

Lack of research-based standards for accessible housing: problematization and exemplification of consequences

Tina Helle · Aase Brandt · Björn Slaug ·
Susanne Iwarsson

Received: 31 January 2011 / Revised: 26 July 2011 / Accepted: 1 August 2011 / Published online: 8 September 2011
© Springer-Verlag 2011

Abstract

Objective To increase the understanding of how definitions of standards for housing design influence the proportion of dwellings not meeting the standards and the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems.

Methods The sample included old people and their dwellings in three European countries ($N = 1,150$). Frequencies and percentages were reported and empirical distribution functions were used.

Results Depending on the functional profile and standards in question, the magnitude of influence of the standards differs in extent, e.g., the existing standard for door openings at the entrance (defined ≥ 75 cm) implied that the proportion of dwellings not meeting it was 11.3% compared to 64.4%, if the standard was set to ≥ 83 cm. The proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems for profiles not using mobility devices was 4–5, 57% for profiles using them and 1–3% for the total sample if the standard was set to 90 cm.

Conclusion Research-based standard definitions for housing design are necessary to ensure that they actually lead to enhanced accessibility, which is a prerequisite for the independence and health of persons with functional limitations.

Keywords Housing standards · Social inclusion · Older persons · Functional limitations · Public health

Introduction

From a public health perspective, standards addressing accessible housing are crucial for people with functional limitations, as they aim at enabling mobility and the use of the environment as an arena for participation in a broad range of everyday activities. Restricted participation may occur due to barriers in the environment. A state of long-lasting exclusion from meaningful activities, due to circumstances beyond the control of the individual, can lead to health risks (Whiteford 2000). Applying this perspective, accessibility and participation are determinants of health (Christiansen and Townsend 2004). Public health has recognized that well-being and health cannot be separated from the environment, but has largely neglected to consider how some basic human needs relate to health, such as the ability to carry out daily activities (Wilcock 2006). In this study, the design of accessible housing, as determined by standards for housing design, is viewed as a public health effort. To the best of our knowledge, empirical research based on this perspective is virtually non-existent.

The formal definition of a *standard* is “a document for common and repeated use, to be used as a rule, guideline or definition” (<http://www.cen.eu>). Standards for housing design are compulsory and enacted at national levels, such

This paper belongs to the special issue “Housing for health promotion”.

T. Helle · A. Brandt · B. Slaug · S. Iwarsson
Department of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine,
Lund University, Lund, Sweden

T. Helle (✉)
Department of Occupational Therapy,
University College Northern Jutland, Selma Lagerlöfsvej 2,
9220 Aalborg Ø, Denmark
e-mail: tih@ucn.dk

A. Brandt
Danish Centre for Assistive Technology, Århus, Denmark

as the American Disability Act (ADA) (<http://www.ada.gov>) or the Danish Building Regulation (<http://www.bygningsreglementet2010.dk>). According to the Committee for Standardization (CEN), accessibility is gaining more importance as already 10% of the European population (40 million) has functional limitations. Viewed in the light of the growing aging population, standards have their place next to policy to integrate accessibility (<http://www.cen.eu>). In some countries, differentiation between the terms *standard* and *norm* is being made, where *norm* refers to exact measures such as length, while in common language the term *standard* is often used interchangeably. Due to the international use of *standard*, we are using this term, referring to the definition and concrete measurement of the physical built housing design features. It is noteworthy that the results of recent European projects (Helle et al. 2010; Iwarsson et al. 2005), where systematic, cross-national analyses of standards for housing design were accomplished, demonstrated considerable variation as regards the definition of such standards. One example is the standard definition addressing door widths, varying from 77 to 90 cm among four Nordic countries (Helle et al. 2010). It is inexpedient and problematic that definitions of the same standards vary among culturally comparable countries, because this variation impacts on the proportion of dwellings society considers to be accessible. This was elucidated also in another recent study evaluating national standards in relation to wheeled mobility users across the USA, Canada, Britain and Australia (Steinfeld et al. 2010). Since designers make use of standards as an important information source during the process of designing accessible dwellings (Nickpour and Dong 2009), standards play a crucial role for citizens, professionals and society at large. Accordingly, it is crucial that the knowledge informing standards is valid and moreover reflect inclusion of the intended population (Keates and Clarkson 2004). However, due to existing cross-national variation in standard definitions, it is reasonable to question the knowledge base informing current housing standards and invest in research contributing to enhanced validity in the definition of standards (Steinfeld et al. 2010).

