	52.5	33.5	8.4	5.6
Safe Home	35.2	36.8	17.6	10.4
Recreation Nearby	35.1	37.6	17.8	9.5
Cultural/Spiritual Needs	17.9	29.2	30.1	22.8
Like the Neighbourhood	28.4	39.9	18.6	13.1

2.5.1 Positive and Negative Aspects of the Neighbourhood

To further explore neighbourhood issues, respondents were asked to list what they considered to be the most positive and negative aspects of the neighbourhood (Tables 20 and 21). The responses reveal a high level of consistency between surveys. The most important aspect remains close proximity to services in the neighbourhood. In addition, good bus service and recreation programs continue to be important features of the neighbourhood. An important finding was the decrease in "Safe/quiet/clean/good lighting" category which decreased from 12.9 to 3.8. This finding suggests that respondents are observing negative changes taking place in the neighbourhood.

The negative aspects also remained very consistent with crime, drug and alcohol use, and noise being the most pressing issues.

Table 20: Positive Aspects of the Neighbourhood, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Positive Aspects	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Close proximity to services	30.8	32.6
Close proximity to family/friends	11.9	9.3
Good bus service	16.4	23.4
Recreation programs/facilities available	12.5	15.6
Friendly community	7.3	4.8
Safe/quiet/clean/good lighting	12.9	3.8
Safe/quiet during the day	3.3	5.6
Security patrols/neighbourhood vigilance	1.5	1.1
Large proportion of Aboriginal people	0.8	2.6
Apartment: good quality, safe, affordable	2.6	1.3
Total	100.0	100.0

Table 21: Negative Aspects of the Neighbourhood, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Negative Aspects	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Unsafe: crime, prostitution, gangs, violence	32.8	35.2
Alcohol/drug-use/partying	24.6	25.4
Noise	10.5	10.8
Inaccessible to services/downtown	4.7	6.5
Lack of facilities for Aboriginals/racism	1.2	0.5
Poor housing condition	1.2	0.6
Far from family/friends	2.3	5.5
Unsupervised/neglected children	5.9	4.6
Poor police services	0.2	1.2
Neighbourhood neglected/dirty	3.3	2.8
Poor street lighting	2.1	1.5
Lack of recreation/parks	1.0	0.8
Lack of community trust	2.8	1.4
Far from bus routes	0.2	0.0
Inadequate/expensive housing	0.5	0.3
Traffic	6.8	2.9
Total	100.0	100.0

Positive and Negative Comments

The following are some comments respondents stated as their reasons for an increase in their neighbourhood satisfaction levels.

> *"Friendly neighbourhood, people get to know you."* (Male, married or common-law with children, 30-39 years of age)

> *"Easier to live in area, because stores are closer, community clubs and churches. Walk to the bus stop is closer. The neighbourhood environment is better."* (Male, single, 20-29 years of age)

> *"Moved and in the last residence the area violence was high and the new place is much better."* (Female, married or common-law with children, 40-49 years of age)

> *"The area is still somewhat rough and unsafe but not as bad as the former neighbourhood and the apartment building now has security measures in place for its tenants."* (Female, single, 50-59 years of age)

> *"Different area is more quiet and more private."* (Male, single, 40-49 years of age)

> *"Same area, with more familiarity and I found places to hang out and play sports in my neighbourhood."* (Male, single, under 20 years of age)

Reasons for a decrease in their neighbourhood satisfaction levels.

> *"Moved further away from services that were accessed."* (Male, single, 30-29 years of age)

> *"This present area has a lot of criminal elements/high level of crime by gangs."* (Male, single, 40-49 years of age)

> *"This area is more unsafe than in other areas I've lived in previously."* (Female, single, 50-59 years of age)

> *"Problems in area - more problems/social ills than gangs - prostitutes also in the area. Lots of prostitutes and vicious and violent gangs."* (Male, single, 30-39 years of age)

> *"I feel that I am more isolated from friends and family, than the previous area."* (Female, single, 30-39 years of age)

> *"High crime area. Object of break-ins, broken windows, graffiti, stolen car."* (Male, single, 40-49 years of age)

Following the open-ended question, respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction levels with the area they live in. Almost three-quarter (73.2%) stated their satisfaction levels had stayed the same between Survey 1 and 2. However, 15.4% had experienced a decrease in their satisfaction level and only 11.5% experienced an increase. It is important to note that those respondents who indicated that their satisfactions levels remained the same does not indicate a positive finding and in fact, this means that those who were unsatisfied in survey 1, remained so in survey 2.

2.6 Services Accessed in Winnipeg

At the completion of survey 1, it was concluded that access to appropriate services is regarded as being crucial in helping respondents adjust to living in Winnipeg.

In general, service use remained active among the 384 respondents who have accessed a total of 798 services through two surveys. At the completion of Survey 2, some important changes occurred as respondents listed 559 active services, and 236 inactive services (29.6%) that were accessed in Survey 1, but were no longer being used.

Overall, the types of services used remained consistent between surveys (Table 22). As noted, the top three services continued to be in the areas of social, employment, and medical. In contrast, access to education services decreased by 8.6%. It was not possible to determine whether these students had completed their programs at the time of the second survey (see profile of students section 2.1).

Table 22: Proportion of Respondents Accessing Service Types, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Services Types	Survey 1	Survey 2
Social Services	51.0	46.6
Employment Services	32.3	35.7
Medical Services	21.6	25.0
Education Services	19.8	11.2
Housing Services	8.1	6.0
Support Services	7.8	8.1
Aboriginal Services	5.5	6.8
Transportation Services	3.9	4.2
Legal Services	3.1	2.9
Services for children	3.1	4.2
Recreation Services	1.8	1.0
Church Services	0.3	0.8

2.6.1 Service Types Usage Patterns

The following section reviews the frequency of services used by respondents to highlight changes which occurred. Where warranted, a note is made as to which services remain actively used and which have not been accessed since the completion of Survey 1.

Between surveys, a total of 232 Social Services have been listed by respondents, with 179 remaining actively used.

- **Social Services (46.6%)**
    - Social Assistance   86.0%
    - Food banks   10.1%
    - Child and Family Services   1.1%
    - Band Social Assistance   1.1%
    - Disability services   1.1%
    - Shelters   0.6%

A total of 194 Employment Services have been listed by respondents with 137 remaining actively used.

- **Employment Services (35.7%)**
    - Human resources- support for job search   29.2%
    - Temporary employment services   26.3%
    - Employed   19.0%
    - Aboriginal Centre- Human resources   13.9%
    - Training   4.4%
    - Employment services (general)   2.9%
    - Aboriginal Centre training   2.2%
    - Individual job search   2.2%

A total of 114 Medical Services have been listed by respondents with 96 remaining actively used.

- **Medical Services (25.0%)**
    - Clinic   37.5%
    - Medical services (general)   29.2%
    - Hospital   24.0%
    - Envoy   3.1%
    - Health Canada   2.1%
    - Public Health Nurse   2.1%
    - Home care   1.0%
    - Pharmacy   1.0%

A total of 88 Education Services have been listed by respondents with 43 remaining actively used.

- **Education Services (11.2%)**
  - Red River College   25.6%
  - Upgrading   20.9%
  - Unspecified education program   14.0%
  - Financial aid   11.6%
  - Aboriginal Centre: education/upgrading   11.6%
  - Yellow Quill College   7.0%
  - High school –children   4.7%
  - University   2.3%
  - Private college   2.3%

A total of 49 Support Services have been listed by respondents with 31 remaining actively used.

- **Support Services (8.1%)**
  - Aboriginal well-being program   45.2%
  - Support group   16.1%
  - Addictions   12.9%
  - Transitional housing for women   12.9%
  - Counseling   9.7%
  - Support services (general)   3.2%

A total of 33 Aboriginal Services have been listed by respondents with 26 remaining actively used.

- **Aboriginal Services (6.8%)**
  - Spiritual/cultural   50.0%
  - Aboriginal Centre   26.9%
  - Friendship Centre   11.5%
  - Representative organizations (MMF, etc.)   7.7%
  - Economic development   3.8%

A total of 41 Housing Services have been listed by respondents with 23 remaining actively used.

- **Housing Services (6.0%)**
  - Housing services (general)   39.1%
  - Manitoba Housing Authority   34.8%
  - Aboriginal   8.7%
  - Kinew Housing   8.7%
  - Winnipeg Rehab. Housing   8.7%

The remaining services only experienced slight changes and remained very consistent between Survey 1 and 2.

- **Transportation Services (4.2%)**
  - Transit   75.0%
  - Taxi   12.5%
  - Aboriginal transport   6.3%
  - Transportation (general)   6.3%
  -

- **Services for children/youth (4.2%)**

  - Daycare   56.3%
  - School   31.3%
  - Services for children/youth (general)   12.5%

- **Legal Services (2.9%)**

  - Legal services (general)   36.4%
  - Winnipeg Police Department   27.3%
  - Lawyer   18.2%
  - Corrections   18.2%

2.6.2 Information Source

The information sources which persons utilized to access services remained consistent between surveys. The majority of respondents continued to use word-of-mouth, referrals, and to a lesser extent, "walk-bys" as their main methods for accessing services (Table 23).

