

2nd half

Chapter 8 Page 68 to 82

Tables 1 - 15 Pages 84 to 98

Appendix B
(Scales and Indices) Page 99 - 112

Appendix C
(Questionnaire) pages 113 - 136

REDUCED FARE FOR THE ELDERLY

Chapter 8
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

VERA INSTITUTE
LIBRARY
2036

The present study was planned to investigate the effects of the recently introduced reduced fare program for the elderly in New York City. A major part of the study involved examination in some depth of the characteristic patterns of transportation as related to the personal activities of elderly residents. A secondary aim of the study was to investigate the impact the elderly have upon the transportation system.

A random sample of 728 persons over 65 years of age who lived in New York City and had registered for the reduced fare program were interviewed in their homes. The sample was heavily weighted with persons in their late 60's and early 70's who had come to the United States from Eastern and Central Europe when they were young and have lived most of their lives in the city. Most reside in Brooklyn, Queens and the Bronx. Typically the respondent has lived in his present apartment for 10 years or more. Most are retired and primarily supported by Social Security. Few receive supplementary income from their families and less than 5% report receiving public assistance. Many are living in apparent poverty. For most, educational attainment and occupational status would lead to their designation as of middle or working class.

The majority of the interviewees live within relatively easy access to public transportation, and rely on it fairly heavily. Combined bus and subway trips are made relatively infrequently as compared with single fare trips. Most often people either take a bus to their destination or they walk.

Walking is by far the most commonly utilized mode of transportation. This means that most of these persons' lives center in and around their immediate neighborhoods. They are aware of and appreciate the facilities available in the central city but utilize them infrequently. Even those individuals who are relatively mobile use the facilities in the immediate neighborhood most of the time.

Most services which are necessary for the maintenance of the older person's life style exist in the immediate neighborhood. Stores, churches, and most important, friends, are available close to home. However, married children and other relatives do not tend to live in the immediate neighborhood. Many live an hour or more away. While most persons maintain contact with relatives when the relative lives far away, visits tend to be infrequent. Relatives are typically seen monthly in contrast to friends who are often seen daily. Since it is difficult to relate in a meaningful way to a person seen monthly, friendship networks have become more important than kinship networks for many persons. For the European immigrant this represents a life style quite different from that of his parents. The urban environment would appear to be responsible for developing a different way of life. As pointed out by Carp (1970), "...it is important to realize that visits to children do not comprise an active social life for retired people generally."

It was found that the overwhelming proportion of visits with other family members do not take place in the home of the older person. The smaller apartment, lack of playground facilities, or problems of parking in the city apparently

make it easier for the children to take the older parent to their homes than to visit in the parent's home. The social life of the family no longer centers in grandma's home. It is grandma who must travel to see her children. Friends are also usually seen outside the home and little entertaining is done at home. Perhaps the home is not considered attractive enough, or perhaps lacking money to entertain, friends are not invited.

It was found that when people met with friends it was usually on a one-to-one basis. Very few of these older persons were involved with informal groups and even fewer with formal organizations. The possible implications for programs for the aging of the fact that most elderly persons do not seem to be group oriented should be carefully considered. It is well known that the elderly tend to underusage of senior citizen centers. In the present study trips to such centers constituted less than 1% of all trips Carp, (1970) similarly found that in San Antonio involvement in such centers tended to be minimal. It may be that as people age they are less inclined to interact simultaneously with a variety of other persons. Senior citizen centers often emphasize group activities although this may not be congenial for many elderly persons. It should be possible to provide more facilities for dyadic interactions in community facilities for the aged. We would recommend that this be attempted on an experimental basis.

Using a step-wise multiple regression procedure, it was found that the primary predictor of the breadth of an elderly person's social space was the distance he lived from his children. Because parents generally visit children, whether or not it is convenient to do so, their social

space enlarges as the children move farther from home. No difference was found between middle and working class persons in this regard; the children of both had moved away from the old neighborhood.

Many older residents of New York City came to this country seeking educational and occupational opportunities for their children, and many were successful (Glazer and Moynihan, 1964; Handlin, 1959). The city offered wide occupational opportunities to the children. Thus, the children obtained jobs which were different from those of their parents and established a different way of life.

Most of the neighborhoods in which the elderly reside have changed. For example, the South Bronx, which is usually thought of as a Puerto Rican neighborhood still contains older European immigrants. When individuals remain stationary they often feel that the neighborhood has moved out from under them. One of the outstanding characteristics of New York is its rapid pace (Milgram, 1970). People move rapidly and things change quickly. As a result of relentless in-and-out-migration and constant urban renewal, neighborhoods change rapidly. It is difficult to find a neighborhood within New York City which has not changed radically within a generation. The elderly are very much aware of such change.