Another problem related to standards is the fact that definitions of the concept of accessibility vary among designers, researchers and user organizations. The lack of a distinct and widely accepted definition is an essential problem in this field of research and practice (Iwarsson et al. 2005; Steinfeld et al. 2010). We use a definition, stating that accessibility is a relative concept, based on the assumption that activity limitations and restricted participation arise from the gap between the functional capacity of an individual or group and the environmental demands. This perspective implies that accessibility comprises a personal component and an environmental component (Iwarsson and Ståhl 2003), with

accessibility problems expressed as a person–environment relationship (P–E-fit) (Lawton and Nahemow 1973). In this definition, the standards are incorporated into the environmental component. Consequently, accessibility is objective in character as it can be observed and measured (Iwarsson and Ståhl 2003). Accordingly, standards determine whether design features are environmental barriers, potentially generating accessibility problems for persons with functional limitations or not.

Since the knowledge base appeared to be vague, in the current study we performed a comprehensive and systematic literature search. We searched for empirical research published during 1990–2010, resulting in measurable standard definitions with potential to inform housing design and targeting adults with physical functional limitations. We also contacted 21 leading researchers in the field and manually inspected the 2008–2010 issues of 22 scientific journals. In all, we screened 2,879 publications and read the full text of 35 and finally identified 7 publications. While none of them targeted housing specifically, they pointed out significant sex differences in design requirements (Paquet and Feathers 2004; Kozey and Das 2004; Das and Kozey 1999); however, the current standards are not updated and do not support design adequately. It was concluded that since the standards do not reflect the body structure and functional capacity of the population with disabilities and the use of today's mobility devices, research-based revisions of current standards are required (Steinfeld et al. 2004, 2010; D'Souza et al. 2009; Ringaert et al. 2001).

Awareness of demographic circumstances is important for planning and housing provision. By 2050, the older population is expected to grow more rapidly than other age groups in Europe and will reach 22% aged ≥ 60 years in 2050 (http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/WPA2009/WPA2009_WorkingPaper.pdf). It is critical to bear in mind that the majority of persons with functional limitations is older and that the frequency, complexity and severity of functional limitations increase with age (Crews and Zavotka 2006). In Sweden, 50% of wheelchair users are ≥ 80 years, of whom 80% utilize a wheelchair indoors. With regard to rollators, 95% of users in Sweden are ≥ 65 years old, of whom 2/3 are over 80 years and 50% use a rollator indoors (Statistics Sweden 2005). Since older people spend most of the day in their home (Heyl et al. 2005), the design of the housing environment is important for maintaining independence and the ability to perform everyday activities (Letts et al. 2003).

The use of epidemiological data on functional capacity in different user groups could serve to increase the knowledge of the extent to which environmental barriers yield accessibility problems and for whom (Keates and Clarkson 2004). One challenge is that existing databases

and national censuses do not have sufficiently detailed data on housing design and functional limitations in the population (Slaug et al. 2010). Another challenge is the fact that older people seldom have only one functional limitation. To support the provision of accessible housing, definitions of standards should be based on the occurrence of typical combinations of functional limitations in the population. Accordingly, the aims of this study were to increase the understanding of how different standards for accessible housing design influence (1) the proportion of dwellings not meeting the standards, and (2) the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems.

Methods

Data for the present study were drawn from the ENABLE-AGE database, comprising data on home and health among single-living, very old persons in ordinary dwellings in five European countries (Iwarsson et al. 2004). Data concerning housing accessibility were collected by means of the Housing Enabler instrument (Iwarsson and Slaug 2001). Due to validity issues concerning the data on environmental barriers, for the present study, we used data from three of the national samples: Germany, Latvia and Sweden ($N = 1,150$), see Table 1.

The Housing Enabler instrument consists of two components that are dichotomously assessed (present/absent): (1) a personal component comprising 13 items on functional limitations and two on dependence on mobility devices; (2) an environmental component comprising 188 items on environmental barriers in the dwelling and the immediate outdoor environment, incorporating national standards on housing design. Based on the assessments of

the two components, an accessibility score is calculated by means of a matrix comprising predefined severity ratings ranging from 1 to 4 (1 = lowest, 4 = highest demand), where the individual functional profile defined is juxtaposed with the environmental barriers found to be present. In this way, the magnitude of accessibility problems in each case is calculated.

Prior to the ENABLE-AGE data collection (Iwarsson et al. 2004), a research version of the Housing Enabler instrument (Iwarsson and Slaug 2001) was developed and tested for inter-rater reliability, indicating moderate to good overall agreement. This process required a systematic analysis of the national standards for housing design of the countries involved (Iwarsson et al. 2005). This methodological endeavor revealed that in 22 of the 188 environmental items, the variation in the national standard definitions was substantial. Therefore, the subsequent data collection included supplementary recordings of exact measurements within predefined measurement intervals each time any of these 22 items was rated as “not present”. Data on ten of these items were applicable to study the proportion of dwellings not meeting different standards (see Table 3). Of these, four standards were chosen due to their exemplification value and further used in the investigation of how standards influence the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems (Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4).

Data analyses

The proportions (%) of dwellings not meeting the standards were calculated. First, for each item the proportions of dwellings in the three national samples and cross-national totals not meeting the existing standards were calculated.