A second observation is that pamphlets, directories, and media have remained an ineffective means for exposing people to existing services. These findings point to the fact that respondents continue to rely on word-of-mouth to find services.

Table 23: Service Type by Information Source, Survey 2, Percentages							
Service Type	Pamphlet	Word-of-Mouth	Referral	Directory	Media	Walk-By	Other
Social Services	4.3	62.0	19.7	2.4	1.3	7.5	2.7
Employment	2.7	67.1	15.1	1.9	2.7	9.7	0.8
Medical	3.6	48.3	22.5	2.6	1.7	16.9	4.3
Education	6.0	46.6	27.1	4.5	3.8	7.5	4.5
Support	5.8	52.5	23.3	3.3	3.3	7.5	4.2
Housing	6.9	52.8	15.3	6.9	0.0	8.3	9.7
Aboriginal	4.3	62.8	19.1	2.1	0.0	6.4	5.3
Transportation	1.4	50.0	11.4	2.9	2.9	27.1	4.3
Legal	9.1	45.5	15.9	4.5	0.0	18.2	6.8
School/Daycare	7.9	38.1	14.3	7.9	3.2	22.2	6.3
Recreation	0.0	66.7	16.7	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0
Church	0.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0

* Row sums equal 100%

2.6.3 Satisfaction with Services

Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with services they currently use on a three-point scale (Table 24). In general, the satisfaction levels for services remained consistent with the majority of respondents being either satisfied or very satisfied with most services. However, important observations can be drawn from the table. First, the percentage of persons who were very satisfied appear to have decreased for a number of services including social, employment, medical and housing. Of the more widely accessed services, only two (aboriginal and education) saw increases in those indicating they were very satisfied.

An important finding was the marked reduction in those indicating that they were 'not satisfied' with services. This is important as, in some cases, the drop was dramatic. For example, those not satisfied with social services decreased from 37% to 13.1%. There were also significant decreases in satisfaction for the main services (social, employment, medical, and education). This is significant as it suggests that once greater familiarity is gained among respondents (in terms of access and use) satisfaction may increase. Furthermore, initial dissatisfaction may be the result of the lack of knowledge or familiarity with services. Nevertheless, the reduction in negative ratings is an important observation.

Service Type	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Not Satisfied	
Table 24: Service Type by Satisfaction Level, Survey 2, Percentages						
	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 1	Survey 2
Social Services	22.1	17.1	41.0	69.8	37.0	13.1
Employment	31.5	20.1	41.0	67.5	27.5	12.3
Medical	45.1	29.8	32.0	60.3	23.0	9.9
Education	34.3	35.8	35.7	54.7	30.0	9.5
Support	51.6	42.0	31.9	47.9	16.5	10.1
Housing	42.5	33.8	20.8	44.2	36.8	22.1
Aboriginal	31.6	44.6	43.0	51.1	25.3	4.3
Transportation	45.9	38.2	17.6	51.5	36.5	10.3
Legal	23.8	22.2	23.8	60.0	52.4	17.8
School/Daycare	52.2	50.0	21.7	36.7	26.1	13.3
Recreation	69.4	16.7	22.2	66.7	8.3	16.7
Church	0	10.0	100.0	50.0	0	40.0

Row sums equal 100%

Following the rating of services, respondents were asked specifically if their overall satisfaction increased, decreased or stayed the same. A total of 60.5% of respondents stated that they had become more satisfied with the services they had been accessing, 14.3% stated that their satisfaction levels stayed the same, and 25.2% indicated they were less satisfied. These findings are important in that they further illustrate the existence of an adjustment period.

Comments on Service Use

Respondents were asked to offer thoughts on the use and access of services. The following are some of their comments.

> *"I am more satisfied with the employment services because I am working a part-time job I got through them."* (Male, single, 40-49 years of age)

> *"I'm more satisfied with the services at Mamawiichitata Centre; I access their counseling services for the purpose of getting custody of my children."* (Male, married or common-law, 30-39 years of age)

> *"I've felt more satisfied with the health care services at the Health Sciences Centre Rehabilitation Hospital because they (staff) provided good care and were friendly and warm towards me."* (Male, single, 50-59 years of age)

> *"I've been more satisfied with the employment services at the Active Personnel agency, because I am able to find work easier."* (Male, single, unknown age)

> *"Less satisfied with spiritual/cultural services because I could not find any services where young people hang out."* (Female, single, 20-29 years of age)

> *"I have been mostly unsatisfied, especially for employment or training services because I need a phone which I don't have and can't afford; and for training I have to be on social assistance; but social assistance says I have to find a job. I don't qualify for assistance."* (Male, single, 50-59 years of age)

> *"Less satisfied, I could not go to the educational programs I wanted because I cannot get funding [un]til next year."* (Male, single, under 20 years of age)

2.6.4 Needs Met by Services

Along with overall satisfaction, respondents were asked whether the services being used met their needs (Table 25). Over the course of the two surveys, some changes have been observed. With respect to the most commonly used services, positive changes are noted as more persons indicated in Survey 2 that services met their needs. This finding is important as it helps confirm that adjustment does occur as persons become more familiar with services. Overall, there was also a decrease in those who indicated that services did not meet their needs. Most significantly, the proportion of those who stated that social services did not meet their needs decreased from 37.6% to 15.5%. This represents an important finding as this is the service most frequently accessed by respondents.

Table 25: Service Type by Needs Met, Survey 2, Percentages				
Service Type	**Yes**		**No**	
	Survey 1	**Survey 2**	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Social Services	62.4	84.5	37.6	15.5
Employment	65.5	78.4	34.5	21.6
Medical	82.3	89.3	17.7	10.7
Education	70.3	89.8	29.7	10.2
Support	81.8	92.4	18.2	7.6
Housing	69.0	72.7	31.0	27.3
Aboriginal	73.5	95.7	26.9	4.3
Transportation	75.0	97.1	25.0	2.9
Legal	59.5	84.4	40.5	15.6
School/Daycare	80.9	83.9	19.1	16.1
Recreation	83.3	83.3	16.7	16.7
Church	100.0	70.0	0	30.0

In order to gauge whether gaps exist in the provision of services, respondents were asked to list services they needed but were unable to access. In total, 80 respondents (20%) listed services that they were unable to access (Table 26). Although educational funding is not a service per se, it was included because inability to secure funding was considered an impediment in accessing education services. In fact, financial considerations were also cited as a barrier to accessing services in general. Another issue was the lack of transportation. In particular, respondents with children encountered difficulty in reaching services not readily accessible by public transportation. In addition, there was inadequate transportation assistance for medical appointments.

Table 26: Services that Respondents were Unable to Access, Survey 2, Percentages	
Service Name	**Percentage**
Educational funding	21.3
Transportation Assistance	11.3
Other*	11.3
Financial services (loans, credit cards)	10.0
Issues with Social services	10.0
Housing Issues	7.5
Support services	6.3
Daycare/child care	5.0
Employment services	5.0
Furniture	5.0
Medical services	5.0
Difficulty obtaining a driver's license	2.5
Total	100

2.7 Services Better Provided by First Nations

When asked if services currently being accessed could be better provided by a First Nations service provider, 40.7% said yes (74.1% in Survey 1), with 2.6% (8.3% in Survey 1) stating that more Aboriginal workers are needed.

Specifically, respondents indicated that the following services could be better delivered through First Nations providers:

- Social Services   43.0%
- Employment Services   18.6%
- Education, training, daycare services   16.3%
- Winnipeg Police, justice services   5.8%
- Housing Service   3.5%
- Health Services   3.5%
- Transportation   2.3%
- Recreation   2.3%
- Emergency housing, shelter   2.3%
- Retail outlet, businesses   1.2%
- Spiritual/cultural   1.2%

2.8 Services/Support Provided by Family and Friends

As an indicator of the need for greater supports and services, respondents were asked to identify if friends and family provided services for them. Just over 70% of the sample indicated that they currently received some form of assistance from friends and family which include the following issues:

- Housing   67.9%
- Child care   14.7%
- Financial assistance   5.7%
- Food   4.5%
- Emotional support   3.8%
- Care for elderly, disabled persons   1.9%
- Transportation   0.8%
- Home making   0.4%
- Emotional and financial support   0.4%

The proportion of respondents indicating that they rely on friends and family for housing is reinforced by the high number of respondents living temporarily with friends and family.

2.9 Overall Satisfaction

A final set of perception questions measured satisfaction by asking respondents to rate their neighbourhood and the city. When asked about their neighbourhood, the majority (73.2%) stated that their satisfaction level stayed the same[4] since Survey 1, while only 11.5% stated that their level of satisfaction increased. This indicates that overall, little improvement has been observed.

With regard to respondents' general satisfaction levels, anticipated satisfaction levels in six months, and satisfaction levels with the city, there was a decrease in the very satisfied category for all three questions (Table 27). Also there was a decrease in unsatisfied and very unsatisfied levels. However, there were concurrent increases in those who were satisfied. It should be noted that general satisfaction as well as satisfaction with the city were included in the statistical analysis of the adjustment of Aboriginal persons to Winnipeg (see section 3.0).

