

*Scripps Gerontology Center*

*Scripps Gerontology Center Publications*

---

*Miami University*

*Year 2008*

---

2007 Ohio Residential Care Facility  
Resident Satisfaction Survey: Instrument  
Refinements

Jane Straker  
strakejk@muohio.edu

J S. Brown  
sbrow@muohio.edu



# 2007 Ohio Residential Care Facility Resident Satisfaction Survey: Instrument Refinements

Prepared for Vital Research, LLC and the Ohio Department of Aging

Jane K. Straker  
J. Scott Brown



Miami University  
Oxford, OH 45056

March 2008

[www.scrippsaging.org](http://www.scrippsaging.org)

## **Acknowledgments**

Thanks to Kirsten Long and Amber Hawkins for their behavioral coding of interviews and the interviewers themselves. Thanks also to Kelly Fischer and Gwen Uman at Vital Research, LLC for their provision of statewide data and other information regarding the survey process. Kelly also assisted with finding facilities and working with interviewers and administrators to secure access for our behavioral coding observers. As always, they were incredibly helpful. Thanks also to Erin Pettegrew and Beverley Laubert at the Ohio Department of Aging for their comments on earlier survey refinements. All of their work will help to improve Ohio's statewide RCF satisfaction survey.

## **Background**

This report describes a number of analyses that were conducted for the purposes of public reporting of consumer satisfaction data from Ohio's residential care facilities and refining the survey to determine whether questions should be dropped in the future. The Ohio Residential Care Facility (RCF) Resident Satisfaction Survey was developed by the Scripps Gerontology Center at Miami University and the Margaret Blenkner Research Institute at Benjamin Rose in 2006. At that time, we conducted a limited pretest with data from 102 residents in 9 nursing homes. Factor analyses and scale reliability provided information to confirm domain constructions and determine some questions that could be eliminated. These survey refinements were made prior to statewide survey administration in 2007. However, because of the limited number of written survey responses received in the pretest the survey development team recommended that future statewide surveys be conducted using face-to-face interviews and that additional psychometric work be conducted after data collection. The RCF satisfaction survey interviews were conducted in the fall 2007. This report details the psychometric analyses conducted on the statewide data.

Over 9000 interviews were conducted with residents in 529 Ohio residential care facilities. The data from those interviews provide the basis for this psychometric work. For the questions in these analyses, the number of respondents ranged from about 6,000 to over 9,000. Results assisted in developing the list of questions to be included in each domain for domain score calculation reported on Ohio's long-term care consumer guide website at [www.ltcoho.org](http://www.ltcoho.org).

Results from a battery of psychometric analyses determined which domains of the survey showed good fit and reliability and, on the other hand, which questions on the survey should be

eliminated. First, this report provides a brief overview of the different psychometric approaches utilized, then this is followed by domain-specific findings and recommendations.

Psychometric analyses conducted included four different approaches to scale reliability and validity testing: Cronbach's coefficient alpha, two different approaches to Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) using structural equation modeling. Cronbach's alpha tests the internal consistency of a group of questions in a domain, i.e., do the questions in domain all appear to be measuring the same idea (are they positively and moderately correlated with one another?). Alpha coefficients of .59 and below are considered low; and .60 to .89 is considered acceptable for research or group decision-making. The researchers used SPSS version 15.0 to compute coefficient alpha.

EFA and CFA assess domain validity, i.e., whether the domains measure what the researchers believe that they measure. EFAs were conducted in two ways. First, EFA was applied to each domain separately to examine domain validity; these analyses are referred to as 'domain EFA' hereafter. Second, EFA was applied to the full battery of 52 questions to validate the number and composition of factors underlying the 52 questions; these analyses are referred to as 'full EFA' hereafter. Each EFA was conducted using varimax rotation. In all cases, factors were identified where eigenvalues exceeded 1.0. A question was considered to load on a factor if its loading exceeded 0.4; questions with loadings between 0.4 and 0.5 were treated with particular caution. If a question loaded at 0.4 on more than one factor, it was placed within the factor on which its loading was highest (i.e., for the three cases where the question loaded on two domains at more than 0.4, the question was placed within the domain with the highest loading — in all three cases the primary loading was well above 0.5 and the secondary loading was just above 0.4). Researchers used SPSS version 15.0 to conduct all EFAs.