Table 1 Sample characteristics of 1,150 single-living, very old persons in ordinary dwellings in three European samples in the study: lack of research-based standards for accessible housing: problematization and exemplifications of consequences (2011)

Characteristic	German sample $n = 450$ (%)	Latvian sample $N = 303$ (%)	Swedish sample $N = 397$ (%)	Total sample $N = 1,150$ (%)
Age				
75–79	–	197 (65.0)	–	197 (17.2)
80–84	212 (47.1)	106 (35.0)	200 (50.4)	518 (45.0)
85–89	238 (52.9)	–	197 (49.6)	435 (37.8)
Sex				
Men	97 (21.6)	35 (11.6)	101 (25.4)	233 (20.3)
Women	353 (78.4)	268 (88.4)	296 (74.6)	917 (79.7)
Use of mobility device				
Wheelchair	4 (0.9)	2 (0.7)	9 (2.3)	15 (1.3)
Rollator	57 (12.6)	5 (1.7)	116 (29.2)	178 (15.5)
Other	85 (18.9)	69 (22.8)	48 (12.1)	202 (17.6)
Housing type				
Apartment in block of flats	383 (85.1)	269 (88.8)	340 (85.6)	992 (86.3)
One-family housing	67 (14.9)	34 (11.2)	57 (14.4)	158 (13.7)




Fig. 1 Curves displaying the cumulative proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems in the environmental barrier *parking space far from entrance* analyzed by means of four different type profiles of combinations of physical functional limitations, in three national samples ($N = 1,150$)—in the study: lack of research-based standards for accessible housing: problematization and exemplification of consequences (2011). *Mov* limitation in movement, *Mov/MD* limitation in movement and dependent in mobility devices, *Mov/UE* limitations in movement and upper extremities, *Mov/UE/MD* limitations in movement and upper extremities and dependence in mobility devices (color figure online)




Fig. 2 Curves displaying the cumulative proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems in the environmental barrier *narrow door openings (entrances)* analyzed by means of four different type profiles of combinations of physical functional limitations, in three national samples ($N = 1,150$)—in the study: lack of research-based standards for accessible housing: problematization and exemplification of consequences (2011). *Mov* limitation in movement, *Mov/MD* limitation in movement and dependent in mobility devices, *Mov/UE* limitations in movement and upper extremities, *Mov/UE/MD* limitations in movement and upper extremities and dependence in mobility devices (color figure online)

Then, based on the mean of the exact measurements recorded for each of the 22 items, two alternative standard definitions were determined. The alternative standards were defined to present lower environmental demands. That is, potentially they generate less accessibility problems for persons with functional limitations. Thereafter, the proportions of dwellings not meeting the alternative standards were calculated, to explore how different definitions of the same standards impact on the proportion of dwellings considered being accessible. In cases where measurements were lacking, data were categorized as missing.

To explore how the standards influence the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems, four different type profiles of combinations of physical functional limitations among very old persons (Slaug et al. 2010) were analyzed against the four environmental barrier items selected. Type profiles are combinations of up to six functional limitations and mobility device use. For this study, we employed the following four type profiles, as they were relevant in relation to the selected environmental barrier items and substantial in terms of sample size

($n \geq 100$): *Mov*: limitations in movement ($n = 265$), *Mov/MD*: limitations in movement and dependence on mobility devices ($n = 100$), *Mov/UE*: limitations in movement and upper extremities ($n = 122$) and *Mov/UE/MD*: limitations in movement and upper extremities and dependence on mobility devices ($n = 105$) (Table 2).

To explore and demonstrate how the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems is impacted by the definition of standards, proportions were analyzed for the four different type profiles and displayed by empirical distribution functions (Kirkwood and Sterne 2003). In Figs. 1, 2, 3 and 4, the Y-axis shows the accumulated proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems and the X-axis shows measures in meters, centimeters or millimeters, referring to the definitions of standards. On the X-axis the definition of standards, according to the ENABLE-AGE research version of the environmental component of the Housing Enabler instrument, is marked.

Figures 1, 2, 3 and 4 allowed for two interpretations. That is, by visual graph inspection of the Y-axis, performed by the first author (TH) and subsequently validated by the




Fig. 3 Curves displaying the cumulative proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems in the environmental barrier *handrails placed too high* analyzed by means of four different type profiles of combinations of physical functional limitations, in three national samples ($N = 1,150$)—in the study: lack of research-based standards for accessible housing: problematization and exemplification of consequences (2011). *Mov* limitation in movement, *Mov/MD* limitation in movement and dependent in mobility devices, *Mov/UE* limitations in movement and upper extremities, *Mov/UE/MD* limitations in movement and upper extremities and dependence in mobility devices (color figure online)




Fig. 4 Curves displaying the cumulative proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems in the environmental barrier *stairs/thresholds/difference in level between rooms/floor spaces* analyzed by means of four different type profiles of combinations of physical functional limitations, in three national samples ($N = 1,150$)—in the study: lack of research-based standards for accessible housing: problematization and exemplification of consequences (2011). *Mov* limitation in movement, *Mov/MD* limitation in movement and dependent in mobility devices, *Mov/UE* limitations in movement and upper extremities, *Mov/UE/MD* limitations in movement and upper extremities and dependence in mobility devices (color figure online)

third author (BS), it was possible to estimate the accumulated proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems for each of the type profiles. Next,

inspection of the X-axis allowed for identification of critical cutoff points for determining the definition of a standard. Calculations were made in SPSS version 17.0.

