

## **CHAPTER 1: ACCESSIBILITY**

Accessibility is a key issue for people with disabilities. It allows for the integration of people with disabilities in society so that they can move around without any restrictions and obstructions and hence participate fully. Lack of accessible buildings, for example, creates serious barriers for people with disabilities.

The policy objective as stated in The White Paper on Integrated National Disability Programme<sup>1</sup> stresses the importance of creating a barrier free society that accommodates the diversity of needs for the entire population. At present the environment is developed in such a way that it hinders the independence and equality of people with disability. This section deals with the surroundings of the disabled person, and how easy it is for him/her to get around with the help of an assistive device and/or with the help of another person. Although questions on transport issues were asked of respondents, the results were too general and vague to be of any value in planning. These questions were, therefore, left out of the final analysis.

Both direct (disabled person) and proxy respondents (someone reporting on behalf of the disabled person) answered this section, which makes the sample for this section the total disabled population (1703 disabled people).

Accessibility is defined as the ability if the disabled person to easily access the rooms and toilet in their dwelling as well various other places and being able to use the facility most of the time. The training of fieldworkers emphasized that accessibility does not only include physical accessibility but also having access to sign language interpreters, braille, and so on.

The accessibility of various places the disabled person might go to which were assessed include:

- Rooms in the dwelling;
- Toilet in the dwelling;
- Work;
- School;
- Shop;
- Places of worship;
- Sport facilities;
- Recreational facilities
- Police station;
- Post office
- Hospitals;
- Clinics;

---

<sup>1</sup> Office on the Status of Disabled People, White paper on the Integrated National Disability Strategy, Office of the Deputy President, November 1997, p 31.

- Bank;
- Hotels;
- Magistrate office.

The main factors that were found to affect accessibility are:

- Type of disability;
- Race;
- Type of area.

Pearson's chi-square and Fisher's exact tests were used and where applicable will be reported on.

### Accessibility of rooms in the dwelling

<i>Accessibility</i>	<i>Frequency of responses</i>	<i>Percentage of respondents (%)</i>
Rooms in the dwelling:		
Yes (accessible)	1521	90
No (not accessible)	176	10
N <sup>2</sup>	1703	100
Toilet:		
Yes (accessible)	1501	88
No (not accessible)	202	12
N	1703	100

**Table 1: Frequency table of the accessibility of the home and toilet**

When asked if the rooms in the house and the toilet are accessible, the overwhelming majority (90%) of the total of population of respondents indicated that the rooms in the home are accessible and 88% said the toilet is accessible. Only 10% said their homes and 12% said that their toilets are not accessible. These data do not tell us whether the person is able to enter into their house.

Before these data can be of any use, they must be disaggregated by type of disability as accessibility issues are different for different disabilities. This is done in the following tables.

<sup>2</sup> Number of valid responses to this question.

***Accessibility of rooms in the dwelling by the type of disability***

<i>Type of disability</i>	<i>Respondents saying rooms are not accessible<sup>3</sup> (%)</i>
Moving around	71
Movement activity	68
Daily life activities	58
Seeing	31
Communication	26
Hearing	19
Emotional disorder	17
Intellectual disabilities	15
Learning difficulties	14

**Table 2: Proportion of respondents whose rooms in the dwelling are not accessible by type of disability**

The population of the above table is based on the 176 respondents (10%) who indicated that their homes are not accessible. When correlating the rooms in the dwelling with the type of disability a person has, the chi-square test showed that there is a significant relationship between movement activity, moving around, daily life activity disability and accessibility in the home.

The data suggests that of the 10% of people that indicated that the rooms in their home are not accessible, 71% have a moving around disability, 68% have a moving activity disability, and 58% have a daily life activity disability. In other words, if you have a moving around, movement activity or daily life activities disability, your home is less likely to be accessible.

The latter disabilities mostly require assistive devices (walking sticks, wheelchairs, prosthesis etc) and therefore need ramps, railings to easily move in and around the home. If it is not provided than the dwelling is often inaccessible.

***Race and the accessibility of rooms in the dwelling***

The data presented in the table below suggest that race has no influence on the accessibility of rooms in the dwelling.

<sup>3</sup> Table 2 is a multiple response table. The percentage of respondents refers to the percentage of the whole sample and therefore adds up to more than 100%, as one person could have indicated to have more than one disability.