CFA models were examined using AMOS 7.0 software. CFA models match the EFA domain technique, but use more stringent modeling constraints to verify validity. [Good scale consistency in these analyses is demonstrated if good or adequate model fit is obtained]. Model fit was assessed using three standard indicators: Model Chi-square (good fit indicated by non-significance except in large samples where non-significance is difficult to obtain), the Incremental Fit Index (good fit = .95 to 1.00; adequate fit = .90 to .95), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA — good fit < .05; adequate fit .05 to .10). The CFA models also allow for more direct testing of the adequacy of domain reorganization.

**Reliability Analysis**

The 2007 questionnaire consisted of 52 questions grouped into 9 domains of residential care life: activities, choice, care and services, employees, communication, meals and dining, laundry, environment, and general satisfaction. Table 1 shows the 52 questions and their original domains, the domain alpha coefficients, and the recalculated alpha when a question is removed from the domain (Alpha Question Deleted). For some domains, the alpha coefficient could be improved by removing questions from the domain. Factor analysis provides a follow-up strategy for determining more optimal domain constructions.

**Table 1. Original Domain Reliability**

<u>Domain</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Alpha: Question Deleted</u>	<u>Alpha Coefficient</u>
<b>Activities</b>			.680
	1. Do you have enough to do here?	.565	
	2. Do you get enough information about the activities offered here?	.631	
	3. Are you satisfied with the activities offered here?	.532	
	4. Can you go where you want to go?	.700	
<b>Choice</b>			.604
	5. Can you get snacks and drinks whenever you want them?	.650	
	6. Can you go to bed when you like?	.565	

<u>Domain</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Alpha: Question Deleted</u>	<u>Alpha Coefficient</u>
	7. Do the employees leave you alone if you don't want to do anything?	.549	
	8. Do the employees let you do the things you want to do for yourself?	.530	
	9. Are you free to come and go as you are able?	.544	
	10. Are the rules here reasonable?	.540	
<b>Care and Services</b>			<b>.507</b>
	11. Do you get the care and services that you need?	.294	
	12. Do the employees explain your care and services to you?	.433	
	13. Do you get your medications on time?	.490	
<b>Employees</b>			<b>.835</b>
	14. Are the employees courteous to you?	.824	
	15. Can you depend on the employees?	.816	
	16. Are the employees here friendly to you?	.823	
	17. Do the employees treat you with respect?	.823	
	18. Do the employees who take care of you know what you like and don't like?	.842	
	19. During the week, are employees available to help you if you need it?	.815	
	20. During the weekend, are employees available to help you if you need it?	.816	
	21. During the evening and night, are employees available to help you if you need it?	.816	
	22. Do you feel confident that the employees know how to do their job well?	.817	
	23. Overall, are you satisfied with the employees who care for you?	.811	
<b>Communications</b>			<b>.677</b>
	24. Are the people in charge available to talk with you?	.600	
	25. Do the people in charge treat you with respect?	.632	
	26. Would you feel comfortable making a complaint?	.666	
	27. Do you know who to go to here when you have a problem?	.643	
	28. Do your problems get taken care of?	.591	
<b>Meals and Dining</b>			<b>.736</b>
	29. Do you get enough to eat?	.731	
	30. Is the food here tasty?	.658	
	31. Can you get the foods you like?	.678	
	32. Is your food served at the right temperature?	.694	
	33. Is the dining area a pleasant place for you to eat?	.725	
	34. Do you like the way your meals are served here?	.687	
<b>Laundry</b>			<b>.597</b>