In the present study, socio-economic status was found to be unrelated to the breadth of an older individual's social space. Considering that several studies conducted in smaller cities and suburbs (Adams, 1968; Gans, 1963; Willmott & Young, 1960) showed a marked relationship between socio-economic status and extended travel, this is an unusual finding. It suggests that New York City is an unusual place.

We would tentatively conclude that where environmental conditions are such that the children of working class individuals tend to remain in the same neighborhood to raise their own families, the working class person's life space would tend to be limited. However, the effects of social class with regard to geographical mobility seem to be attenuated when children of working class parents move far away from their parents. For this sample in New York City, the socio-economic status of the elderly individual does not appear to determine whether his social space is broad or narrow. This suggests that working class people are not always distinguished by a life style which is neighborhood oriented.

The urban environment supports geographic mobility. For many years apartments have been hard to find in New York City, particularly in the older neighborhoods with a preponderance of rent controlled apartments and where there is a high proportion of elderly persons. The likelihood is that married children could not find suitable apartments near their parents even if they wanted to do so. At the same time the mass transportation system is comprehensive enough so that visiting family and friends is possible from most places in the city. These two environmental factors make it probable that extended families will commonly be geographically dispersed even when the children are not especially occupationally and socially mobile.

The finding that environmental factors are more important for predicting social space than personal factors and socioeconomic status is important. It suggests that social space is a mediating factor between the individual and his environment. The implication is that a person's social space can be

directly affected by environmental factors. Change in the environment can serve to constrict or expand an older person's social space. This should be regarded as a hopeful finding because environmental factors are amenable to planned change. However, lack of appropriate knowledge and planning in this area can give disastrous consequences leading to even greater isolation and alienation of the elderly.

The reduced fare program has in general been a marked success so far as the registrants for the program are concerned. They are enthusiastic about it and use it extensively. Older persons not only claim to travel more as a result of the reduced fare program but also feel that they save money which is badly needed for other things. Most believe that by instituting the reduced fare program the city has recognized them as individuals who are valuable and merit special consideration.

When asked if they had any suggestions about the reduced fare program that should be reported to the Mayor's Office, several persons indicated that we should "tell them thank you." The only repeated complaint concerned the requirement that a person who wants to take advantage of the reduced fare for subway travel, must both go and return by subway during the same day. This was felt to be unnecessarily restrictive.

As might be expected, the apparently increased travel by the elderly is largely done during the non-rush hours. They find the reduced fare hours reasonably convenient although many have had to change their life patterns in some way in order to make use of it. They feel a need to travel and quite clearly have places to which they want and need to go. Those who appeared

to be most benefited by the reduced fare program were individuals who: 1) had a more active social life, 2) used mass transit as a primary mode of travel, 3) maintained contact with society through available communications systems and the mass media, 4) maintained friendships beyond the immediate neighborhood, and 5) read newspapers and voted in local elections. In short, the primary beneficiaries of the reduced fare program are the elderly residents of the city who want to remain active and in touch with society. They represent an important potential political force.

Elderly residents of New York were generally fearful of being mugged or robbed. They were less afraid of buses than they were of standing on deserted street corners waiting for a bus. By far the most frequent suggestion made for improving transit facilities was that more guards be employed for their protection. Thus the major complaint about the transit system was not intrinsic to the system itself, but rather a complaint about life in the city.

For all its obvious fault, the mass transit system in New York City is, of course, capable of transporting people to most places of interest in the city. It was found that older residents of the city, those in their 70's and 80's, rely fairly heavily upon mass transit, provided they are not living in a state of abject poverty. Mass transit provides the means for visiting relatives and friends and maintaining associations with those who live out of the immediate neighborhood. Older persons who want to maintain contact with others can do so because relatively inexpensive mass transit is available to them. This appears to be one of the major reasons why most older persons said that New York City was not a difficult place to live.

As a consequence, there does not appear to be as much dependence upon family in New York as there is for example, in Nashville (Bourg, 1970). Bourg noted that elderly persons who could not afford transportation appropriate to their needs were forced to rely upon their families in order to travel. It would appear that in New York City older persons are helped to maintain a greater measure of independence because of lower transportation costs. The reduced fare program helps them afford such independence.

