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Abstract: With the intensification of aging, the elderly housing choice has become one of the social problems that has attracted greater public attention. Through scientific and systematic questionnaires and statistical analysis, the main factors affecting the elderly housing choice were concluded, an evaluation index system of elderly housing choice was established, and an effective criteria of calculating the system evaluation index values $Z_k$ was formed based on the fitting function of matlab. On this basis, a method of the elderly housing choice was proposed, scientificness and rationality of this method has been verified in the case study.
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1. INTRODUCTION

With the second baby boom population which occurred from the 1960s to the mid-1970s into old age, China's elderly population began to increase at an average annual growth rate of 6.2 million [1]. This large-scale, high-speed growth pattern corresponds to the diversified and blowout development of the elderly consumers’ demand. Meanwhile, changes of elderly living preferences, enhancement of purchase desire and the increase of income indicate the inevitable expansion of the elderly housing market demand. Nowadays, for the older age groups, residence is no longer a simple concept of physical space, it has gradually become a kind of social environment not only to meet the personal material demand more to meet the spiritual needs. Through the establishment of precise mathematical model, and a systematic and comprehensive evaluation of alternative sets, some important information about alternative system performance and living environment can be provided to consumers. Then, the decision-making risk of consumers will be reduced effectively.

2. RESEARCH SIGNIFICANCE

Unlike welfare houses, old folks' homes and other social welfare facilities, elderly housing is a kind of real estate product bred out by the interaction between consumers, developers and government. Survey data shows that based on practical considerations of children living and their own needs, those elderly who want to stay in elderly housing immediately and other who would like to stay there in the future accounted for 30% and 63% of the total number of survey respectively. The transformation of old groups’ ideology provides unlimited business opportunities for real estate developers. Construction of elderly housing is imperative.

In addition, the family structure of "four-two-one" and fast-paced social life caused a number of two-income families lack sufficient time to take care of elderly people, which make daily life issues of elderly become increasingly prominent. With the development of the integrated system, ideas of old people have made a qualitative leap, the elderly not only want to obtain the convenience of living more desire spiritual satisfaction from elderly housing [2]. With many uncertainties that affect elderly housing choice, it’s difficult for general public to make a scientific and rational judgment or decision. An unripe idea can result in a phenomenon of "selling old to buy new", which may cause losses to consumers. Therefore, the research in this paper will help consumers to make a comprehensive preparation before buying house, and it will provide a favorable reference to solve the pension problem.

3. MODEL ESTABLISHMENT

3.1. Establishment of Evaluation Index System

A questionnaire was made to explore the main factors which affect the elderly housing choice. 500 questionnaires were issued to elderly and 479 valid questionnaires were recovered. 300 questionnaires were issued to middle-aged group and 283 valid questionnaires were recovered. Excluding the index less than 50% and retaining the index more than 50%, 6 indicators were concluded. Then the following evaluation system was established.

3.2. Solution of the Weight Set

Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) is an analytical method of multi-objective decision, which is commonly used to compare the superiority of multiple factors [3, 4]. The evaluation index system established in this paper includes
more indicators, so this paper used “three scale method” to reduce subjective error generated from the traditional method [5].

1. Establishment of Indirect Judgment Matrix

Firstly, using three scale method to calculate the comparison matrix:

\[
C = \begin{pmatrix}
c_{ij}
\end{pmatrix}_{n \times n}
\]

where,

\[
c_{ij} = \begin{cases}
2 & \text{The i-th element is more important than the j-th element} \\
1 & \text{The i-th element and the j-th element are equally important} \\
0 & \text{The j-th element is more important than the i-th element}
\end{cases}
\]

Then, calculate the sum value \((r_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{ij})\) of each row. Elect the maximum \((r_{\text{max}})\) and the minimum \((r_{\text{min}})\), so comparative basis scaling \((d_y)\) can be calculated. Finally, indirect judgment matrix \((D = (d_y))_{n \times n}\) will be obtained.