<u>Domain</u>	<u>Question</u>	<u>Alpha: Question Deleted</u>	<u>Alpha Coefficient</u>
	35. Do you get your clothing back from the laundry?	N/A	
	36. Does your clothing come back from the laundry in good condition?	N/A	
<b>Environment</b>			.832
	37. Do you like the location of this place?	.825	
	38. Are the outside walkways and grounds well taken care of?	.823	
	39. Does this place look attractive to you?	.811	
	40. Is this place kept clean enough for you?	.819	
	41. Do you have enough privacy in your room or apartment?	.820	
	42. Is this place quiet when it should be?	.824	
	43. Are you satisfied with your room or apartment?	.815	
	44. Do you feel safe here?	.817	
	45. Are your belongings safe here?	.825	
	46. Do you feel comfortable here?	.809	
	47. Do you think this is an appealing place for people to visit?	.812	
<b>General</b>			.742
	48. Do the people who live here fit in well with each other?	.734	
	49. Are you treated fairly here?	.723	
	50. Do you feel like you are getting your money's worth here?	.692	
	51. Overall, do you like living here?	.670	
	52. Would you recommend this place to a family member or friend?	.652	
<b>Overall Satisfaction (52 Questions)</b>			.889

### **Factor Analysis for Domain Construction**

The following sections describe the factor analyses undertaken to determine whether current domain constructions were the best that could be obtained or whether some reconstructions were necessary. Because domain scores as well as individual question scores are reported on the consumer guide web site it is important for those scores to be as valid as possible.

#### Activities:

While Cronbach's alpha when including all four activities questions was adequate (.68), further analyses revealed better reliability when Question 4, "Can you go where you want to go



(either with help or on your own)?" was removed ( $\alpha = .70$ ). Domain EFAs were consistent with this finding. The four questions loaded on a single factor, but Question 4 exhibited the weakest association among the questions. Full EFA further confirmed this finding by identifying Questions 1, 2, and 3 as a single factor. In these analyses, Question 4 loaded instead with the questions from the Choice domain. CFA of the four questions confirmed validity, as well as the weak association of Question 4 with the other three activities domain questions. The results consistently demonstrated that Question 4 should be excluded from the activities domain.

#### Choice:

The Choice domain includes 6 questions (Question 5 through Question 10) that together demonstrated adequate scale reliability ( $\alpha = .60$ ). However, further analyses showed that removing Question 5, "Can you get snacks and drinks whenever you want them?" increased domain reliability ( $\alpha = .65$ ). Domain EFA confirmed this finding by identifying a single factor across the six questions with Question 5 showing the weakest association within the domain. The full EFA generally confirmed these findings with Questions 6, 7, 8, and 9 demonstrating strong scale cohesiveness while Question 5 was not associated with the other questions in the Choice domain. CFA of all six questions demonstrated adequate fit with all questions loading well except Question 5, further confirming the previous analyses. The results consistently showed that Question 5 should be removed from the Choice domain.

#### Care and Services:

Initial analyses suggested only marginal scale reliability for the three questions (Questions 11, 12, and 13) in this domain ( $\alpha = .51$ ). Adding Question 5 from the original Choice domain and Question 18 ("Do the employees who take care of you know what you like and don't like?") from the Employees domain while also removing Question 11 ("Do you get the

care and services that you need?") modestly increased the domain reliability ( $\alpha = .53$ ). Domain EFA identified a single factor across the original three domain questions. Additional analyses were conducted including Questions 5, 12, 13, and 18 and removing Question 11. These results demonstrated good domain reliability. Full EFA identified Questions 5, 12, and 18 as a single factor, with Question 13 loading somewhat more weakly than the other three questions. Question 11 was not associated with Questions from this or any other domain. CFA of the three original Care and Services questions demonstrated adequate fit, indicating marginal scale validity. Additional CFA including Questions 5, 12, 13, and 18 demonstrated excellent scale validity. Thus, results suggested that Questions 5 and 18 should be added to Questions 12 and 13 to comprise the Care and Services domain.