Racial groups <sup>4</sup>	Accessibility of Rooms in the dwelling	
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)
African	90	10
Coloured	94	6
Indian*	85	15
White	89	11
<b>% of total population</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>10%</b>

**Table 3: Accessibility of rooms in the dwelling by population group**

*Accessibility of rooms in the dwelling with racial groups and type of area*

Racial groups <sup>5</sup>	Metropolitan areas (not accessible)	Count <sup>6</sup>	Urban or Rural areas (not accessible)	Count
African	6%	437	13%	774
Coloured	1%	70	9%	88
Indian*	15%	98	14%	14
White	15%	107	6%	98
<b>Total</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>712</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>974</b>

**Table 4: Proportion of respondents whose rooms in the dwelling are not accessible by race and type of area**

The above table indicates that there is an urban and rural bias in terms of accessibility of rooms in the dwelling for the different population groups. In metropolitan areas African and Coloured respondents were more likely to consider their homes accessible than those in urban and rural areas.

For the White population, urban and rural homes are more accessible than homes in metropolitan areas. The number of valid responses for the Indian population is too small to draw any significant statistical conclusions.

<sup>4</sup> Pearsons chi-square test for significance for race is  $p=0.087$ .

<sup>5</sup> To test the level of significance Pearson's chi-square test was used for the Africans and White population groups and Fisher's exact test for the Coloured population group. Africans ( $p<0.05$ ), Whites ( $p<0.05$ ) and Coloureds ( $p<0.05$ ). The racial group not significant on Pearson's chi-square test is marked with an \*.

<sup>6</sup> The **Count** refers to the total number of respondents in that category.

### Accessibility of the toilet by the type of disability

Type of disability	% of respondents <sup>7</sup>
Moving around	71
Movement activity	67
Daily life activities	57
Seeing	31
Communication	23
Hearing	18
Intellectual disabilities	16
Learning difficulties	15
Emotional disorder	15

**Table 5: Proportion of respondents whose toilets are not accessible by type of disability**

The population in table 5 is based on the 202 (12%) respondents who said that their toilets are not accessible. Of that 12% of people who said that their toilet is not accessible, 71% has a moving around disability, 67% has a movement activity disability and 57% has a and daily life activities disability. In other words if you have a moving around, movement activity or daily life activity disability your toilet is less likely to be accessible.

This is similar to table 2 that reports on the accessibility of rooms in the dwelling with type of disability. Again, it is those disabilities that mainly require assistive devices such as walking sticks, wheelchairs and so on, that also need ramps, railings, etc. to access the toilet easily.

### *Race and the accessibility of toilets?*

Racial groups <sup>8</sup>	Accessibility of the toilet	
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)
African	88	12
Coloured	94	6
Indian*	84	16
White*	89	11
<b>% of total population</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>12%</b>

**Table 6: Accessibility of the toilet by population group**

The data suggest that race has no influence on the accessibility of the toilet.

<sup>7</sup> Table 5 is a multiple response table. The percentages of respondents refers to the percentages of the whole sample and therefore adds up to more than 100%, as one person could have indicated to have more than one disability.

<sup>8</sup> Pearson's chi-square test for significance for race is  $p=0.084$ .

*Correlation between accessibility of the toilet with racial groups and type of area*

Racial groups <sup>9</sup>	Metropolitan areas (not accessible)	Count	Urban or Rural areas (not accessible)	Count
African	8%	438	15%	777
Coloured	1%	70	10%	88
Indian*	16%	99	14%	14
White*	15%	108	7%	98
<b>Total</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>715</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>977</b>

**Table 7: Proportion of respondents whose toilets are not accessible by race and area**

The above table indicates that there is an urban and rural bias in terms of accessibility of the toilet for the different population groups. In metropolitan areas African and Coloured respondents were more likely to consider their toilets accessible than those urban and rural areas.

For the White population group there are no significance between race and accessibility and for the Indian population the count is too low for any significant statistical conclusions.

**Accessibility of various other places**

In the questionnaire respondents had five options to choose from when answering whether a particular place was accessible or not. These were: yes (accessible), no (not accessible), never go there, not applicable and none available. In this analysis we only focused on two of the options, yes (accessible) and no (not accessible).

In the training of the fieldworkers we emphasized that accessibility does not only include physical accessibility but also having access to sign language interpreters, braille etc.

<sup>9</sup> To test the level of significance Pearson's chi-square test was used for the African and Coloured population groups. Africans ( $p \geq 0.05$ ) and Coloureds ( $p < 0.05$ ). Racial groups that were not significant on Pearson's chi-square test are marked with an \*.

*Accessibility at work*

Type of disability	Accessibility at work		Count
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)	
Moving around	50	50	124
Daily life activity	51	50	111
Movement activity	56	44	141
Communication	57	43	42
Intellectual disability	57	43	49
Emotional disorder	63	37	393
Seeing	69	31	116
Hearing	75	25	76
Learning difficulties	77	23	43
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>393</b>

**Table 8: Accessibility at work**

Thirty three percent of the total disability population indicated problems with accessibility in the work place. People with moving around disability (50%), daily life activities (50%) and movement activity disabilities (44%) have the biggest problems in accessing the work place.