	General Satisfaction		Satisfaction in 6 months		Satisfaction with the city	
Table 27: Satisfaction Levels, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages						
	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 1	Survey 2	Survey 1	Survey 2
Very Satisfied	6.2	2.6	17.7	12.6	8.9	4.1
Satisfied	47.8	60.7	75.4	83.7	68.2	83.1
Unsatisfied	38.7	35.4	5.6	3.4	20.8	10.9
Very Unsatisfied	7.3	1.3	1.3	0.3	2.1	1.9

2.10 Profile of Social Assistance Recipients

In Survey 2, 46.1% of the sample were on social assistance, compared to 48.4% in Survey 1. The age and family status of respondents receiving social assistance benefits in Survey 2 are as follows:

- 18 to 19   3.4%
- 20 to 29   29.5%
- 30 to 39   33.5%
- 40 to 49   23.9%
- 50+   9.7%
- Single   52.0%
- Single Parents   26.6%
- Married w/ children   11.3%
- Married w/ no children   10.2%

---

[4] Although a high number of respondents indicated their satisfaction level remained the same, this does not indicate a positive finding. For example, if in survey 1, a respondent indicated they were dissatisfied with the area, they would state their satisfaction level not changed if they continued to feel dissatisfied.

Between Survey 1 and Survey 2, 14.1% (or 54 respondents) went off social assistance, while 11.7% (or 45 respondents) began to receive benefits. Of the 54 respondents who went off of social assistance at Survey 2, 40 became employed (see table below), six became students, and nine were unemployed. These respondents were no longer collecting social assistance at the provincial level, but five did collect band social assistance. Additionally, 36 respondents had incomes of less than $10,000, while two had no income.

Table 28: Employment Status of those On Social Assistance in Survey 1 and Employed in Survey 2	
Employment Status	Survey 2
Full-time	10
Casual	18
Part-time	10
Self-employed	2
Total	40

Of the 45 respondents who went on social assistance, 24 were unemployed in Survey 1, four were students, and 17 were employed (five part-time, five casually, four full-time, and three were self-employed). In addition, ten respondents had no income in Survey 1, while 17 reported incomes of less than $10,000 and ten reported incomes of more than $10,000. As a high proportion of the sample continued to receive social assistance in the second survey, status as a social assistance recipient was included in the analysis to determine its impact on the transition to an urban setting.

Those who are receiving social assistance benefits or had in the past made the following comments about their experiences with social assistance.

> *"I've felt more satisfied with the social assistance's disability benefits because there is more money in the allowance for shelter and biweekly cheques."* (Male, single parent, 60+ years of age)

> *"[I]t's too expensive for me to use the laundry facilities in the apartment or in the area."* (Male, married or common-law, 30-39 years of age)

Some neighbourhoods that social assistance recipients live in are unsafe. *"Higher crime level in the neighbourhood (some murders/violence in the past year)."* (Female, single, 30-39 years of age)

> *"I can't afford my own place, as I don't have a job nor am I on social assistance, because I don't qualify, social assistance cancelled my benefits."* (Female, single, 30-39 years of age)

> *"So far, I've felt less satisfied with the social assistance services because I feel that my worker and I don't understand each other because of the type of services she gives me that I don't need and the kinds I need- she won't allow."* (Female, single parent, 40-49 years of age)

Many people receiving social assistance benefits must supplement the money they receive by using food banks and soup kitchens. *"I've been more satisfied with the food bank services because they give us food when I run out before cheque days."* (Female, married or common-law with children, 30-39 years of age)

This respondent has been unable to access *"some special needs benefits for social assistance programs for household items (no response to my request[,] I've been waiting a long time)."* (Male, single, 20-29 years of age)

This respondent needs *"medical appointment transportation assistance, [but does not receive it]."* (Male, single, 60+ years of age)

> *"I have [a] hard time getting my special requests/needs met from social assistance."* (Male, single, 50-59 years of age)

> *"There should be a place where new comers can register and there should be someone from each of the social service needs there to help them right away, like a housing officer, a CFS worker - a tour person or someone who is familiar with all the social services. An easy to use reference manual."* (Male, single, 20-29 years of age)

2.11 Employment Profile

Although the majority of respondents experienced no changes to their employment status, a key finding was that 88 persons (23.3%) became employed. In contrast, 7.7% of respondents changed from being employed in Survey 1 to unemployed.

Of the 88 people who became employed in Survey 2, 87.5% were unemployed and 11.4% were students in Survey 1. Additionally, 46 were receiving social assistance benefits, and 15 stated that they had no income.

Of those who became employed during Survey 2, their employment status were as follows: 47.7% were employed casually, 27.3% were employed on a full-time basis, 20.5% had part-time employment, 3.4% were self-employed, and 1.1% had temporary employment. These respondents also experienced broad income ranges, however the majority (63.6%) received an income of less than $10,000.

There were 29 respondents whose employment status changed from employed in survey 1 to unemployed in Survey 2) Of these 29 respondents, two were students, nineteen (79.2%) were on social assistance and two were band sponsored. The majority (75.9%) had an income of less than $10,000 annually (compared to 64% of these respondents having an income of less than $10,000 during Survey 1 when they were employed) and two stated that they had no income.

Table 29: Status of Employed in Survey 1/ Unemployed in Survey 2	
Employment Status	**Survey 1**
Full-time	10
Casual	8
Part-time	8
Self-employment	3
Total	29

2.12 Advice and Suggestions

In Survey 2, respondents were given the opportunity to provide any advice or suggestions to other Aboriginal people arriving in Winnipeg for the first time. The table below lists the responses.

Table 30: Advice and Suggestions for New Arrivals, Survey 2, Percentages	
Advice and Suggestions	**Percentages**
Use the Aboriginal Centre	14.0
Other*	11.9
Look for Aboriginal services and use them	10.1
I would refer them to services they need	8.1
Use food banks, soup kitchens, shelters	7.2
Use Winnipeg services	5.4
Look for employment, education, training	5.4
Be prepared/informed, don't give up	5.1
Connect with friends/family for support and information	4.8
Use the Mamawiichitata Centre	4.5
Use Support services	4.5
Use temporary employment services	4.5
Stay away from drugs, alcohol, gangs, Main Street	3.9
Use or become informed about Social Assistance	2.7
Use Housing services	2.4
It's hard living in Winnipeg, good luck	1.2
Get informed about services	0.9
Stay away from Social Assistance	0.9
Get involved/informed about community/cultural activities	0.9
Don't move to Winnipeg	0.9
Ask for help if you need it	0.9
Total	100.0

*Other included multiple responses mentioned only once, but not categorized.

The primary suggestions consisted of recommendations to make use of Aboriginal services and other Winnipeg services. Finding a support system, whether it be through friends and family or services, was regarded to be important. Employment and education were also seen as key to making the transition to life in Winnipeg easier.

The following comments illustrates the advice given for new persons arriving including:

"Explore all your options before you try to move back home." (Female, married or common-law with children, 20-29 years of age)

"Be sure you graduate, and have a good education as you'll need it to get a good job." (Male, single, 20-29 years of age)

"Take the initiative of helping yourself, it won't happen unless you make it happen." (Male, single, 20-29 years of age)

"I would encourage them to pursue a career and work goals for themselves." (Male, single, 20-29 years of age)

"Ask for help when you need it and for Métis people to use the resources offered by the Manitoba Métis Federation." (Male, single parent, 30-39 years of age)

"Make sure you know where everything is, and try to stay away from poor housing." (Female, single, 60+ years of age)

"Find a place to live in a safe area, with friendly neighbours." (Male, married or common-law, 30-39 years of age)

"I would express my views about Winnipeg and how difficult the system is here for Aboriginals to get a start or to establish themselves, especially without a support network." (Male, single, 30-39 years of age)

"Volunteer to get experience in the type of work you want to go after." (Female, single parent, under 20 years of age)

"For families with children I would advise they be careful of their children's peers. I would also refer them to services offered by the Indian and Northern Affairs, and to take advantage of all those services existing in Winnipeg." (Female, married or common-law with children, 30-39 years of age)

"I'd give them information on some of the affordable places to shop for food and clothes and some safer areas in which to look for apartments/houses." (Female, married or common-law with children, 40-49 years of age)

"I would give them information on emergency or crisis intervention programs to those down and out." (Female, single parent, 30-39 years of age)

"Female Aboriginals should start by using the North End Women's Transition Centre." (Female, single parent, 20-29 years of age)

"Stay away from the core area if you have children. Too dangerous." (Female, single, 40-49 years of age)

"If you fail to plan, you plan to fail." (Male, single, 20-29 years of age)

3.0 Evaluating the Transition of Aboriginal Persons to Winnipeg

3.1 Introduction

The overall objective of the Aboriginal Mobility Study is to develop a better understanding of the experiences of Aboriginal peoples when they move to Winnipeg. In particular, the goal of the study is to identify those factors that are related to an individual's transition to Winnipeg. It is anticipated that a broader knowledge base will facilitate the development of more effective policies to better meet the needs of newly-arrived Aboriginal peoples.