#### Employees:

Though a single domain across ten questions was originally intended for the Employees domain, the discussion here is divided into two sections because two separate factors in the Employees domain were indicated across all factor analyses. The first factor is comprised of those questions that relate to Employee Relations (Questions 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18). Reliability tests for these original questions indicated good scale reliability ( $\alpha = .70$ ). However, since analyses above noted the need to move Question 18 ("Do the employees who take care of you know what you like and dislike?") to the Care and Services domain, reliability tests were reexamined using the four remaining questions which demonstrated improved reliability ( $\alpha = .76$ ). Domain EFA verifies these findings by identifying a factor comprised of Questions 14 through 17. Question 18 does not load with any other Employees domain questions. This finding is mirrored exactly in the full EFA, and CFA results excluding Question 18 from the Employee Relations domain showed excellent scale validity.

The second factor within the original questions of the Employees domain was comprised of those questions that relate to Employee Responsiveness (Questions 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23). Analyses indicated an excellent scale reliability for these questions ( $\alpha = .81$ ). Domain EFA verified these findings by identifying a factor comprised of Questions 19 through 23. These findings are mirrored exactly in the full EFA. CFA including all five questions, however, showed problems with domain validity. A careful examination of the EFA results showed that Question 23 (“Overall, are you satisfied with the employees who care for you?”) was the most weakly associated question within the Employee domain. CFA models were reexamined excluding Question 23, and these analyses demonstrated very good scale validity.

Results clearly indicated the need to remove Question 18 from the Employee domains (and as noted above, the question was moved to the Care and Services domain). Results also showed that Question 23 should not be included in constructing the ‘Responsiveness’ factor within the Employee domain. Additional scale reliability testing showed no diminished adequacy when both these questions were removed ( $\alpha = .80$ ).

#### Communications:

Analyses indicated good scale reliability for the five questions of the Communications domain ( $\alpha = .68$ ). Domain EFA identified a single factor, and full EFA verified the consistency of Questions 24 through 28 as a reliable scale. CFA models demonstrated good scale validity with all five questions loading adequately. Thus, all analyses verify that the Communications domain composed of Questions 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28 is adequate as originally constructed.

### Meals and Dining:

Analyses of the Meals and Dining domain indicated excellent scale reliability of the six questions originally included in this domain ( $\alpha = .74$ ). However, removing Question 33 (“Is the dining area a pleasant place for you to eat?”) did not alter scale reliability, indicating that this question may be redundant within the scale. Domain EFA of Questions 29 through 33 identified a single factor. Full EFA identified Questions 30, 31, 32, and 34 as a single factor, with Question 29 loading only weakly with this domain. Question 33, on the other hand, was not associated with any of the domain domains in the data. CFA models of the original six questions demonstrated poor domain validity. A reduced CFA excluding Question 33 demonstrated adequate validity, confirming the findings from the EFA models ( $\alpha = .73$ ). Thus, results show that Question 33 should be excluded from the Meals and Dining domain.

### Laundry:

Analyses for this domain are limited due to there being only two questions in the scale (specifically, domain EFA and CFA are not appropriate for use with only two scale questions). Analyses of these two measures indicated adequate scale reliability ( $\alpha = .60$ ). Full EFA identified Question 35 and Question 36 as a distinct single factor, verifying the Laundry domain to be adequate as originally constructed.

### Environment:

Excellent scale reliability was indicated across all 11 original Environment domain questions ( $\alpha = .83$ ), though removing any single question from the scale resulted in little change in the scale reliability, suggesting some redundancy across these questions. Domain EFA verified the scale consistency identifying a single factor for all 11 questions. Full EFA, however, provided inconsistent scaling results dividing the questions with Questions 38, 39, 40, and 42

loading together on a separate Environment factor and Questions 37, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, and 47 loading with some questions from the General domain. Confirming the full EFA findings, CFA demonstrated marginal validity when fitting all 11 questions.