Table 2 Occurrence of functional limitations and dependence in mobility devices for each of the four type profiles in the database used ($N = 1,150$) in the study: lack of research-based standards for

accessible housing: problematization and exemplifications of consequences (2011)

Functional limitation	Mov $n = 265$ (%)	Mov/MD $n = 100$ (%)	Mov/UE $n = 122$ (%)	Mov/UE/MD $n = 105$ (%)
Prevalence of poor balance	100 (37.7)	60 (60.0)	56 (45.9)	71 (67.6)
Incoordination	14 (5.3)	12 (12.0)	19 (15.6)	18 (17.1)
Limitations of stamina	148 (55.8)	62 (62.0)	71 (58.2)	80 (76.2)
Difficulties in moving head	20 (7.5)	12 (12.0)	30 (24.6)	34 (32.4)
Difficulty in reaching with arms	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	72 (59.0)	72 (68.6)
Difficulty in handling and fingering	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	65 (53.3)	71 (67.6)
Loss of upper extremity skills	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	13 (10.7)	15 (14.3)
Difficulty in bending, kneeling, etc.	203 (76.6)	90 (90.0)	91 (74.6)	97 (92.4)
Reliance on walking aids	0 (0.0)	99 (99.0)	0 (0.0)	105 (100.0)
Wheelchair user	0 (0.0)	3 (3.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (3.8)

Mov limitation in movement, *Mov/MD* limitation in movement and dependence on mobility devices, *Mov/UE* limitations in movement and upper extremities, *Mov/UE/MD* limitations in movement and upper extremities and dependence on mobility devices

Table 3 The cumulative proportion of dwellings not meeting different definitions of standards used to define environmental barriers in three national samples ($N = 1,150$), starting from the existing standard definitions followed by two alternative ones representing

lesser environmental demands in the study: lack of research-based standards for accessible housing; problematization and exemplification of consequences (2011)

Existing and alternative standard definitions of environmental barriers	German sample $n = 450$ (%)	Latvian sample $n = 303$ (%)	Swedish sample $n = 395$ (%)	Total sample $N = 1,150$ (%)
Outdoor environment				
Parking spaces far from the entrance (≥ 50 m) ^a	13.6 ^a	5.0 ^a	21.4 ^a	14.0 ^a
Alternative 1: 40–49 m ^b	28.4 ^b	–	34.5 ^b	23.1 ^b
Alternative 2: 25–39 m ^b	36.4 ^b	–	41.8 ^b	28.8 ^b
Passenger loading zones far from the entrance (≥ 100 m) ^a	21.1 ^a	1.7 ^a	5.0 ^a	10.4 ^a
Alternative 1: 27–99 m ^b	54.2 ^b	–	24.7 ^b	29.8 ^b
Alternative 2: 10–26 m ^b	72.2 ^b	–	35.8 ^b	41.9 ^b
Marked handicap parking is lacking or too far from the entrance (≥ 100 m) ^a	88.9 ^a	65.0 ^a	70.0 ^a	76.1 ^a
Alternative 1: 47–99 m ^b	–	–	77.3 ^b	78.3 ^b
Alternative 2: 10–46 m ^b	–	–	81.6 ^b	81.3 ^b
Entrances				
Narrow door openings (≤ 75 cm) ^a	7.0 ^a	23.4 ^a	6.8 ^a	11.3 ^a
Alternative 1: 76–82 cm ^b	27.8 ^b	40.9 ^b	55.7 ^b	40.9 ^b
Alternative 2: 83–90 cm ^b	46.2 ^b	58.1 ^b	90.4 ^b	64.6 ^b
High threshold and/or steps at the entrance (≥ 25 mm) ^a	67.6 ^a	23.4 ^a	77.8 ^a	74.9 ^a
Alternative 1: 22–24 mm ^b	–	–	86.1 ^b	78.5 ^b
Alternative 2: 15–21 mm ^b	–	–	79.8 ^b	79.3 ^b
Handrails placed too high (≥ 80 cm) ^a	10.0 ^a	52.5 ^a	6.5 ^a	20.0 ^a
Alternative 1: 81–90 cm ^b	–	79.2 ^b	34.5 ^b	37.7 ^b
Alternative 2: 91–100 cm ^b	–	86.5 ^b	64.5 ^b	50.1 ^b
Narrow door openings (balcony/terraces) (≤ 75 cm) ^a	29.8 ^a	26.1 ^a	54.2 ^a	37.2 ^a
Alternative 1: 76–81 cm ^b	42.9 ^b	–	76.6 ^b	43.4 ^b
Alternative 2: 82–90 cm ^b	55.6 ^b	–	88.7 ^b	52.9 ^b
Indoor environment				
Stairs/thresholds/difference in level between rooms/floor spaces (≥ 25 mm) ^a	24.9 ^a	60.1 ^a	47.4 ^a	41.9 ^a
Alternative 1: 22–24 mm ^b	40.4 ^b	67.3 ^b	58.7 ^b	53.8 ^b
Alternative 2: 15–21 mm ^b	43.3 ^b	70.6 ^b	76.3 ^b	61.9 ^b
Narrow passages/corridors in relation to fixtures/design of building (≤ 110 m) ^a	58.9 ^a	39.6 ^a	39.8 ^a	47.2 ^a
Alternative 1: 129–160 cm ^b	71.6 ^b	61.4 ^b	61.7 ^b	65.5 ^b
Alternative 2: 111–128 cm ^b	81.3 ^b	71.6 ^b	82.1 ^b	79.0 ^b
Narrow door openings (≤ 75 cm) ^a	79.6 ^a	68.3 ^a	53.7 ^a	67.7 ^a
Alternative 1: 76–80 cm ^b	84.4 ^b	80.2 ^b	86.1 ^b	83.9 ^b
Alternative 2: 81–90 cm ^b	89.3 ^b	81.2 ^b	95.5 ^b	89.3 ^b