The elderly residents of New York City in this sample are apparently supporting themselves with an average income of under \$200 a month for a family averaging 1.6 members. Such incomes if not below the poverty level are clearly on the borderline. As long as facilities are provided which permit them to maintain themselves in society, these people continue to cope against great odds. While the number of welfare recipients in New York City is building up alarmingly, many older people although apparently eligible are not receiving public assistance. The elderly are a large and important sector of New York City's population totaling nearly a million persons (Cantor, Rosenthal and Mayer, 1970). If these older people are not subsidized by some combination of methods such as reduced fare, rent subsidies, and the like, many will be forced to enter homes for the aged or accept public assistance in order to live. Thousands of additional people on welfare could bankrupt the city. Thousands more in nursing homes and homes for the aged would certainly strain our pocketbooks, and should more than strain our consciences.

The reduced fare program is one concrete if modest way in which people

with small and dwindling incomes can be helped to make ends meet without feeling that they are receiving charity. This is very important for the elderly; the strength of pride which leads them to resist what they see as give-away programs is reflected in the small proportion of eligible older persons who are receiving public assistance. Probably one reason why the reduced fare program is so acceptable is that it is in line with the very common practice of reducing prices for certain segments of the population at certain times. For the New York City resident, "two-fors" (reduced priced theater tickets during weekday evenings) are often made available.

College students obtain reduced rates for many shows, museums, and other cultural facilities in the city. Provisions are made for youth to travel at lower rates. Seen in this context, the reduced fare program for the elderly seems quite natural and reasonable.

While the elderly are very appreciative of the reduced fare program they do not consider it their special province. A majority of the elderly people questioned thought that there were others in the city who should be included in the reduced fare program, such as the poor. This is important since it adds another dimension to the approaches attempting to solve the transportation problems of the aged. Revis (1970) makes a compelling argument for considering the elderly in combination with other "captive riders", including the very young, housewives, and the physically handicapped. This procedure would serve to make a more sizeable market base capable of supporting more transit services than would be possible if each were considered separately. For some time Wilson (1970) has been actively campaigning

for joint consideration of the elderly and the handicapped. It is evident that the elderly would support such an approach since they strongly endorsed the statement: "They should have a reduced fare program for the poor as well as the elderly."

The city would benefit from any new programs which would encourage the greater use of mass transit by more people during off-hours. The problem of off-hours is not, of course, peculiar to the transit system in New York. Shops, theaters, museums, and so forth generally reduce rates during specified times. They have found this to pay off financially. The transit system must be maintained during those hours when few people make use of it. The present study suggests that incentives for off-hour usage do have some benefits for the system.

The elderly are not the only group which could benefit from indirect financial assistance. Because the reduced fare program fits the pattern of the city, it has been very successful with a relatively modest outlay of funds. We would recommend that this program and others like it be extended as a means of subsidizing those persons for whom such subsidy is needed. Extending the reduced fare program to other groups in the city might prove to have another important advantage that has not as yet been considered. Other groups might be able to make use of the 10:00p.m. to 7:00 a.m. hours which are not included in the reduced fare hours for the elderly. If persons could be encouraged to use buses and subways during the late night and early morning hours not only would the city reap financial benefit, but mass transit would become safer at night. Crowds bring safety in public places.

We would not expect the elderly to travel much during the late hours, but other groups might make good use of an option for late traveling at a reduced rate.

The major conclusion of this study is that a seemingly modest environmental innovation - the reduction of subway and bus fares from 30¢ to 15¢ for elderly residents of the city - appears to have had marked facilitating effects. Because the innovation was directed toward a key environmental factor in the city and because it was designed in accordance with existing and accepted social practices, the program has been successful. The elderly "consumers" who participated in the study were pleased with the program and did not feel that it was patronizing. Those who appeared to benefit the most were the older persons who relied upon mass transit to maintain an active social life.

A change in a relatively simple environmental factor represented by the reduced fare program for the elderly has been shown to affect the social space of the recipients. Environmental alterations often have a marked impact upon the life style of persons in a particular setting. It is recommended that the possibilities for other innovative environmental modifications be explored.