A substantive reexamination of the questions included in the original Environment domain suggested a division of these questions into two domains. The first of these domains, Facility Environment, included Questions 37, 38, 39, 40, and 42. A reduced CFA model confirmed good scale validity for this reduced domain. The second of the domains, Resident Environment, included Questions 41, 43, 44, 45, and 47. A reduced CFA model also confirmed adequate scale reliability for this reduced domain. Subsequent reliability analyses verified scale reliability for both Facility Environment ( $\alpha = .68$ ) and Resident Environment ( $\alpha = .71$ ). Question 46 was not associated with either subdivision of the original Environment domain.

#### General:

Reliability analyses for the General domain indicated very good scale reliability across all five original questions ( $\alpha = .74$ ). However, it should be noted that removing Question 48 (“Do the people who live here fit in well with each other?”) had no effect on scale reliability. Domain EFA identified a single factor including Questions 48, 49, 50, 51, and 52, though Question 48 was most weakly associated with the other questions. Full EFA identified a single factor comprised of Questions 49, 50, 51, and 52 from the General domain as well as several questions from the Environment domain. Question 48 did not load with any factor. CFA models demonstrated adequate scale validity using all five original General domain questions, though Question 48 was again the most weakly associated question. Additional CFA excluding Question 48 showed improved scale validity. Because Question 46 from the original Environment domain (“Do you feel comfortable here?”) exhibited strong associations with many of the General

domain questions, a CFA model including it with Questions 50, 51, and 52 was examined. This scaling demonstrated excellent validity with all questions having strong associations with one another. Additional analyses verified that this 4-question General domain exhibited excellent scale reliability ( $\alpha = .76$ ).

Table 2 shows the questions in the final domains, the reliability for each domain and the factor loading of each question on the domain.

**Table 2. Revised Domains and Future Survey Refinements**

Questions		Factor Loadings
<b>Activities</b> ( $\alpha = .70$ )		
1	Do you have enough to do here?	.820
2	Do you get enough information about the activities offered here?	.704
3	Are you satisfied with the activities offered here?	.841
<b>Choice</b> ( $\alpha = .65$ )		
6	Can you go to bed when you like?	.557
7	Do the employees leave you alone if you don't want to do anything?	.667
8	Do the employees let you do the things you want to do for yourself?	.725
9	Are you free to come and go as you are able?	.642
10	Are the rules here reasonable?	.622
<b>Care and Services</b> ( $\alpha = .53$ )		
5	Can you get snacks and drinks whenever you want them?	.585
12	Do the employees explain your care and services to you?	.741
13	Do you get your medications on time?	.564
18	Do the employees who take care of you know what you like and don't like?	.690
<b>Employee Relations (was "Employees")</b> ( $\alpha = .76$ )		
14	Are the employees courteous to you?	.799
15	Can you depend on the employees?	.688
16	Are the employees here friendly to you?	.818
17	Do the employees treat you with respect?	.808