In order to address the study objectives, four areas of inquiry were identified to investigate the mobility process of Aboriginal peoples moving to Winnipeg. The following goals were formulated to guide the analysis:

> ➢ To determine those factors related to the satisfaction of newly-arrived Aboriginal persons.
> ➢ To evaluate the differences in the residential status of those Aboriginal persons who are new to Winnipeg.
> ➢ To explore elements which distinguish the employment and social assistance status of those Aboriginal persons who relocate to an urban centre.
> ➢ To investigate those components which contribute to an explanation of the use of services by newly-arrived Aboriginal persons.

An exploratory model was developed to investigate these areas of inquiry and determine the factors related to an Aboriginal person's adjustment when moving to an urban centre. The model proposes that the transition process is reflected in four outcome domains. These measures are indicative of the goals specified above and include aspects of satisfaction, residential status, socio-economic status and service access. First, the respondent's general satisfaction, in addition to satisfaction with the city and residence are regarded as indicators of an individual's perceived adjustment. The second outcome domain focuses on indicators of residential status including the distinction between those in rental and those in temporary accommodations, and the differentiation between those planning to remain permanently or for a long-term period and those in Winnipeg for a temporary or undetermined period of time. In the third outcome domain, measures of employment and social assistance status are utilized to investigate factors related to the socio-economic circumstances of Aboriginal peoples who have recently arrived in the urban centre. The final outcome domain centres on measures of service use in the areas of housing, social support, health, education and employment.

The model postulates that a set of mediating factors or categories are associated with these outcomes representing the transition of Aboriginal persons in an urban area. The determinants defined by the model include socio-demographic characteristics, socio-economic status, residential status, residential mobility, neighbourhood characteristics and access to services.[5] The first factor consists of socio-demographic variables

---

[5] It should be noted that the Socio-Economic Status, Residential Status and Access to Services categories are treated as both outcome measures, as well as predictors for the remaining outcome domains.

including gender, age, education level, marital status and living arrangements. These are regarded as background variables that serve as resources in the transition process. The second factor reflects the socio-economic resources of the respondent in terms of income level, employment status and social assistance status. The individual's current situation in either rental or temporary accommodations and their expected time in Winnipeg are included within the third factor of residential status. It is believed that adjustment to the city can be facilitated if the individual is able to obtain rental accommodations and make plans to remain permanently in the city. A fourth aspect considered to influence transition is the residential history of respondents, and how this reflects their level of residential mobility. This category contains measures of the extent to which an individual has moved and changed communities, as well as plans for future moves. The fifth factor involves the characteristics of the respondent's neighbourhood as it is assumed that the quality of the living environment may influence the transition process. It is comprised of a rating of various aspects of the neighbourhood including proximity to supports and services and perceptions of safety. The sixth factor, access to services, includes measures of use of housing, social, medical, education and employment services.

A bi-variate analysis was conducted to explore the possible associations that may exist between the determinants described above and the outcome domains related to satisfaction, residential status, socio-economic status and access to services. The objective of this analysis is to evaluate the influence of socio-demographic characteristics, socio-economic status, residential status, residential mobility, neighbourhood characteristics, as well as service access on the transition of Aboriginal people to an urban centre. It was anticipated that this analysis will contribute to a better understanding of the adjustment process Aboriginal persons experience when moving to Winnipeg. In essence, the analysis represents an initial stage in the development of a more complete explanatory model to understand this transition process.

As the data from both Survey 1 and Survey 2 are either of an ordinal (ranked) or a nominal (categorized) nature, a non-parametric test was chosen to explore the relationships proposed by the model. The chi-squared (x^2) test calculated through cross-tabulations is considered to be the non-parametric test of greatest utility (Robinson, 1998). With the exception of three socio-demographic characteristics, all variables were dichotomized. A list of the outcome and predictor variables and the categories assigned to the variables are contained in Appendix D. The chi-square can operate on two samples with dichotomous variables as cross-tabulations create 2 x 2 contingency tables. For the 2 x 2 tables, the Yates' corrected chi-square (continuity correction) was computed representing the subtraction of 0.5 from the absolute chi-square value (Robinson, 1998). If the cross-tabulation table included cells with an expected frequency of less than five, the Fisher's exact test was computed. In addition, for those variables that were not dichotomized, the two-sample x^2 test computed the Pearson chi-square (SPSS, 1999).

For the chi-square tests, predictors from Survey 1 were paired with outcome variables also from Survey 1. Similarly, the Survey 2 outcomes were paired with predictors from the same survey, but additional variables were included that measured change occurring between the two surveys. It was possible to measure change in the factors of socio-

demographic characteristics, socio-economic status and residential status. Change was measured by residualizing the measure at Time 2 by the baseline measure at Time 1 (Lawton et al., 1978). Dummy variables were created using the change data to indicate the type of change that occurred. A complete list of the change variables is included in the variable list (Appendix D).

The results of the chi-square tests are summarized in Appendix E. Only those predictor variables with significance levels above the removal criteria of $p = 0.05$ are reported. The following discussion provides a summary of the findings in terms of the models proposed relationship between the outcome domains and the determinants that are organized into factors. The discussion will be structured around the four areas of inquiry specified at the beginning of this section. It will highlight those factors for which a significant relationship has been found with the outcome domains. Additionally, the discussion will outline the implications of these findings for policy development to advance the transition of Aboriginal persons in an urban setting. The section concludes with a synopsis of key policy issues that are highlighted by the analysis.

3.2 Satisfaction

The first goal of the analysis was to determine those factors related to the satisfaction of newly-arrived Aboriginal persons. As was specified above, general satisfaction, as well as city and residential satisfaction were defined to be the outcomes of interest. The following outlines those factors associated with satisfaction, and highlights the policy issues related to the findings.

General Satisfaction

♦ **Residential Satisfaction**
  ➢ Satisfaction was highly correlated with residential satisfaction.

♦ **Residential Mobility**
  ➢ While those who were satisfied did move between surveys, they did not leave Winnipeg.

♦ **Neighbourhood Satisfaction**
  ➢ Satisfaction was higher for those who regarded their neighbourhood favourably. Those who were satisfied agreed that:
    ▪ Their neighbourhood and home were both safe.
    ▪ They lived close to family and friends.
    ▪ Services and programs that meet cultural, spiritual and social needs in the neighbourhood were adequate.
    ▪ Parks were nearby.
    ▪ They liked their neighbourhood.

Satisfaction with the City

♦ **Residential Status**
  ➢ Those who were dissatisfied with the city were more likely to be renting accommodations.

♦ **Residential Mobility**
  ➢ The majority of those who were dissatisfied with the city were planning to move.
  ➢ In addition, while those who were satisfied did move between surveys, they did not leave Winnipeg during that time.

♦ **Neighbourhood Satisfaction**
  ➢ A higher proportion of those who were satisfied with the city also agreed that:
    ▪ Their neighbourhood had good public transportation.
    ▪ They lived close to family and friends.
    ▪ Their home was safe.
    ▪ There were adequate services and programming for cultural, spiritual and social needs in the neighbourhood.
    ▪ They liked their neighbourhood.

♦ **Access to Services**
  ➢ It was found that those who were dissatisfied with the city did not access housing and medical services.

Residential Satisfaction

♦ **Residential Mobility**
  ➢ As would be expected, most of those who were unsatisfied with their residential situation were also planning to move.

♦ **Neighbourhood Satisfaction**
  ➢ Satisfaction with the neighbourhood is also associated with residential satisfaction. Those who were satisfied with their residential circumstances agreed that:
    ▪ Parks were nearby.
    ▪ They were close to recreation.
  Those who were dissatisfied with their residence also felt that:
    ▪ Their neighbourhood and home were not safe.
    ▪ Programming for spiritual, cultural and social needs was inadequate.
    ▪ They did not like their neighbourhoods.

The results highlighted above demonstrate that overall satisfaction is highly correlated with residential and neighbourhood characteristics. In particular, it is important for newly-arrived Aboriginal persons to feel safe and to have local access to social networks, recreation, and programming for cultural, spiritual and social needs. The findings also suggest that if Aboriginal newcomers are satisfied with their residential environment, they will move less often and will make fewer trips outside the city thus enabling them to achieve a greater level of stability. In turn, it appears that a higher level of satisfaction will lead to the use of more services that will enhance transition in the urban centre.

3.3 Residential Status

The second goal of the investigation was to evaluate the differences in the residential status of those Aboriginal persons who are new to Winnipeg. Residential status was defined in terms of tenancy status and expected time in Winnipeg. Therefore, the following compares: 1) those in rental accommodation from those in temporary circumstances; and 2) those who are expecting to remain long-term or permanently in Winnipeg from those who are uncertain or who are planning to remain only temporarily.