\[
d_y = \begin{cases}
\frac{(r - r_j)}{(r_{\text{max}} - r_{\text{min}})}(d_{\text{max}} - 1) + 1 & r_i > r_j > 0 \\
1 & r_i = r_j \\
\left[\frac{(r_i - r_j)}{(r_{\text{max}} - r_{\text{min}})}(d_{\text{max}} - 1) + 1 \right]^{-1} & r_i < r_j
\end{cases}
\]

2. The Weight of Level Element [6]

\[
\bar{A} = \left(\bar{a}_{ij}\right), \quad \bar{a}_{ij} = \frac{d_y}{\sum d_y}.
\]

Calculate the sum value of each row of \(\bar{A}\), and \(\bar{M}_i = \sum \bar{a}_{ij}\). Level elements feature vector will be obtained after standardization of \(\bar{M}\). The weight of level element:

\[
W = [\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots, \omega_6]
\]

where,

\[
\omega_i = \frac{\bar{M}_i}{\sum \bar{M}_i}
\]

3. Consistency Test

Consistency index:

\[
CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1}
\]

where,

\[
\lambda_{\text{max}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\bar{a}_{ij})
\]

If \(CI = 0\), it shows the judgment matrix is consistent completely, or consistency ratio \((CR = \frac{CI}{RI})\) should be calculated. If \(CR < 0.1\), the result is acceptable.

4. ESTABLISHMENT OF FUZZY INTEGRATED EVALUATION SYSTEM

4.1. Establish Factors Set and Weight Set

The main factors set:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation index system of elderly housing choice U</th>
<th>Target Layer</th>
<th>Criteria Layer</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria Layer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing price U_1</td>
<td>Housing price U_1</td>
<td>Public transport distance U_21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic U_2</td>
<td>Traffic U_2</td>
<td>The number of public bus U_22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and entertainment U_3</td>
<td>Leisure and entertainment U_3</td>
<td>Distance U_31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large shopping centers U_4</td>
<td>Large shopping centers U_4</td>
<td>Number U_32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive hospital U_5</td>
<td>Comprehensive hospital U_5</td>
<td>Distance U_41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental infrastructure U_6</td>
<td>Environmental infrastructure U_6</td>
<td>Security administration U_61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SOS facilities U_62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery service U_63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Installation of lifts U_64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antiskid measures U_65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Evaluation index system of elderly housing choice.
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Table 2. The corresponding remark grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>The Original Data Points and Fitting Curve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0.8,1.0]</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>[x = [100:100:800]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.6,0.8]</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>[y = [0.3,0.2,0,19,0.15,0.11,0.07,0.05,0.02]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.4,0.6]</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>[y = -1.3 \times 10^{-6} x_1^2 + 4.4 \times 10^{-7} x_2^2 - 0.0007 x_3 + 0.36]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.2,0.4]</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>[y = [1.0,0.93,0.87,0.73,0.59,0.48,0.29,0.17]]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0,0.2]</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>[y = 2.1 \times 10^{-11} x_1^3 - 1.7 \times 10^{-7} x_2^2 + 0.0001 x_3 + 0.99]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Calculation criterion of evaluation value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Evaluation Value</th>
<th>Remark: (x_i) represents residential real price, (\triangle) represents the ideal unit for residential consumers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing price</td>
<td>(Z_i = 1 - \frac{(x_i - \Delta)}{500} \times 0.1 ) ((0 \leq Z_i \leq 1))</td>
<td>(x_i = [100:100:800])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>(Z_2 = \sum_{j=1}^{k} n_{2j} \times y_{2j} ) (0 \leq Z_2 \leq 1) (x_j \leq 800)</td>
<td>(y_2 = [0.3,0.24,0.19,0.15,0.11,0.07,0.05,0.02]) (y_2 = -1.3 \times 10^{-10} x_1^2 + 4.4 \times 10^{-7} x_2^2 - 0.0007 x_3 + 0.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and entertainment</td>
<td>(Z_3 = \sum_{j=1}^{k} n_{3j} \times y_{3j} ) ((0 \leq Z_3 \leq 1)) (x_j \leq 3500)</td>
<td>(x_j = [600:400:3400])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large shopping centers</td>
<td>(Z_4 = \sum_{j=1}^{k} n_{4j} \times y_{4j} ) ((0 \leq Z_4 \leq 1)) (x_j \leq 4000)</td>
<td>(x_j = [500:500:4000])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive hospital</td>
<td>(Z_5 = \sum_{j=1}^{k} n_{5j} \times y_{5j} ) ((0 \leq Z_5 \leq 1)) (x_j \leq 5000)</td>
<td>(x_j = [800:600:5000])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental infrastructure</td>
<td>(Z_s = W_s \triangle R_s ) ((0 \leq Z_s \leq 1))</td>
<td>(x_j = [1.0,0.93,0.87,0.73,0.59,0.48,0.29,0.17]) (y_3 = 2.1 \times 10^{-11} x_1^3 - 1.7 \times 10^{-7} x_2^2 + 0.0001 x_3 + 0.99)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each evaluation index is divided into 5 grades, evaluation set: \(V = (V_1, V_2, V_3, V_4, V_5) = (Excellent, Good, Medium, Pass, Fail)\), its score set is \(H = (1,0.9,0.8,0.6,0.4,0.2)\).