Data treated as missing if measures were not recorded according to the data collection instructions

^a Standards incorporated into the environmental component of the ENABLE-AGE research version of the Housing Enabler (Iwarsson and Slaug 2001; Iwarsson et al. 2005)

^b Defined based on the mean of the exact measures recorded

Results

Different definitions of standards impact on the proportion of dwellings not meeting them for several of the environmental barriers studied to a marked extent (Table 3). In our

material, this impact was most distinct for the standard for *door openings* at the entrance. The total proportion of dwellings not meeting the existing standard was 11.3%. If replacing this standard with an alternative definition representing the least environmental demand and hence the least

potential accessibility problems, the redefinition of this standard from ≥ 75 to ≥ 83 cm resulted in the total proportion of dwellings not meeting this alternative standard increased to 64.6% (Table 3). Compared to the standard for *door openings* in other parts of the dwelling, the increase in the proportion of dwellings not meeting the alternative standard was not as distinct. The existing standard for *door openings* for entrance doors gave rise to less potential accessibility problems (11.3%) compared to doors to the balcony/terraces (37.2%) and indoors (67.7%). Moreover, when the existing standard for *door opening* indoors was replaced with the alternative standard representing the least environmental demand, the total proportion of dwellings not meeting this standard increased to 89.3%.

Replacing the standard for *passenger loading zones* with alternative standard definitions also gave rise to a noteworthy impact on the proportion of dwellings with potential accessibility problems. Applying the alternative standard definition representing the least environmental demand led to an increase by a factor of four for the total sample (from 10.4 to 41.9%), but for Sweden a factor of seven (from 5 to 35.8%).

For some of the existing standards there was a marked variation among countries; see e.g., *parking spaces far from the entrance* or *stairs/thresholds/difference in level between rooms/floors* (Table 3).

The four curves show that the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems depends on the type profile and the standard in question (Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4).

Concerning the distance from *parking spaces* to the entrance (Fig. 1), the curves demonstrated that the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems was quite similar for the four type profiles. The existing standard at 50 m implied a proportion of 9–18% of the sample defined as having accessibility problems for all four type profiles, compared to 5% or less if the standard definition was altered to 25 m and 25–34% if the standard was set at >50 m. No critical cutoff could be defined for this standard; however, closer the values to a distance of 25 m, the lower was the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems.

When it came to the standard addressing *door openings* at entrances (Fig. 2), the curves show that for the existing standard at ≥ 75 cm, the proportion of individuals within the type profiles not including the use of mobility devices defined as having accessibility problems was 4–5% compared to 57% within the type profiles including the use of mobility devices. If this standard was defined to be ≥ 90 cm, only 1–3% of the total sample was defined to have accessibility problems. The curves of the two type profiles including the use of mobility devices decreased dramatically along with lowering the environmental demand concerning door width.