*Accessibility at school*

Type of disability	Accessibility at school		Count
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)	
Moving around	58	43	113
Movement activity	61	39	142
Daily life activity	65	35	123
Intellectual disability	74	26	112
Seeing	77	23	129
Emotional disorder	77	23	96
Communication	78	22	88
Hearing	87	13	109
Learning difficulties	88	12	198
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>559</b>

**Table 9: Accessibility at school**

Twenty one percent of the total disability population have problems in accessing schools. People with moving around disability (43%), movement activity disabilities (39%) and daily life activity

disabilities (35%) had problems in accessing the school. This is followed by a least degree of difficulty by people with hearing disabilities and learning difficulties.

### *Accessibility at shops*

Type of disability	Accessibility at the shop		Count
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)	
Moving around	57	43	411
Movement activity	64	36	478
Daily life activity	68	32	417
Seeing	76	24	388
Communication	80	20	182
Emotional disorder	83	17	275
Hearing	85	15	265
Intellectual disability	85	15	249
Learning difficulties	90	10	289
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>1438</b>

**Table 10: Accessibility at the shop**

One fifth of the total population indicated that they have accessibility problems at shops. Data suggests that people with a moving around (43%), movement activity (36%) and daily life activities (32%) and seeing (24%) disabilities have the biggest problems with accessibility in shops. These are followed by respondents with a hearing disability (15%), intellectual disability (15%) and learning difficulties (10%) who also indicated some degree of difficulty in accessing shops.

### *Accessibility at place of worship*

Type of disability	Accessibility at place of worship		Count
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)	
Moving around	61	39	390
Movement activity	69	31	456
Daily life activity	70	30	399
Seeing	79	21	373
Communication	82	18	183
Intellectual disability	84	17	218
Emotional disorder	85	15	236
Hearing	86	14	252
Learning difficulties	90	10	269
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>1328</b>

**Table 11: Accessibility at place of worship**



Eighteen percent of the total disability population indicated that they have difficulty in accessing their places of worship. Respondents with a with moving around disability (39%), movement activity disability (31%) and daily life activity disabilities (30%) mainly indicated as having difficulty in accessing places of worship. Respondents with learning difficulties also appear to have problems with accessing places of worship.

#### *Accessibility at recreational facilities*

Type of disability	Accessibility at recreational facilities		Count
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)	
Moving around	51	49	144
Movement activity	60	40	182
Daily life activity	61	39	137
Seeing	69	31	125
Intellectual disability	71	29	87
Emotional disorder	73	27	106
Communication	80	20	85
Hearing	85	16	110
Learning difficulties	89	11	140
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>579</b>

**Table 12: Accessibility at recreational facilities**

Twenty four of the total disability population indicated as having problems in accessing recreational facilities. The biggest problems in accessing recreational facilities are for respondents with a moving around disability, movement activity disability, daily life activity disabilities and seeing disabilities. Hearing disabilities and learning disabilities respondents also indicated, to a lesser degree, difficulty in accessing recreational facilities.

**Accessibility at sport facilities**

Type of disability	Accessibility at sports facilities		Count
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)	
Moving around	48	52	161
Movement activity	60	40	199
Daily life activity	64	36	155
Emotional disorder	74	26	129
Seeing	76	24	148
Communication	79	21	98
Intellectual disability	79	21	114
Learning difficulties	86	14	190
Hearing	87	13	126
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>683</b>

**Table 13: Accessibility at sports facilities**

Twenty three percent of the total disability population said they have problems in accessing sport facilities and 77% said they don't have any problems. Respondents with movement activity disabilities, moving around disabilities and daily life activity problems have the most difficulty in accessing sport facilities. People with hearing and learning disabilities also showed some problems in accessing sport facilities.

**Accessibility the police station**

Type of disability	Accessibility at police stations		Count
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)	
Moving around	55	45	252
Movement activity	62	38	289
Daily life activity	63	37	230
Intellectual disability	71	29	96
Communication	72	28	81
Emotional disorder	74	26	134
Seeing	76	24	230
Learning difficulties	80	20	122
Hearing	83	17	162
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>805</b>

**Table 14: Accessibility at police stations**

Twenty five percent of the total disability population said they have difficulty in accessing police stations. The highest percentage of people had moving around disabilities (45%), movement

activity disabilities (38%) and daily life activity disabilities (37%). A smaller percentage (17%) of people with hearing disabilities also indicated some difficulty in accessing police stations.