4.2. Evaluation Value \(Z_s\)

If a certain place exists an indicator, \(n_{ij}\) represents the number of this indicator, \(x_{ij}\) represents the distance between the house and this indicator. \(y_i\) represents the fitting function obtained by MATLAB on the basis of survey data.

}\(U = \{U_i, U_j, U_k, \ldots, U_n\} (i = 1,2,3,\ldots,n)\)

Sub-factors set:
\(U_j = \{U_{ij}, U_{i2}, U_{i3}, \ldots, U_{in}\}\) !

Then, we get the main weight set:
\(W = (\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots, \omega_n) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j = 1\right)\) (9)

and sub- weight set:
\(W_j = (\omega_{j1}, \omega_{j2}, \ldots, \omega_{jn}) \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \omega_j = 1\right)\) (10)
The result of evaluation system is its comprehensive score:

\[ h = B = W \cdot Z_{\text{total}} \]  

(12)

5. CASE ANALYSIS

Using the sum product method to calculate the weights of evaluation system.

5.1. \( U - U_i \)

\[
D = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & 5 & 3 & 3 & 5 \\
1 & 1 & 5 & 3 & 3 & 5 \\
\frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 3 & 1 & 1 & 3 \\
\frac{1}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 3 & 1 & 1 & 3 \\
\frac{1}{5} & \frac{1}{5} & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\bar{A} = \frac{d_i}{\sum d_i} = \begin{bmatrix}
0.32609 & 0.32609 & 0.27778 & 0.34615 & 0.34615 & 0.27778 \\
0.32609 & 0.32609 & 0.27778 & 0.34615 & 0.34615 & 0.27778 \\
0.06522 & 0.06522 & 0.05556 & 0.03846 & 0.03846 & 0.05556 \\
0.10869 & 0.10869 & 0.16667 & 0.11539 & 0.11539 & 0.16667 \\
0.10869 & 0.10869 & 0.16667 & 0.11539 & 0.11539 & 0.16667 \\
0.06522 & 0.06522 & 0.05556 & 0.03846 & 0.03846 & 0.05556 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\bar{M} = \frac{\bar{M}_i}{\sum \bar{M}_i} = [1.90004, 1.90004, 0.31848, 0.78150, 0.78150, 0.31848]^{0.5}
\]

\[
\omega_i = \frac{\bar{M}_i}{\sum \bar{M}_i}. 
\]

The weight set:

\[ W = [\omega_1, \omega_2, \ldots, \omega_n] \\
= (0.3167, 0.3167, 0.0531, 0.1302, 0.1302, 0.0531) \]

\[
\lambda_{\text{max}} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (DW)_{ni} = 6.0775, CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n - 1} = 0.0155
\]

\[
CR = \frac{CI}{RI} = 0.0155 \frac{1.24}{0.125} = 0.125 < 0.1, \text{ so it has a satisfactory consistency.}
\]