Table 4 Summary of the extent to which the existing standards compared to the alternative standard definitions representing the least environmental demands (between brackets) impact on the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems in the study: lack of research-based standards for accessible housing: problematization and exemplification of consequences (2011)

Environmental barrier	Type profile			
	Mov (%)	Mov/MD (%)	Mov/UE (%)	Mov/UE/MD (%)
Parking space far from entrance	10 (25)	18 (33)	9 (23)	18 (34)
Narrow door openings (entrance)	0 (5)	10 (67)	1 (4)	9 (67)
Handrails placed too high	16 (31)	17 (48)	20 (37)	16 (44)
Stairs/thresholds/difference in level between rooms/floors	12 (24)	40 (63)	20 (39)	51 (68)

Mov limitation in movement, *Mov/MD* limitation in movement and dependence on mobility devices, *Mov/UE* limitations in movement and upper extremities, *Mov/UE/MD* limitations in movement and upper extremities and dependence on mobility devices

With regard to *handrails placed too high* (Fig. 3), the curves show that the existing standard at 80-cm height resulted in the lowest proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems for all type profiles. The proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems increased most markedly when the standard was defined to 90–100 cm.

The standard concerning *stairs/thresholds/difference in level between rooms/floor spaces* (Fig. 4) demonstrated that the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems applying the existing standard was 40–51% for the two type profiles including the use of mobility devices, compared to 12–20% for the two without. The critical cutoff point was 20 mm for the type profiles including the use of mobility devices, but at 15 mm only 3–7% of the total sample was defined as having accessibility problems.

Table 4 summarizes to which extent the existing standards impact on the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems, compared to the alternative definitions representing the least environmental demands.

Discussion

To the best of our knowledge, the results of the current study are quite unique in that they provide new insights into the role of definition of standards for housing design. The main contribution is the innovative exploration of how standards influence accessibility for persons with different combinations of physical functional limitations and use of mobility devices typical for very old people, and the

examination of how standards impact on the proportion of dwellings considered as accessible. As clearly demonstrated by the results, the definitions of standards determines the proportion of dwellings with environmental barriers and the proportion of individuals defined as having accessibility problems. Depending on the functional type profile and standard in question, the magnitude of influence of the standards differs in extent. According to the extrapolations of accessibility problems (Figs. 1, 2, 3, 4), type profiles including the use of mobility devices are more sensitive to the housing design. That is, accessibility problems for the individuals represented by these type profiles decrease with standard definitions representing less environmental demand, which is in line with anthropometric research (Paquet and Feathers 2004). Moreover, for some standards the alternative definitions representing less environmental demands has a marked impact on the proportion of dwellings that do not meet these alternative standards. Thus, from a planning perspective, these explorations indicate the importance of determining standards on a qualified decision base, as the definition of standards has implications for the proportion of individuals that potentially has accessibility problems and the proportion of dwellings that society considers as accessible.

Another important contribution is the methodology employed, allowing for specific reading of the consequences of redefining the environmental demand of the standard definitions and, hence, the investigation of which groups of persons will be in—or excluded by the definition of standards (Keates and Clarkson 2004). Our findings support current conclusions stressing the necessity to apply research results to policy and standard development (Steinfeld et al. 2010) to ensure that the standards actually lead to enhanced accessibility for the intended population.

Seen in the light of the magnitude of influence that standard definitions have on housing design and accessibility problems, it is potential public health problem if the standards do not enable mobility and participation. Based on the results of our initial literature review, we conclude that the expertise and understanding informing the standards, suffers from *knowledge instability* (Persson and Sahlin 2008). That is, there is a lack of research supporting the definition of standards, which may also explain why standards for housing design vary among countries and over time (Helle et al. 2010; Iwarsson et al. 2005). Considering the number of persons living with functional limitations and the increasing aging population, research contributing to development of standards leading to the design of accessible environments is important to accommodate the well-being and health (Wilcock 2006).

Moreover, it is interesting to note that in the literature review, although limited to studies on physical functional limitations among adults, the seven publications included

only targeted wheeled mobility users (Steinfeld et al. 2004, 2010; D'Souza et al. 2009; Paquet and Feathers 2004; Kozey and Das 2004; Ringaert et al. 2001; Das and Kozey 1999). Viewed in the light of the fact that there are a much larger proportion of e.g., rollator users in the older population (Kaye et al. 2000), there is a research gap related to the development of standards. Maybe researchers prioritize wheelchair users since this group is considered to have the largest implication on housing design. Nevertheless, persons using other mobility devices may encounter different kinds of accessibility problems, deserving explicit attention. In fact, since only 15 persons in our large study sample used a wheelchair compared to 380 persons using other types of mobility devices (about the half were rollator users), we now know that mobility device users in general make large demands on the housing design, which to the best of our knowledge was hitherto unknown. According to Kozey and Das (2004), also when it comes to the number of sub-groups within the wheelchair user population, more knowledge is needed to be able to design environments that match the requirements of these individuals. In other words, there is a need to generate more knowledge on person–environment fit interactions to insure access for as many as possible (Keates and Clarkson 2004).

