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A purpose sample

- 5 pilot interviews
- 48 older people in their 60s, 70s, 80s and 90s
- living in general and supportive housing in England representing all housing types
- Aim for two-thirds women to men
- Locations: Loughborough area; Bristol; Haringey; Milton Keynes
Methodology

Two interviews with each participant:

1. Basic characteristics and a housing history
2. An oral history of kitchen living linked to life events. First remembered kitchen, kitchen with the family, in retirement, etc.
3. Linking tasks – visual representation of kitchen positives/negatives, kitchen in wider space in the home
4. An examination of the current kitchen to capture typical activities, opinions, ergonomic problems, likes and dislikes
5. Sketch plans, lighting readings, measurements
## Characteristics of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-69 yrs (16)</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>10/6</td>
<td>Higher income spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spread: mainstream housing, 1 extra care housing; 13 independent; 1 wheelchair user; 10 living with spouse; 15 British/1 Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79 yrs (16)</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>4/12</td>
<td>Lower income spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spread: mainstream housing; 13 independent; 3 mobility issues; 8 living with spouse; 8 living alone, 15 British/1 Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+ years (16)</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>3/13</td>
<td>Lowest income spread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited spread: mainstream housing; 4 low rise flats; 6 extra care housing; 10 independent; 6 mobility problems; 3 living with spouse; 13 living alone, 16 British</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The date of birth for participants ranged from 1919 to 1948.
Oral histories reflect on:

Kitchen use (basic tasks, to eat, keep warm, reminiscence)
Scullery, Tin bath
Copper, Dolly tub & dolly blue,
Larder, Pantry
Kitchen table, Kitchen dresser
Bristol 4 : woman born 1922, 88yrs

(first remembered home until aged 13 years, 1920s/30s)“

“ what will come out over and over again from me is that what we had in those days was a kitchen, a back kitchen or sometimes called a scullery and a walk in larder and a walk in coal shed, a yard and with this sort of house a brick built wash house”. “ So in what you would call the kitchen, the biggest of the lot, had a brick stove on the adjoining wall”
“There is an amusing story because when I eventually moved to [ ] my grandson went house hunting with my daughter, trying to find a flat for me to move into, and at one time age 4 or 5, I suppose, he went rushing around to view and he came back to his mother and said: ‘This is no good mum, this is no good’ so the woman who was showing her flat was put out, turned to this wretched little child and said ‘What makes you say that?’ and he just said ‘There is no room for granny’s marmalade’ and he had spotted at once the major fault of more modern accommodation, no storage.”
Ability issues for the participants

- Sight: 15 with some probs., 2 with problems
- Hearing: 9 with some probs., 4 with problems
- Reaching: 20 with problems
- Dexterity: 16 with problems
Everyday themes

• Preparing cooking and eating food
• Washing, cleaning, recycling
• Layout and spaces
• Space savers
• Extending the ‘work triangle’
• Laundry
• Lighting
• Flooring
• Adaptations
Reach and dexterity

- Window handles hard to reach.
- Wall cupboards too high: (range 136cm to 151cm).
- Corner cupboards hard to reach into.
- Sinks and worktops at inconvenient height.
- Awkward bending down to use appliances.
- Access to low pet bowls.
Layout and space

- There were many sizes and layouts of kitchens.
- Areas: 5.7 to 24 sq m
- Work triangle: 3.1 to 6.7m
- Co-locating items is important e.g. work surfaces and cupboards adjacent to appliances.
- Bi-fold doors and extra shelving also provide more space
Lighting

• Natural light is important to many.

• Light readings:
  – sink area, 61% above 300 lux threshold
  – kitchen eating area, only 30% above 300 lux threshold
  – food preparation, only 20% above 750 lux threshold

• A sink without a window prompted placing mirror to reflect light.
Looking towards future solutions

• A natural extension of this study was to review the possibilities of using more advanced technology to make kitchen life easier. See for example: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-11893452

• A survey conducted with a group of 45 older people to obtain their reactions to some of the ideas and concepts behind the ‘techno kitchen’.

• As a basis for the survey an analysis was done of simple solutions from the TiKL interviews and more advanced ‘techno’ solutions that have been proposed by the smart house community.
2. Fridge readout

Press button on fridge to read out food items present or run out of.

Positive responses: 38%

“Would help with shopping.”

“Good idea for freezer where more food stored. Opening door less saves energy.”

“Unsure of technology behind it. Would you trust it?”

“Would also need to know if items in date. Would need to log food items in and out.”
13. Easier controls on washing machine

Washing machine has only 6 buttons for easier use.

Positive responses: 79% 

“I only use 2 or 3 programmes most of time.”

“Less confusing.”

“Too many programmes never used.”

“Am happy with dial and choice..”
15. Electrical shut off

Shut off non-essential electrical equipment when you leave the house.

“Yes it is easy to go out and forget that things still on.”

“Would be safer.”

“Save money on electric not being used. Peace of mind.”

Positive responses: 93%
Enthusiasm for certain types of technology support

- The results of the survey show that there is enthusiasm for certain types of technological support in the kitchen provided it is well thought through and designed to meet people’s needs.

- Most interest was expressed in technology that increases safety in the kitchen or which addressed immediate problems.

- Some ideas received only limited support but were seen as possibly useful to others with more severe disabilities.
Outcomes

• A Data Bank of the stories and experiences of older people, documenting their lives in the kitchen and their changing needs.

• “Inspirational material” on adaptations made by the participants that others may apply to their own kitchens.

• A Guide to help people adapt their kitchen to meet their changing needs in later life…

… this should also be useful to architects, kitchen designers, occupational therapists social service professionals, retail sector.