Tenant Status
- **Socio-Demographic Characteristics**
  - Those in temporary accommodations tended to be single, male, between the ages of 14 and 24, and without children.
  - Those in temporary accommodations also lived with others and were more likely to experience an increase in the number of persons they live with thus signifying residential instability.
- **Socio-Economic Status**
  - The income of those living in temporary accommodations was generally lower, however, most were not on social assistance.
  - An interesting observation was that those who were employed were more likely to be in temporary accommodations, while those who were renters tended to be unemployed.
- **Residential Mobility**
  - Those who were living in temporary accommodation were less likely to have moved to Winnipeg in the past.
  - Those who were in temporary accommodations expected to move and they were also more likely to be unsure or planning to remain in Winnipeg only temporarily.
  - Finally, a much higher proportion of those in temporary accommodation moved between surveys and also left Winnipeg during that time.
- **Access to Services**
  - Those in temporary accommodations were less likely to have accessed social, medical and education services.

Expected Time in Winnipeg

- ♦ **Socio-Demographic Characteristics**
  - ➤ Those with unsure/temporary plans to remain in Winnipeg were unlikely to be responsible for children.
  - ➤ Those who were unsure or planned to stay only temporary were more likely to live alone than those who expressed longer-term plans to remain in the city.
  - ➤ The majority of those with unsure/temporary plans lived in accommodations with two or more people. Moreover those with unsure or temporary plans for remaining in the city, experienced either an increase or decrease in the number of people they lived with, thus suggesting instability in the residential setting.

- ♦ **Socio-Economic Status**
  - ➤ Equal proportions of the employed/students and the unemployed had uncertain or temporary plans for remaining, while more of those who expressed long-term plans were unemployed.
- ♦ **Residential Status**
  - ➤ Most of those in temporary accommodations had uncertain or temporary plans for remaining.
  - ➤ It should be noted that in Survey 1 a large sub-sample of the respondents (31.9%) were renting but did not express long-term plans for staying in the city. In Survey 2, those who changed from temporary to rental accommodations still had not determined their plans for remaining in the city.
- ♦ **Residential Mobility**
  - ➤ Those with uncertain or temporary plans for remaining in Winnipeg also expected to move.
  - ➤ Persons with uncertain or temporary plans were more likely to have moved and left the city between surveys.
- ♦ **Neighbourhood Satisfaction**
  - ➤ A larger proportion of those who expressed uncertain or temporary plans for remaining in Winnipeg agreed that their home was safe but disagreed that their neighbourhood was safe.

The reported findings regarding residential status highlight that it is the younger, male population with fewer financial resources who experience difficulty in obtaining rental accommodations. It is this sub-group of non-renters who are unsure of their plans for remaining in Winnipeg that must be focused upon in order to insure that newly-arrived Aboriginal persons are given the opportunities in which to thrive in the city. The uncertainty of living in a temporary situation with a changing number of roommates creates instability. This instability results in frequent moves, uncertainty in future plans and, subsequently, difficulty in adapting to an urban setting.

Greater resources are required for Aboriginal newcomers to Winnipeg who are in temporary accommodations. Many of those who cannot access housing have had little previous experience in the city. This lack of familiarity may explain why non-renters do not access services that could potentially assist them in settling permanently in Winnipeg.

More support is required to provide these newcomers with housing that is safe and that promotes a sense of security within the community. As many in temporary accommodations are employed, a more stable environment will allow them to make permanent plans for remaining in the city and thereby assure a greater potential of retaining employment.

It should also be noted that despite access to housing, many renters are also uncertain of their future plans for remaining in Winnipeg. The fact that some renters are not satisfied with the city is an indicator that newly-arrived Aboriginal persons are discouraged from remaining permanently because of the lack of resources and opportunities. Therefore, a more adequate infrastructure of housing and neighbourhood services is required to assist newcomers to make more positive adjustments when moving to an urban area.

3.4 Socio-Economic Status

The third area of enquiry was to explore elements that distinguish the employment and social assistance status of those Aboriginal persons who have decided to relocate to an urban centre. The following relationships were observed:

Employment/Student Status

♦ **Socio-Demographic Characteristics**
➢ Gender was significant as a much higher proportion of females were unemployed.
➢ Those who were employed were more likely to have an income greater than $10,000.

♦ **Residential Status**
➢ There were more unemployed than employed who were renting accommodations and who were also planning to remain permanently.

♦ **Neighbourhood Satisfaction**
➢ A higher proportion of the unemployed disagreed that their home was safe.

♦ **Access to Services**
➢ Those who were unemployed were more likely to access social services, while the employed/students accessed employment and education services.

Social Assistance Status

♦ **Socio-Demographic Characteristics**
➢ As there were more females who were unemployed, it followed that more females would be on social assistance.
➢ The age groups ranging from 25 to 44 represented the largest proportion of social assistance recipients.
➢ In addition, as would be expected, those on social assistance were more likely to have children.

♦ **Socio-Economic Status**
  ➢ Most of those on social assistance had an income of less than $10,000.

♦ **Residential Status**
  ➢ More on social assistance were renting accommodations.

♦ **Neighbourhood Satisfaction**
  ➢ A larger proportion of social assistance recipients disagreed that their neighbourhood was safe.

♦ **Access to Services**
  ➢ Those on social assistance accessed social services.
  ➢ Social assistance recipients did not access education or employment services.

The analysis of socio-economic status reveals that there are two distinct groups of Aboriginal newcomers to Winnipeg with different needs. First, it is primarily females who are unemployed, on social assistance with fewer financial resources. They require a broad range of social and economic services to advance their transition to life in Winnipeg. As most in this group have children in their care, the need for family support services is particularly pronounced. Furthermore, the transition of these newcomers to Winnipeg would be enhanced if they were able to access safe and secure environments. As most of those who are unemployed and on social assistance are living in rented accommodations and have long-term plans to remain in Winnipeg, the delivery of support services is less complicated. In contrast, the employed require assistance to acquire housing but because they tend to live in temporary accommodations, support provision is more difficult. As was specified above, if they were able to access rental housing, they would perhaps be able to make more long-term plans to remain in Winnipeg and continue to work.

3.5 Access to Services

And the final goal of the analysis was to investigate those components that contribute to an explanation of the use of services by newly-arrived Aboriginal persons. The following outlines those factors related to the service access outcomes.

Housing Services

♦ **Socio-Economic Status**
  ➢ Those with an income greater than $10,000 were more likely to access housing services.
  ➢ Those on social assistance did not access housing services.

Social Services

♦ **Socio-Demographic Characteristics**
  ➢ Those who accessed social services tended to be female, between the ages of 25 and 44, with children.

♦ **Socio-Economic Status**
  ➢ Access to social services was correlated with lower income.

♦ **Residential Status**
  ➢ Those who accessed social services rented accommodations.
  ➢ Access to social services was also correlated with expectations to remain in Winnipeg for a long-term period.

♦ **Residential Mobility**
  ➢ Respondents were more likely to access social services if they had not moved or left Winnipeg since the first survey.

♦ **Neighbourhood Satisfaction**
  ➢ Those who accessed social services did not feel that their home or neighbourhoods were safe.
  ➢ Those accessing social services did agree that there were adequate programs and services in the neighbourhood for cultural, spiritual and social needs.

Medical Services

♦ **Socio-Demographic Characteristics**
  ➢ The highest proportion of those who accessed medical services were in the age groups of 25 to 34 and 45 or more.
  ➢ Single persons did not access medical services.
  ➢ Those with children did access medical services.

♦ **Socio-Economic Status**
  ➢ Those with lower incomes accessed more medical services.

♦ **Residential Status**
  ➢ Access to medical services occurred to a higher degree for those who rented accommodations.

♦ **Access to Services**
  ➢ If respondents accessed medical services, they were less likely to access housing, education and employment services.

Education Services

♦ **Socio-Demographic Characteristics**
➢ Of those who access education services, the highest proportion were between the ages of 14 and 24.
➢ Those who accessed education services lived with two or more persons.

♦ **Socio-Economic Status**
➢ Those on social assistance did not access education services.

♦ **Residential Status**
➢ More persons who rented accommodations also accessed education services suggesting that Aboriginal students may be in more stable residential circumstances than others who move to the city.

♦ **Residential Mobility**
➢ Access to education services was more probable for those who had never moved to Winnipeg previously indicating that Aboriginal students may lack a familiarity with the city.
➢ If education services were accessed, it was less likely that the respondent had moved or left Winnipeg since Survey 1 also suggesting residential stability.

♦ **Neighbourhood Satisfaction**
➢ Those who accessed education services did not agree:
▪ They were close to family and friends
▪ There was adequate programming for their cultural, spiritual and social needs.

Employment Services

♦ **Socio-Demographic Characteristics**
➢ More males accessed employment services.

♦ **Residential Status**
➢ A higher proportion of those who accessed employment services lived in temporary accommodations.

♦ **Residential Mobility**
➢ If a person was expecting to move, there was a greater probability that they also accessed employment services.
➢ Those who left Winnipeg between surveys were less likely to access these services.

♦ **Access to Services**

  ➢ Those employed were more likely to have accessed employment services indicating that these services were successful in employment placement.

There are several important issues related to the use of services. Some of these issues have already been discussed in the previous three areas of inquiry and will be reiterated to highlight their significance. First, a very important finding is that housing services are more accessible to those with greater financial resources. It is essential that newly-arrived Aboriginal persons with limited financial resources also have access to subsidized housing as a more secure environment will improve their adjustment and probability of remaining in the city.