Questions		Factor Loadings
<b>Employee Responsiveness (was “Employees”) (alpha = .78)</b>		
19	During the week, are employees available to help you if you need it?	.785
20	During the weekend, are employees available to help you if you need it?	.839
21	During the evening and night, are employees available to help you if you need it?	.839
22	Do you feel confident that the employees know how to do their job well?	.636
<b>Communications (alpha = .68)</b>		
24	Are the people in charge available to talk with you?	.739
25	Do the people in charge treat you with respect?	.713
26	Would you feel comfortable making a complaint?	.586
27	Do you know who to go to here when you have a problem?	.595
28	Do your problems get taken care of?	.741
<b>Meals and Dining (alpha = .73)</b>		
29	Do you get enough to eat?	.528
30	Is the food here tasty?	.792
31	Can you get the foods you like?	.757
32	Is your food served at the right temperature?	.693
34	Do you like the way your meals are served here?	.673
<b>Laundry (alpha = .60)</b>		
35	Do you get your clothing back from the laundry?	.767
36	Does your clothing come back from the laundry in good condition?	.731
<b>Facility Environment (was Environment) (alpha = .68)</b>		
37	Do you like the location of this place?	.626
38	Are the outside walkways and grounds well taken care of?	.682
39	Does this place look attractive to you?	.765
40	Is this place kept clean enough for you?	.656
42	Is this place quiet when it should be?	.579
<b>Resident Environment (was Environment) (alpha = .71)</b>		
41	Do you have enough privacy in your room or apartment?	.671
43	Are you satisfied with your room or apartment?	.694

Questions		Factor Loadings
44	Do you feel safe here?	.709
45	Are your belongings safe here?	.672
47	Do you think this is an appealing place for people to visit?	.688
<b>General</b> (alpha = .76)		
46	Do you feel comfortable here?	.735
50	Do you feel like you are getting your money's worth here?	.721
51	Overall, do you like living here?	.814
52	Would you recommend this place to a family member or friend?	.830

### **Survey Refinements**

The reworking of these domain domains indicated that the following questions should not be included when calculating scale scores from the survey:

Question 4. “Can you go where you want to go?”

Question 11. “Do you get the care and services that you need?”

Question 23. “Overall, are you satisfied with the employees who care for you?”

Question 33. “Is the dining area a pleasant place for you to eat?”

Question 48. “Do the people who live here fit in well with each other?”

Question 49. “Are you treated fairly here?”

Because these questions weaken domain construction, we verified their removal using two additional strategies: comments from interviewers were reviewed and behavioral coding was performed.

At the end of data collection, exit interviews and surveys were completed by Vital Research, LLC. Comments on the instrument were provided to Scripps for review. An overarching comment on the RCF survey indicated that interviewers noted that some questions



felt redundant to others. Others noted that respondents didn't understand what was meant. None of the interviewer evidence suggested a compelling reason for retaining the questions.

Behavioral coding was performed by Scripps researchers on 12 interviews. Behavioral coding notes all interviewer errors in reading and all respondent requests for clarification or repeats. Interviewer errors often provide clues regarding how questions might be changed to be read more comfortably. Respondent difficulties suggest where question probes might be added, or wording changed. This necessary step had not been performed prior to statewide survey implementation since the survey development and pretest was geared toward producing a self-administered written survey. When interviews are chosen as the preferred mode of survey administration, behavioral coding provides some additional illumination regarding question wording and question order.

The behavioral coding observations confirmed interviewer comments about resident perceptions of redundancy and/or not understanding exactly what was meant by the question. Question 4 elicited eight requests for clarification from the interviewers. Removal of this question will both strengthen the overall survey and improve the interview process. The remaining questions identified for removal performed well in behavior coding suggesting that their weak performance in survey reliability was not likely due to interviewer error.

In addition to the revised domains shown above, the following refinements are suggested for the 2009 statewide residential care facility survey.

**Table 3. Recommended Survey Refinements**

<b>Existing Question</b>	<b>Modified Question</b>
5. Can you get snacks and drinks whenever you want them?	Can you get snacks and drinks whenever you want <i>to</i> ?
8. Do the employees let you do the things you want to do for yourself?	<i>Are you allowed to</i> do the things you want to do for yourself?
12. Do the employees explain your care and services to you?	Add probes for care and probes for services.
16. Are the employees here friendly to you?	<i>Are the people who work here</i> friendly? (Question matches nursing home resident survey.).
22. Do you feel confident that the employees know how to do their job well?	Do you feel confident that the employees know how to do their jobs?
26. Would you feel comfortable making a complaint?	Would you feel comfortable speaking up when you have a problem?
40. Is this place kept clean enough?	Is this place clean enough?
45. Are your belongings safe here?	Add probe “the things that belong to you, your property”
47. Do you think this is an appealing place for people to visit?	Do you think this is <i>a pleasant</i> place for people to visit?