*Accessibility at a magistrates office*

Type of disability	Accessibility at magistrate offices		Count
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)	
Moving around	54	46	255
Movement activity	62	38	297
Daily life activity	62	38	242
Communication	65	35	83
Seeing	70	30	232
Emotional disorder	71	29	144
Intellectual disability	72	28	96
Learning difficulties	79	21	120
Hearing	83	17	158
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>814</b>

**Table 15: Accessibility at the magistrates office**

Twenty seven percent of the total disability population had difficulty in accessing magistrate offices. The majority being people with moving around disabilities, movement activity disabilities and daily life activity disabilities. People with hearing disabilities also had difficulty in accessing magistrate offices.

*Accessibility post office*

Type of disability	Accessibility at the post office		Count
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)	
Moving around	58	42	315
Movement activity	65	35	366
Daily life activity	65	35	295
Intellectual disability	72	28	121
Communication	76	24	107
Seeing	77	23	308
Emotional disorder	78	22	172
Learning difficulties	85	15	169
Hearing	87	13	201
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>1039</b>

**Table 16: Accessibility at the post office**

Twenty two percent of people indicated having difficulty in accessing post offices. They are mainly people with moving around disabilities, movement activity disabilities and daily life activity disabilities. To a lesser extent respondents with a hearing disability and learning difficulties also showed difficulty in accessing post offices.

***Accessibility at the bank***

<b>Type of disability</b>	<b>Accessibility at the bank</b>		<b>Count</b>
	<b>Yes (accessible)</b>	<b>No (not accessible)</b>	
Moving around	60	40	303
Daily life activity	63	37	270
Intellectual disability	65	35	105
Movement activity	67	33	341
Communication	69	31	96
Emotional disorder	69	31	146
Seeing	74	26	282
Learning difficulties	77	23	125
Hearing	84	16	173
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>919</b>

**Table 17: Accessibility at the bank**

Twenty five percent of the total disability population has difficulty in accessing banks. They are primarily people with moving around disabilities, movement activity disabilities, daily life activity disabilities and intellectual disabilities. A smaller percentage of respondents with hearing disabilities indicated some difficulty in accessing banks.

***Accessibility at the hospital***

<b>Type of disability</b>	<b>Accessibility at the hospital</b>		<b>Count</b>
	<b>Yes (accessible)</b>	<b>No (not accessible)</b>	
Moving around	73	27	487
Daily life activity	76	24	496
Movement activity	78	22	554
Communication	82	18	219
Intellectual disability	82	18	267
Seeing	83	17	414
Hearing	85	15	279
Emotional disorder	85	15	297
Learning difficulties	87	13	286
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>1511</b>

**Table 18: Accessibility at the hospital**

Only 16% of the total disability population indicated some difficulty in accessing hospital. They are mainly people with moving around disabilities, daily life activity disabilities and movement activity disabilities.

***Accessibility at a primary health care clinic***

Type of disability	Accessibility at a primary health care clinic		Count
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)	
Moving around	73	27	458
Movement activity	78	22	520
Daily life activity	78	22	464
Seeing	84	17	388
Communication	85	15	205
Intellectual disability	85	15	263
Hearing	86	14	249
Emotional disorder	87	13	285
Learning difficulties	89	11	277
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>1423</b>

**Table 19: Accessibility at primary health care clinics**

Sixteen percent of the total disability population indicated difficulty in accessing primary health care clinics. They people with moving around disabilities, movement activity disabilities and daily life activity disabilities. Again people with learning difficulties indicated some problem in accessing primary health care clinics.

***Accessibility at hotels***

Type of disability	Accessibility at hotels		Count
	Yes (accessible)	No (not accessible)	
Moving around	51	49	98
Intellectual disability	58	42	43
Daily life activity	60	40	90
Movement activity	63	37	125
Emotional disorder	64	37	63
Communication	69	31	49
Seeing	70	30	99
Learning difficulties	71	29	59
Hearing	77	23	75
<b>Average percentage of total population</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>370</b>

**Table 20: Accessibility at hotels**

Twenty nine percent of people have problems in accessing hotels. They are people with moving around disabilities, movement activity disabilities and daily life activity disabilities. People with intellectual disabilities also showed some difficulty in accessing hotels.

**Main observations:**

From the above results it is clear that accessibility was narrowly understood to only mean physical accessibility and that may be why mostly moving around, movement activity and daily life activity disabilities came up with high scores for inaccessibility.

It is also evident that accessibility is not much of an issue for the other types of disabilities or it is so much of an issue that the person just does not go to these places (e.g. people with communication disabilities not accessing banks) and are therefore never confronted with accessibility issues.

*[Question to readers: Would it be useful to add in the stats for 'never go' etc. to compare with the inaccessible percentages? The two together might in fact provide a fuller picture of the accessibility situation.]*