Second, the findings regarding access to social services are similar to the observations of social assistance recipients. Those who access social services tend to be female, between the ages of 25 and 44, with children in their care, and with limited financial resources. These characteristics suggest that family support services are an essential component to their transition to Winnipeg. This group of Aboriginal newcomers to Winnipeg display stable residential status and feel that they have adequate cultural, spiritual and social programs and services. However, they require a more secure residential setting which again is important for a more positive adjustment to living in an urban centre.

Thirdly, as would be expected, families, as well as older movers to Winnipeg are the primary users of medical services. However, it may be assumed that single persons would also be in need of medical services as many are arriving from home reserves where access to medical professionals may be irregular. Therefore, the provision of medical services must be improved to take into account the needs of both families, as well as single Aboriginal newcomers.

Another important group of newly-arrived Aboriginal persons to Winnipeg are those accessing education services. They are younger and live with other persons, but display some stable residential characteristics as they rent accommodations and did not move or leave Winnipeg between surveys. Based on the findings reported above, further support is required for Aboriginals moving to Winnipeg with goals of obtaining an education. The findings suggest that they require orientation services as many students are unfamiliar with the city. They also require supports to replace their friends and families who live outside the city, as well as access to cultural, spiritual and social services and programs.

Finally, those who access employment services are predominantly male and also employed thus suggesting that they have been successful in accessing needed services. The findings also demonstrate that those who are employed tend to live in temporary accommodations thus suggesting instability. Therefore, as stated above, those who access employment services and are employed require assistance in obtaining appropriate housing accommodations that will allow them to maintain stable employment status.

3.6 Summary of Findings

This analysis represents a preliminary exploration of the data from both Survey 1 and Survey 2. The associations that were determined in the analysis contribute to a better understanding of the experience of newly-arrived Aboriginal peoples to Winnipeg. It is anticipated that the findings outlined above will contribute to the finalization of an explanatory model of those factors that contribute to a more positive adjustment for Aboriginal persons moving to urban centres. By better understanding the factors that affect this transition, more effective policy recommendations can then be developed to insure that newly-arrived Aboriginal persons are satisfied and well-adjusted in the urban context.

The objective of the investigation is to identify key policy issues that must be addressed in order to promote the positive transition of Aboriginal persons. Based on these preliminary findings, the following areas of policy were identified to be essential in the transition of Aboriginal persons relocating to an urban setting:

1. The development of improved neighbourhoods that provide safety, security, social network support, and programming for the cultural, spiritual and social needs of Aboriginal persons.
2. The provision of safe and affordable housing that is accessible to all newly-arrived Aboriginal persons.
3. The advancement of an adequate service infrastructure to address the disproportionate number of newcomers who live in temporary accommodations and/or are uncertain of their future plans in the city.
4. The provision of adequate support services and safe housing for newcomers and their families who are on social assistance.
5. The development of supports for students including orientation services, support networks and access to cultural, spiritual and social programming.
6. The recognition of the diversity of persons arriving and their specific needs.

References

Lawton, M.P., Brody, E.M. and Turner-Massey, P. (1978). The relationships of environmental factors to changes in well-being. *The Gerontologist*, 18 (2), 133-138.

Robinson, G.M. (1998). *Methods & Techniques in Human Geography*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

(1999). *SPSS Base 10.0 User's Guide*. Chicago, IL: SPSS Inc.

Appendix A   Profile of Non-Respondents

This profile is of the non-respondents of Survey 2. It will simply show the characteristics of those people who did not continue in the study and complete Survey 2, but it will not be able to determine why these people did not continue.

A total of 141 respondents did not participate in Survey 2 who had originally been interviewed for Survey 1. The majority of the non-respondents were males (55.3%). While 86% of non-respondents were single. Over 70% of these people were between the ages of 20 and 39. The majority of the non-respondents were First Nations Status (86%); however, 18 of the 45 Metis who participated in Survey 1 did not participate in Survey 2. Over 50% of the non-respondents were unemployed during Survey 1 and 24% were students. This would explain why 52% were on social assistance, and 25% received band sponsorship for students. There was a broad range of education levels. The majority (52%) had not completed high school; however, 13.5% had received some university education. Additionally, 58% had a total annual household income of less than $10,000.

In relation to residential mobility, 77% of the non-respondents had only moved to Winnipeg once in their lifetime. And this move had occurred within 12 months of the first survey. Their reasons for moving to Winnipeg consisted mainly of family reasons, as well as employment, and education opportunities. At the time of Survey 1, 26% of these non-respondents were planning to stay in Winnipeg permanently, while 57% were unsure how long they would stay, and 17% (24 respondents) planned on remaining for only 12 months or less.
Surprisingly, more of the non-respondents rented their accommodations (57%) and did not live temporarily with friends and family. Of those who rented 73% had a month-to-month lease agreement.

A total of 101 of the non-respondents stated in Survey 1 that they planned on moving in the next year. Just over 80% planned on moving to another location within Winnipeg, while 13% planned to move to a location outside of Winnipeg, and 5% planned to leave the province. Almost one half of the non-respondents (46%) stated that housing and housing issues were the reasons why they planned to move.

There were some variations with regards to satisfaction levels. Almost 40% of the non-respondents were satisfied with their overall situation, while 34% were unsatisfied, and 20% were very unsatisfied. However, 58% stated that in the next six months they anticipated being satisfied. Just under 60% of non-respondents were satisfied with Winnipeg, while 24% were unsatisfied.

Appendix B   Comparison of the Samples: Survey 1 (n = 525) and Survey 2 (n = 384)

Table B1: Status, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Status	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
First Nations Status	90.7	92.3
First Nations Non-Status	0.4	0.3
Metis	8.7	7.2
Inuit	0.2	0.3
Total	100.0	100.0

Table B2: Gender, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Gender	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Male	45.0	41.4
Female	55.0	58.6
Total	100.0	100.0

Table B3: Age Categories, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Age	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
14 to 17	2.3	1.3
18 to 19	7.0	5.5
20 to 29	31.9	30.3
30 to 39	29.8	28.7
40 to 49	18.6	21.6
50 to 59	7.5	8.9
60+	2.9	3.7
Total	100.0	100.0

Table B4: Marital Status, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Marital Status	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Single	70.5	61.1
Singe Parent	18.3	16.7
Married/Common-law with no children	4.8	9.1
Married/Common-law with children	6.4	13.1
Total	100.0	100.0

Table B5: Tenancy Status, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Tenancy Status	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Rent	48.1	49.0
Own	0.6	0.0
Temporarily live with friends & family	51.3	50.8
Total	100.0	100.0

Table B6: Total Number of Persons in Household, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Number of Persons	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
1	13.2	13.2
2	34.2	20.9
3	19.5	19.8
4	16.8	18.3
5 and over	16.4	27.8
Total	100.0	100.0

Table B7: Employment Status, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Employment Status	Survey 1	Survey 2
Employed	21.1	36.6
Student	14.9	9.8
Unemployed	64.0	53.6
Total	100.0	100.0

Table B8: Income Source, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Income Source	Survey 1	Survey 2
Employment Insurance (EI)	3.4	1.8
EI- Maternity Leave	0.2	0.3
EI- Disability	0.2	0.3
Social Assistance	45.9	46.1
Old Age	1.5	1.0
Worker's Compensation	0.2	0.0
Veteran's Allowance	0.0	0.3
MMF Sponsorship	0.2	0.3
Canada Pension Plan	0.8	0.5
Disability Pension	3.0	2.1
Band Sponsorship (students)	8.8	3.6
Student Bursary/Loan	1.1	0.8
Other pension	2.1	1.0
Child Tax Credit	3.4	3.9
GST	1.5	5.5
Other	1.5	0.8
Band Social Assistance	NA	3.4

Table B9: Annual Household Income, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Household Income	Survey 1	Survey 2
Up to $10,000	58.2	62.1
$10,001 to $15,000	15.3	20.5
$15,001 to $20,000	8.9	8.7
$20,001 to $25,000	4.0	3.2
$25,001 to $30,000	0.4	0.8
$30,001 to $35,000	0.9	0.3
$35,001 to $40,000	0.0	0.0
$40,001 to $45,000	0.2	0.3
$45,001 to $50,000	0.2	0.0
No Income	11.8	4.2
Total	100.0	100.0

Appendix C   Results of Survey 2

Table C1	
Table 3: Gender, Survey 2, Percentages	
Gender	**Survey 2**
Male	41.4
Female	58.6
Total	100.0

Table C2	
Table 1: First Nations Status, Survey 2, Percentages	
First Nations Status	**Survey 2**
First Nations Status	92.3
First Nations Non-status	0.3
Metis	7.2
Inuit	0.3
Total	100.0

Table C3		
Family Status, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Family Status	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Single	72.0	61.1
Singe parent	18.3	16.7
Married with no children	3.7	9.1
Married with children	6.1	13.1
Total	100.0	100.0

Table C4: Employment Status, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Employment Status	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Employed	22.4	36.6
Student	10.4	9.8
Unemployed	66.4	53.6
Total	100.0	100.0