From a public health perspective, the development of valid standards will benefit health promotion and prevention of ill health for persons with functional limitations (Wilcock 2006). Accordingly, it is problematic if assumptions and convictions rather than empirical investigations will continue to inform the definitions of standards. Research has shown that that very old people want to have an active everyday life and participate in society (Dahlin-Ivanoff et al. 2007; Haak et al. 2007) and that those living in accessible housing perceive their dwellings as more meaningful and useful in relation to carrying out daily activities (Oswald et al. 2007). Therefore, considerations of such aspects of housing have implications for healthy aging in place. Although public health acknowledges environments as being imperative to health (Andersson and Ejlertsson 2009), research targeting the relationship of housing design and health are seldom addressed. In this respect, the development of standards leading to the design of home environments supporting activity and participation is important.

Still, it should be noted that there are critical viewpoints concerning standards for housing design, stressing that the understanding of housing design according to ergonomic standards and criteria of technical efficiency alone is too one-sided a perception (Imrie 2006). According to the proponents of this perspective, standards are deterministic and reflect a reductionist perspective (Burns 2004). While we do acknowledge the relevance of this criticism, we

nevertheless argue that valid standards are imperative to provide designers with such specifications as a management tool. Ambitions to conduct research on standards addressing accessibility instead of universal design could also be questioned, as universal design is gaining increasing international interest among researchers, user organizations, professionals and politicians. The prerequisite of universal design is an existing knowledge base guiding designers in designing as many as possible, but given that the knowledge base within the field of housing design still is very limited, standards are important to guide the design process. However, since accessibility is an objective concept, it does not reflect how persons with functional limitations actually perceive the interaction with the environment. Since other studies based on the ENABLE-AGE data have shown that there are complex relationships between objective and perceived housing (Nygren et al. 2007), future research should also incorporate user perceptions and needs.

One of the strengths of this study is the large empirical data material, based on extensive data collection with very old, single-living Europeans with great variation in housing type, of whom only 155 of the total sample ($N = 1,150$) reported having had housing adaptations. The analysis involving four type profiles of combinations of typical physical functional limitations (Slaug et al. 2010) is a novel and promising approach for future research, as older persons and persons with disability often have several and different functional limitations in combinations (Kaye et al. 2000). Still, the type profiles represent a first exploratory step of using a methodology novel to this area, and further research is required to strengthen their validity, which must be considered when interpreting the results. It should also be kept in mind that although the material is based on real observations, the results presented are theoretical constructions. That is, as long as the standards incorporated in the data collection instrument used have unknown validity, we cannot know if the results reflect the reality. However, the extrapolations and graphical illustrations indicate tendencies on a qualified basis, since they are based on a large data material, a well-defined concept of accessibility and a data collection instrument tested for validity and reliability (Iwarsson and Slaug 2001). Since the data were collected for other purposes, the material available was limited, whereas we might have chosen to study standards for other design features if that had been an option.

To conclude, this study represents a critical stance on how housing standards are defined. Magnitudes of accessibility problems to a great extent depend on how standards are defined, and the determination of standards is of great importance to the proportion of dwellings that society considers accessible. Seen in the light of the crucial role that standards for housing design play in society at large, the study stresses the need for research to contribute to the development

of research-based standard definitions for accessible housing design for the promotion of health and prevention of ill health in persons with functional limitations.

Acknowledgments This study was accomplished within the context of the Centre for Ageing and Supportive Environments (CASE), at Lund University, funded by the Swedish Council for Working Life and Social Research. The study was also supported by funding from the Ribbing Foundation, Lund, Sweden, the Danish Association of Occupational Therapy and the University College Northern Jutland, Aalborg Denmark. The authors would like to thank all study participants, consortium and national team members for their contribution.