Behavioral coding suggested the nine changes above, with probes added in response to resident requests for clarification and wording changes in response to minor interviewer error. None of the changes affect meaning; instead they should improve reliability by accommodating natural sentence constructions most comfortable for interviewers.

## Summary

This report covers psychometric analyses of the Ohio Residential Care Facility Resident Satisfaction Survey. Using data from the first statewide implementation, our results suggested changes and refinements to the survey. The largest change involves the elimination of six questions from the survey. This is in response to weak domain reliabilities, as well as reports from interviewers regarding resident perceptions about question redundancy. The second change involves moving some questions from one domain to another. We recommend that this be done not only in calculating domains, but also in the interviews themselves. Given that domains were constructed based on interview findings we expect that residents perceive the questions as related and will find the question order meaningful. Lastly, we recommend some wording changes and additions to 10 of the survey questions based on interview behavioral coding. We expect that these changes, taken as a whole, will result in a better interview process and more reliable results when the RCF satisfaction survey is administered again in 2009. The new list of questions follows.

<b>Questions</b>	
<b>Activities</b>	
1	Do you have enough to do here?
2	Do you get enough information about the activities offered here?
3	Are you satisfied with the activities offered here?
<b>Choice</b>	
4	Can you go to bed when you like?
5	Do the employees leave you alone if you don't want to do anything?
6	Are you allowed to do the things you want to do for yourself?
7	Are you free to come and go as you are able?
8	Are the rules here reasonable?
<b>Care and Services</b>	

<b>Questions</b>	
9	Can you get snacks and drinks whenever you want to?
10	Do the employees explain your care and services to you? (By care we mean the things workers do for you or to help you)
11	Do you get your medications on time?
12	Do the employees who take care of you know what you like and don't like?
<b>Employee Relations</b>	
13	Are the employees courteous to you?
14	Can you depend on the employees?
15	Are the people who work here friendly?
16	Do the employees treat you with respect?
<b>Employee Responsiveness</b>	
17	During the week, are employees available to help you if you need it?
18	During the weekend, are employees available to help you if you need it?
19	During the evening and night, are employees available to help you if you need it?
20	Do you feel confident that the employees know how to do their jobs?
<b>Communications</b>	
21	Are the people in charge available to talk with you?
22	Do the people in charge treat you with respect?
23	Would you feel comfortable speaking up when you have a problem?
24	Do you know who to go to here when you have a problem?
25	Do your problems get taken care of?
<b>Meals and Dining</b>	
26	Do you get enough to eat?
27	Is the food here tasty?
28	Can you get the foods you like?
29	Is your food served at the right temperature?
30	Do you like the way your meals are served here?
<b>Laundry (alpha = .60)</b>	
31	Do you get your clothing back from the laundry?
32	Does your clothing come back from the laundry in good condition?

<b>Questions</b>	
<b>Facility Environment (was Environment) (alpha = .68)</b>	
33	Do you like the location of this place?
34	Are the outside walkways and grounds well taken care of?
35	Does this place look attractive to you?
36	Is this place clean enough?
37	Is this place quiet when it should be?
<b>Resident Environment (was Environment) (alpha = .71)</b>	
38	Do you have enough privacy in your room or apartment?
39	Are you satisfied with your room or apartment?
40	Do you feel safe here?
41	Are your belongings safe here? (the things that belong to you, your property)
42	Do you think this is a pleasant place for people to visit?
<b>General (alpha = .76)</b>	
43	Do you feel comfortable here?
44	Do you feel like you are getting your money's worth here?
45	Overall, do you like living here?
46	Would you recommend this place to a family member or friend?