5.2. \( U_o - U_{o,j} \)

\[
D = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 1 & 5 & 1/2 & 4 & 4 \\
1 & 1 & 5/2 & 4 & 4 \\
2/5 & 2/5 & 1 & 5/2 & 5/2 & 2 \\
1 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 2/4 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & 1 & 2/4 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]
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The weight set: \( W_n = [\omega_1, \omega_2, \cdots, \omega_n] = (0.3507, 0.3507, 0.1706, 0.064, 0.064) \)

\[
\lambda_{\text{max}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (DW)_{ij} = 5.079, \quad CI = \frac{\lambda_{\text{max}} - n}{n-1} = 0.0198, \quad CR = \frac{CI}{RI} = 0.0198 \times 1.12 = 0.0177 < 0.1, \text{ so it has a satisfactory consistency.}
\]

If an older consumer want to buy a house, his expected price is 5000 yuan/m², the real price of a residence is 6000 yuan/m². Within 800 meters away from the house, there are facilities, delivery business and anti-skid facility. There is no elevator in this community, but with emergency buses available at the distance of 350 meters. Within 3500 meters away from the house, there is only one recreation area at the distance of 2000 meters, another is at the distance of 1300 meters. Within 5000 meters away from the house, there is only one large shopping centers at the distance of 2800 meters, another is at the distance of 3500 meters. Within 5000 meters away from the house, there is only one comprehensive hospital at the distance of 2800 meters. There is no elevator in this community, but with emergency facilities, delivery business and anti-skid facility.

According to Table 3, we get:

\[
Z_1 = 1 - \frac{(6000 - 5000)}{500} \times 0.1 = 0.8
\]

\[
Z_2 = (-1.3 \times 10^{-10} \times 200^3 + 4.4 \times 10^{-7} \times 200^2 - 0.0007 \times 200 + 0.36) \times 3
+ (-1.3 \times 10^{-10} \times 350^3 + 4.4 \times 10^{-7} \times 350^2 - 0.0007 \times 350 + 0.36) \times 1
= 0.8730
\]

\[
Z_3 = (2.1 \times 10^{-11} \times 1300^3 - 1.7 \times 10^{-7} \times 1300^2 + 0.0001 \times 1300 + 0.99) \times 1
= 0.8788
\]

\[
Z_4 = (5 \times 10^{-15} \times 2000^4 - 3.2 \times 10^{-11} \times 2000^3 + 3.5 \times 10^{-8} \times 2000^2
- 0.00018 \times 2000 + 1.1) \times 1 + (5 \times 10^{-15} \times 3500^4 - 3.2 \times 10^{-11} \times 3500^3 + 3.5 \times 10^{-8} \times 3500^2 - 0.00018 \times 3500 + 1.1) \times 1
= 0.9811
\]

\[
Z_5 = (-7.5 \times 10^{-13} \times 2800^3 + 8.9 \times 10^{-11} \times 2800^2 - 3.7 \times 10^{-7} \times 2800^2
+ 0.00045 \times 2800 + 0.84) \times 1 = 0.6919
\]

\[
Z_n = W_n \cdot R_n
\]

\[
= (0.3507, 0.3507, 0.1706, 0.064, 0.064)
\]

\[
= 0.7296
\]

Then, we get: \( Z_\text{total} = (0.8000, 0.8730, 0.8788, 0.9811, 0.6919, 0.7296)^T \).

Make the fuzzy synthetical judgment of \( U \), \( h \) will be calculated.

\[
h = B = W \cdot Z_\text{total}
\]

\[
= (0.3167, 0.3167, 0.0531, 0.1302, 0.1302, 0.0531)
\]

\[
= 0.8331
\]

So the comprehensive score of this elderly housing is 0.8331, remark grade is “excellent”. Similarly, other alternative systems’ comprehensive scores can be calculated in the same way. Through a rational sort of those scores, a more appropriate housing will be selected.

CONCLUSION

With the increase of aging population, how to solve the question of senior's inhabitation is very exigent. This paper concluded a method to calculate evaluation value of the evaluation index system of elderly housing choice on the basis of FAHP. This method has strong operability and wide scope of application. Case analysis shows that the improved FAHP method has great practical value to solve the question of senior's inhabitation. Of course, due to regional differences, different factors will be considered in different regions, the specific differences can be improved on the basis of this paper.
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