Table C5: Income Source, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Income Source	**Survey 1**	**Survey 2**
Employment Insurance (EI)	3.4	1.8
EI- Maternity Leave	0.3	0.3
EI- Disability	0.3	0.3
Social Assistance	48.4	46.1
Old Age	1.3	1.0
Worker's Compensation	0.3	0.0
Veteran's Allowance	0.0	0.3
MMF Sponsorship	0.3	0.3
Canada Pension Plan	0.5	0.5
Disability Pension	2.6	2.1
Band Sponsorship (students)	5.2	3.6
Student Bursary/Loan	1.3	0.8
Other pension	2.6	1.0
Child Tax Credit	3.9	3.9
GST	1.8	5.5
Other	1.3	0.8
Band Social Assistance	0.0	3.4

Table C6: Type of Residence, Survey 1 and 2, Percentages		
Type of Residence	Survey 1	Survey 2
Apartment	54.2	51.7
Single-detached house	18.3	21.9
Row or townhouse	8.5	10.4
Condominium	0.0	1.0
Duplex	11.9	8.9
Rooming house	6.3	5.0
Other	0.8	1.0
Total	100.0	100.0

Table C7: Total Number of Children in Household by Family Status, Percentages					
# Children in household	Single* %	Single Parent %	Married w/ no children %	Married w/ children %	Entire Sample %
0	35.4	0.0	5.5	0.0	40.9
1	11.3	5.0	1.3	5.5	23.1
2	6.9	6.9	1.1	2.9	17.8
3	5.0	3.4	1.1	2.4	11.9
4+	2.1	1.6	0.3	2.4	6.4

* Single persons may include children of other household members currently residing in the home.

Appendix D   Evaluating the Transition of Aboriginal Persons to Winnipeg: List of Variables

The Transition Process of Newly-Arrived Aboriginal Persons:
Outcome and Predictor Variables

Outcome Measures

1. Satisfaction
(0 = very satisfied/satisfied; 1 = very unsatisfied/unsatisfied)
General Satisfaction Survey 1 and 2
Satisfaction with City Survey 1 and 2
Residential Satisfaction Survey 1 and 2

2. Residential Status
Tenant Status Survey 1 and 2 (0 = rent; 1 = temporary accommodations)
Expected Time in Winnipeg Survey 1 and 2 (0 = long-term; 1 = uncertain/temporary)

3. Socio-Economic Status
Employment Status Survey 1 and 2 (0 = employed/student; 1 = unemployed)
Social Assistance Status Survey 1 and 2 (0 = no social assistance; 1 = on social assistance)

4. Access to Services
(0 = no access; 1 = access)
Access to Housing Services Survey 1 and 2
Access to Social Services Survey 1 and 2
Access to Medical Services Survey 1 and 2
Access to Education Services Survey 1 and 2
Access to Employment Services Survey 1 and 2

<div align="center">Explanatory Factors</div>

1. Socio-Demographic Characteristics
Gender (0 = male; 1 = female)
Age (1 = 14-24; 2 = 25-34; 3 = 35-44; 4 = 45+)
Education (1 = Gr. 9 or less; 2 = Gr. 9-12, no HSC; 3 = HSC or more)
Marital Status (0 = single; 1 = married/common-law)
- ➢ Survey 1
- ➢ Survey 2 and Change from Survey 1 to Survey 2:
  - ▪ Became Single
  - ▪ Became Married/Common-Law

Family Status (0 = no children; 1 = responsible for children)
- ➢ Survey 1
- ➢ Survey 2 and Change from Survey 1 to Survey 2:
  - ▪ Now Responsible for Children
  - ▪ No Longer Responsible for Children

Living Arrangements (0 = lives alone; 1 = lives w/ 1 person; 2 = lives w/ 2 or more persons)
- ➢ Survey 1
- ➢ Survey 2 and Change from Survey 1 to Survey 2:
  - ▪ Decrease in Number in Household
  - ▪ Increase in Number in Household

2. Socio-Economic Status
Income (0 = <$10,000; 1 = >$10,000)
- ➢ Survey 1
- ➢ Survey 2 and Change from Survey 1 to Survey 2:
  - ▪ Income Decrease
  - ▪ Income Increase

Employment Status (0 = employed/student; 1 = unemployed)
- ➢ Survey 1
- ➢ Survey 2 and Change from Survey 1 to Survey 2:
  - ▪ Became Employed/Student
  - ▪ Became Unemployed

Social Assistance Status (0 = no social assistance; 1 = on social assistance)
- ➢ Survey 1
- ➢ Survey 2 and Change from Survey 1 to Survey 2:
  - ▪ Became a Recipient of Social Assistance
  - ▪ No Longer a Recipient of Social Assistance

3. Residential Status

Tenant Status (0 = rent; 1 = temporary accommodations)
- ➢ Survey 1
- ➢ Survey 2 and Change from Survey 1 to Survey 2:
  - ▪ From Temporary to Renter
  - ▪ From Renter to Temporary

Expected Time in Winnipeg Survey 1 (0 = permanently; 1 = uncertain/temporary)
Expected Time in Winnipeg Survey 2 (0 = permanently; 1 = uncertain/temporary)

4. Residential Mobility

Number of Moves to Winnipeg Prior to Survey 1
Number of Total Moves in Residential History Prior to Survey 1
Moved Since Survey 1 (0 = no; 1 = yes)
Left Winnipeg Between Survey 1 and Survey 2 (0 = no; 1 = yes)
Expect to Move Survey 1 (0 = no; 1 = yes)
Expect to Move Survey 2 (0 = no; 1 = yes)

5. Neighbourhood Characteristics

(0 = strongly agree/agree; 1 = strongly disagree/disagree)
Neighbourhood Rating
- ➢ Safe Neighbourhood Survey 1 and 2
- ➢ Good Public Transportation Survey 1 and 2
- ➢ Close to Friends and Family Survey 1 and 2
- ➢ Close to Grocery Store Survey 1 and 2
- ➢ Close to Shopping Survey 1 and 2
- ➢ Close to Medical Services Survey 1 and 2
- ➢ Close to Parks Survey 1 and 2
- ➢ Close to Recreation Survey 1 and 2
- ➢ Adequate Services for cultural/spiritual/social Needs Survey 1 and 2
- ➢ Like Neighbourhood Survey 1 and 2
- ➢ Safe Home Survey 1 and 2

6. Access to Services

(0 = no access; 1 = access)
Access to Housing Services Survey 1 and 2
Access to Social Services Survey 1 and 2
Access to Medical Services Survey 1 and 2
Access to Education Services Survey 1 and 2
Access to Employment Services Survey 1 and 2

Appendix E   Evaluating the Transition of Aboriginal Persons to Winnipeg: Results

Predictors of General Satisfaction, Satisfaction with City, and Anticipated Satisfaction in Six Months (Survey 1 and Survey 2)

	General Satisfaction	Satisfaction with City	Residential Satisfaction
Survey 1	Expect to Move (.002) Residential Satisfaction (.001) Safe Neighbourhood (.040) Safe Home (.026) Close to Recreation (.031) Adequate Programs (.025) Like Neighbourhood (.016)	Rent/Temporary (.014) Like Neighbourhood (.037) Access to Housing Services (.018) Access to Medical Services (.051)	Family Status (.029) Expect to Move (.003) Safe Neighbourhood (.016) Parks Nearby (.027) Home Safe (.000) Recreation Nearby (.007) Adequate Programs (.019) Like Neighbourhood (.000)
Survey 2	Income (.027) Moved Since Survey 1 (.005) Left Wpg Since Survey 1 (.000) Expect to Move (.001) Residential Satisfaction (.002) Safe Neighbourhood (.000) Close to Family/Friends (.000) Parks Nearby (.035) Safe Home (.000) Adequate Programs (.043) Like Neighbourhood (.000)	Change: Living w/ Spouse (.046) Change: from Rent to Temp (.054) Expect to Move (.003) Public Transportation (.000) Close to Family/Friends (.001) Home Safe (.002) Adequate Programs (.021) Like Neighbourhood (.002)	Expect to Move (.000) Safe Neighbourhood (.006) Home Safe (.001) Like Neighbourhood (.000) Access to Social Services (.018)

Predictors of Tenant Status and Expected Time in Winnipeg (Survey 1 and Survey 2)