References

- Andersson I, Ejlerstsson G (eds) (2009) *Folkhälsa som tvärvetenskap—möten mellan ämnen*. Studentlitteratur, Lund (In Swedish)
- Burns N (2004) Negotiating difference: disabled people's experiences of house builders. *Hous Stud* 19:765–780
- Christiansen CH, Townsend E (2004) *Introduction to occupation the art and science of living*. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ
- Crews DE, Zavotka S (2006) Aging, disability and frailty: implications for universal design. *J Physiol Anthropol* 25:113–118
- D'Souza C, Steinfeld E, Paquet V (2009) Functional reach abilities of wheeled mobility device users: toward inclusive design. In: *Proceedings of the 2009 International Conference on Inclusive Design, INCLUDE 2009*, Royal College of Art, London
- Dahlin-Ivanoff S, Haak M, Fänge A, Iwarsson S (2007) The multiple meaning of home as experienced by very old Swedish people. *Scand J Occup Ther* 14:25–33
- Das B, Kozey JW (1999) Structural anthropometric measures for wheelchair mobile adults. *Appl Ergon* 30:385–390
- Haak M, Dahlin-Ivanoff S, Fänge A, Sixsmith J, Iwarsson S (2007) Home as the locus and origin for participation: experiences among very old Swedish people. *OTJR: Occup Particip Health* 27:95–103
- Helle T, Nygren C, Slaug B, Brandt Å, Pikkariainen A, Hansen A-G, Pétersdóttir E, Iwarsson S (2010) The Nordic housing enabler: inter-rater reliability in cross-Nordic occupational therapy practice. *Scand J Occup Ther* 17:1–9
- Heyl V, Wahl H-W, Mollenkopf H (2005) Visions, out of home activities and emotional well-being in old age: do macro-contexts make a difference? *Int Congr Ser* 1282:147–151
- Imrie R (2006) *Accessible housing, quality, disability and design*. Routledge, London
- Iwarsson S, Slaug B (2001) *The Housing Enabler: an instrument for assessing and analysing accessibility problems in housing*. Veten and Skapen HB and Slaug Data Management, Nävlinge and Staffanstorps
- Iwarsson S, Ståhl A (2003) Accessibility, usability, and universal design: positioning and definition of concepts describing person–environment relationships. *Disabil Rehabil* 25:57–66
- Iwarsson S, Sixsmith J, Oswald F, Wahl H-W, Nygren C, Sixsmith A, Széman Z, Tomsone S (2004) *The ENABLE-AGE project: multi-dimensional methodology for European housing research*. In: Wilkinson N, Hurol Y (eds) *Housing research methodologies*. Urban International, Mersin
- Iwarsson S, Nygren C, Slaug B (2005) Cross national and multi-professional inter-rater reliability of the Housing Enabler. *Scand J Occup Ther* 12:29–39
- Kaye HS, Kang T, LaPlante MP (2000) Mobility devices use in the United States. *Disability Statistics Report 14*. Available from:

- Disability Statistics Center, University of California, San Francisco, 3333 California St., Suite 340, San Francisco, CA 94118
- Keates S, Clarkson PJ (2004) Combining utility usability and accessibility methods for Universal Access. ACM CHI Workshop on Universal Design, Seattle, USA
- Kirkwood BR, Sterne JAC (2003) Medical Statistics Second edition. Blackwell Science Ltd, USA
- Kozey JW, Das B (2004) Determination of the normal and maximum reach measures of adult wheelchair users. *Int J Ind Ergon* 33: 205–213
- Lawton MP, Nahemow L (1973) Ecology and the aging process. In: Eisdorfer C, Lawton MP (eds) *The psychology of adult development and aging*. American psychological association (APA), Washington, DC
- Letts L, Rigby P, Stewart D (2003) *Using Environments to Enable Occupational Performance*. Slack Incorporated, Thorofare, NJ
- Nickpour F, Dong H (2009) Anthropometrics without numbers! An investigation of designers' use and preference of people data. Include 2009, Royal College of Art, April 8–10, 2009, London. Available from <http://www.hhc.rca.ac.uk/2084/all/1/procedings.aspx>
- Nygren C, Oswald F, Iwarsson S, Fänge A, Sixsmith J, Schilling O, Sixsmith A, Széman Z, Tomsone S, Wahl HW (2007) Relationships between objective and perceived housing in very old age. *Gerontologist* 47:85–95
- Oswald F, Wahl H-W, Schilling O, Nygren C, Fänge A, Sixsmith A et al (2007) Relationships between housing and healthy ageing in very old age. *Gerontologist* 47:96–107
- Paquet V, Feathers D (2004) An anthropometric study of manual and powered wheelchair users. *Int J Ind Ergon* 33:191–204
- Persson J, Sahlin N-E (2008) *Risk and Risici*. Bokförlaget Nya Doxa, Nora, Sweden
- Ringaert L, Rapson D, Qui J, Cooper J, Schwedyk E (2001) Determination of new dimensions for universal design codes and standards with consideration of powered wheelchair and scooter users. Universal Design Institute, Faculty of Architecture, University of Manitoba. Website: <http://www.arch.umanitoba.ca/UofM/CIBFD>
- Slaug B, Schilling O, Iwarsson S, Carlsson G (2010) Defining profiles of functional limitations in groups of older persons: how and why? *J Aging Health*. doi:10.1177/0898264310390681
- Statistics Sweden (2005) *Undersökningarna av levnadsförhållanden (ULF)*
- Steinfeld E, Paquet V, Feathers D (2004) Space requirements for wheeled mobility devices. In: *Proceedings of the human factors and ergonomics society 48th annual meeting*
- Steinfeld E, Maisel J, Feathers D, D'Souza C (2010) Anthropometry and standards for wheeled mobility: an international comparison. *Assist Technol* 22:51–67
- Whiteford G (2000) Occupational deprivation: global challenge in the new millennium. *Br J Occup Ther* 63:200–204
- Wilcock A (2006) *An Occupational Perspective on Health*. Second edition. Slack Incorporated, Thorofare, NJ
- <http://www.hi.se>
- <http://www.si-folkesundhed.dk>
- <http://www.un.org>
- <http://www.iso.org>
- http://www.med.lu.se/plain/english/case/methodology_and_technology_platform/methods/the_enabler_concept/the_housing_enabler