	Tenant Status		**Expected Time in Wpg**	
Survey 1	Gender (.015) Age (.012) Marital Status (.006) Family Status (.000) Living with Others (.000) Income (.000) Social Assistance Status (.003) # Moves to Wpg (.005) Expected Time in Wpg (.000)	Expect to Move (.002) Safe Neighbourhood (.041) Close to Family/Friends (.045) Close to Medical Services (.027) Recreation Nearby (.047) Access to Social Services (.000) Access to Medical Services (.000 Access to Education Services (.000)	Family Status (.005) Expect to Move (.017) Rent/temporary (.000) Safe home (.037) Access to Social Services (.032)	
Survey 2	Gender (.008) Age (.002) Family Status (.000) Living with Others (.000) Change: Live w/ less people (.006) Change: Live w/ more people (.000) Income (.000) Employment Status (.000) Change: became employed (.000) Social Assistance Status (.000)	Moved since Survey 1 (.000) Left Wpg since Survey 1 (.000) Expected Time in Wpg (.000) Expect to Move (.000) Adequate Shopping (.011) Access to Social Services (.000) Access to Medical Services (.000) Access to Education Services (.021) Access to Employment Services (.000)	Living with Others (.018) Change: Lives w/ less people (.012) Change: Lives w/more people (.031) Employment Status (.011) Change: became employed (.056) Change: became unemployed (.000) Change: went on soc. assis. (.039)	Moved since Survey 1 (.004) Left Wpg since Survey 1 (.000) Expect to move (.013) Rent/temporary (.000) Change: from temp. to rent (.028) Safe Neighbourhood (.021) Safe Home (.027)

Predictors of Employment and Social Assistance Status, Access to Housing and Social Services (Survey 1 and Survey 2)

	Employment Status	Social Assistance Status	Access to Housing Services	Access to Social Services
Survey 1	Gender (.012) Education (.014) Income (.000) Access to Social Services (.000) Access to Education Services (.000) Access to Employment Serv. (.000)	Gender (.055) Age (.052) Family Status (.038) Income (.002) Rent/temporary (.003) Access to Social Services (.000) Access to Employment Serv. (.000)	Income (.005)	Gender (.029) Age (.006) Living with Others (.055) Length in Wpg (.032) Rent/temporary (.000) Employment Services (.000)
Survey 2	Gender (.034) Income (.000) Expected Time in Wpg (.011) Expect to Move (.054) Rent/temporary (.000) Change: from temp to rent (.006) Home Safe (.045) Access to Social Services (.000) Access to Education Services (.000) Access to Employment Serv. (.000)	Gender (.001) Age (.009) Family Status (.013) Income (.000) Expect to Move (.023) Rent/temporary (.000) Change: from temp to rent (.022) Safe neighbourhood (.020) Access to Housing Services (.054) Access to Social Services (.000) Access to Education Services (.002) Access to Employment Serv. (.000)	Change: decrease in income (.027) Social Assistance Status (.054) Change: went on soc. assis. (.028) Parks Nearby (.032)	Gender (.002) Age (.015) Family Status (.004) Income (.000) Change: increase in income (.035) Moved since Survey 1 (.016) Left Wpg since Survey 1 (.001) Rent/temporary (.000) Safe Neighbourhood (.008) Home Safe (.007) Adequate Programs (.039) Like Neighbourhood (.025) Employment Services (.000)

Predictors of Access to Medical, Education and Employment Services (Survey 1 and Survey 2)

	Access to Medical Services	Access to Education Services	Access to Employment Services
Survey 1	Age (.024) Marital Status (.001) Family Status (.000) Live with others (.011) Income (.038) Rent/temporary (.000) Access to Housing Services (.013) Access to Education Services (.007)	Age (.001) Live with Others (.002) Rent/temporary (.000) Close to Family/Friends (.000) Adequate Programs (.055)	Gender (.001) Employment Status (.000) Social Assistance Status (.000) Expect to Move (.002)
Survey 2	Age (.054) Family Status (.033) Live with others (.030) Leave Wpg Since Survey 1 (.015) Rent/temporary (.000) Access to Housing Services (.016) Access to Education Services (.003) Access to Employment Services (.001)	Social Assistance Status (.002) Change: went on soc. assis. (.015) # Moves to Wpg (.009) Moved since Survey 1 (.015) Left Wpg since Survey 1 (.041) Rent/temporary (.021) Safe neighbourhood (.049) Close to medical services (.003) Adequate Programs (.012)	Gender (.001) Employment Status (.000) Social Assistance Status (.000) Left Wpg since Survey 1 (.005) Rent/temporary (.000) Change: from temp to rent (.049)

Appendix F -- Glossary of Terms

Aboriginal services: These services tend to be offered by Aboriginal organizations to Aboriginal persons residing in Winnipeg. Types of Aboriginal services include the Aboriginal Centre, Friendship Centres, spiritual and cultural services, and representative organizations (such as AMC and MMF).

Alcohol/Substance abuse (reasons for moving): These reasons consisted of moving to get treatment for their substance abuse problem. Sometimes treatment was a condition of getting custody of their children back.

Children taken by CFS (reasons for moving): This reason for moving relates to parents moving to regain custody of their children or to be closer to their children to visit while they are in the care of Child and Family Services.

Church services: Church services consist of types of services like religious mass, education, and youth groups.

Common-law: Common-law refers to those persons who having been living with their significant other for 6 months or longer, but are not married.

Disability reasons (for moving): Disability reasons include that the respondent has a medical condition that has in some form or another caused them to become disabled. In some cases they have moved for treatment.

Divorced/separated person(s): This term refers to persons who were married at one time or still are, but do not reside in the same residence.

Education for children (services): Education services for children and youth include daycare and school services that are offered in Winnipeg.

Education reasons (for moving): Educational reasons include issues related to moving due to the lack of opportunity to further one's education to the opportunity to gain post-secondary education.

Education services: Educational services include a wide range of services. They include upgrading, high school, college, university, computer training, and financial aid for education.

Employment reasons (for moving): These reasons consist of all issues relate to employment, from moving in search of a job to moving due to the lack of employment opportunities in an area, or simply to live closer to work.

Employment services: These services include support for job searches, job training and human resources at the Aboriginal Centre, aboriginal training programs, job searches through newspaper advertisements and the internet, as well as employment and temporary labour agencies.

Family reasons (for moving)**:** These reasons include any issues related to the respondent's family. For example, moved with their family because the respondent is a minor, moved to be closer to family members, moved in search of biological parents or family members, moved to escape abuse, or moved because the respondent is now legal age.

Family structure: Family structure refers to the marital status of those persons 18 years or older. They may be single, a single parent, married, living common-law, divorced/separated, or widowed.

Foster placement (reasons for moving): Reasons for moving related to foster placements tend to be either reasons for past moves during the respondent's childhood, or the respondent is presently a minor and still in the foster care system.

Health reasons (for moving): Health reasons generally of moving to be closer to health care facilities or to move away from unhealthy living conditions.

Housing reasons (for moving): These reasons included the following: moved due to overcrowding, moved because of inadequate housing conditions, moved into a subsidized housing unit, moved to a larger place, or moved to live on their own.

Housing services: Housing services tend to consist of subsidized housing programs, and they include Manitoba Housing Authority, SAFER, Sam Management, Kinew Housing, Winnipeg Rehabilitation Housing, and DOTC Housing.

Housing shortage (reasons for moving): Housing shortage tends to be a common reason for why Aboriginal people have moved to Winnipeg. Their prior community or reserve did not have enough housing, therefore overcrowding was occurring.

Justice/Corrections (reasons for moving): These reasons included being released from corrections, moved to be closer to spouse who is the an correctional facility, moved due to court case, or living in a specific place may be a condition or their parole.

Legal services: Legal services consist of services provided by the Winnipeg Police Department, by a lawyer, or through corrections.

Living temporarily (with friends or family): Respondents who are living temporarily with friends or family are those who do not have a residence of their own, and for the most part are simply staying with friends or family temporarily until they find other accommodations.

Married person(s): This refers to people who possess a marriage certificate and are not separated.

Medical services: Medical services encompass a broad range of services, from the use of hospitals, clinics, pharmacies, home care, Envoy, Public Health Nurses, and Health Canada.

Other (reasons for moving): This category of reasons for moving consists of all other reasons that did not fit into any other category. For example, issues of inaccessibility.

Reasons for moving: Respondents were asked to list their different reasons for moving, whether it was while moving into Winnipeg, to a reserve, or between communities. Also some of these reasons were for moves that occurred recently, while others were reasons for moves they had made in the past.

Recreational services: Recreational services involve any services that respondents may participate in for leisure. This may include such services from sporting programs to bingo.

Residential school (reasons for moving): Reasons for moving related to residential schools tend to be based on past moves during the respondent's childhood.

Safety reasons (for moving): Safety has been cited as a reason for moving for example when the respondent feels threatened for one reason or another.

Services: Services consist of different programs designed to assist people living in Winnipeg. Services are offered through government department, community and church groups, as well as private and non-profit companies. Services can fall under the categories of housing, social, medical, Aboriginal, legal, educational, employment, support, children and youth, transportation, recreational, and church.

Single parent: This is a person who is not currently married or living common-law, but has at least one child in their care.

Single person(s): This refers to persons who are not married and are not living in a common-law situation. However, single persons may include children of other household members currently residing in the home.

Social services: These services include social assistance, shelters, food banks, Child and Family Services, and disability services.

Socio-political reasons (for moving): Socio-political reasons include such issues as wanting a change of scenery, feeling uncomfortable, or favoritism on the reserve or in the community.

Support services: Support services include counseling, support groups, transitional housing for women, Aboriginal well-being programs, and addictions.

Transportation services: The types of services that fall under the transportation category include the use of transit, a taxi, or Aboriginal transport.

Widowed person(s): This term refers to persons who were married at one time, but a spouse has passed away.