References

- Adams, B. Kinship in an urban setting. Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1968.
- Barron, M. Minority group characteristics of the aged in American society. Journal of Gerontology, 1953, 8, 477-482.
- Bock, F. A study of the travel pattern of persons aged 65 or older in the Chicago area and the effect of a reduction in transit fares. Chicago: IIT Research Institute, 1970.
- Bourg, C. Life styles and mobility patterns of older persons. Washington, U.S. Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Housing and Urban Development, June, 1970.
- Cantor, M. The economics of aging in New York City. New York City Office for the Aging, September, 1969 (mimeo).
- Cantor, M. The reduced fare program for older New Yorkers. Some effects and implications of the first year of operation. Paper presented at the Interdisciplinary Workshop on Transportation and Aging, Washington, D.C., May, 1970a.
- Cantor, M. Elderly ridership and reduced transit fares: The New York City experience. Washington, D. C., U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Administration on Aging, 1970b.
- Cantor, M., Rosenthal, K. and Mayer, M. The elderly in the rental market of New York City. Facts for Action, New York City Office for the Aging, 1970.
- Carp, F. A future for the aged: residents of Victoria Plaza. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1966.
- Carp, F. The mobility of retired people. Paper presented at the Interdisciplinary Workshop on Transportation and the Aging, Washington, D.C., 1970a.
- Carp, F. Public transit and retired people. Paper presented at the Interdisciplinary Workshop on Transportation and the Aging, Washington, D.C., 1970b.
- Clark, M. and Anderson, B. Culture and aging. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1967.
- Craik, K. Transportation and the person. High Speed Ground Transportation Journal, 1969, 3, 86-91.
- Cummings, E. and Henry, W. Growing old. New York: Basic Books, 1961.

- Curran, H. Home rule and the transit problem in New York City. TPG, 1921, 4, 161.
- "Effects of Reduced Fare of Senior Citizens Bus Ridership in New York City." Brooklyn, New York, Division of Transportation Planning, Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, November, 1969.
- Epstein, L. The income position of the aged. In H. Orbach and C. Tibbitts (Eds.) Aging and the economy. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1963.
- Forrester, J. Urban dynamics. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1969.
- Gans, H. The urban villagers: a group and class in the life of Italian-Americans. New York: Free Press, 1962.
- Gelwicks, L. Transportation and its influence upon the quality of the older persons' relations with the environment. Paper presented at the Interdisciplinary Workshop on Transportation and Aging, Washington, D.C., May 1970.
- Glazer, N. and Moynihan, P. Beyond the melting pot. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1964.
- Granick, R. and Nahemow, L. Preadmission isolation as a factor in adjustment to an old age home. In Hoch, P. and Zubin, J. (Eds.) Psychopathology of aging. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1961.
- Hall, E. Proxemics. Paper read at AASP meeting in Man and Space session, 1968.
- Hammel, L. Regional planning and implications for the elderly. Paper presented at the Interdisciplinary Workshop on Transportation and Aging, Washington, D.C., May 1970.
- Handlin, O. The newcomers. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Havens, B. An investigation of activity patterns and adjustments in an aging population. The Gerontologist, 1968, 5.
- Havighurst, R., Newgarten, B. and Tobin, S. Disengagement and patterns of aging. Paper read at the International Social Science Seminar on Social Gerontology, 1963.
- Irwin, N. Public transit and the quality of urban living. Ekistics, 1970, 29, 47-57.

- Kogan, L. and Wantman, M. Estimates of population characteristics, New York City, 1964-1965-1966. New York: Center for Social Research, The City University of New York, 1968.
- Kutner, B., et al. Five hundred over sixty. New York: Russell Sage, 1956.
- Lawton, P. and Simon, B. The ecology of social relationships in housing for the elderly. The Gerontologist, 1968, 8, 108-115.
- Lee, T. Urban neighborhoods as a socio-spatial schema. Human Relations, 1968, 21, 241-268.
- Loether, H. Problems of aging: sociological and social psychological perspectives. Belmont, California: Dickenson Publishing Co., 1967.
- Markovitz, J. The elderly: social, economic and transportation needs. Paper presented at the Interdisciplinary Workshop on Transportation and Aging, Washington, D. C., May 1970.
- Milgram, S. The experience of living in cities. Science, 1968, 167, 1461-1468.
- Nahemow, L. Comparison of users and nonusers of a community mental health facility. Proceedings, 76th Annual Convention, American Psychological Association, 1968, 699-700.
- Nash, A. and Hille, S. Public attitudes toward transport modes: a summary of two pilot studies. Highway Research Record, 1968, 233, 33-46.
- Ostfeld, A. Frequency and nature of health problems of retired persons. In F. Carp (ed.) The retirement process. Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1970.
- "Reduced Fares for Senior Citizens." Division of Senior Citizens, Department of Human Resources, Chicago, 1970.
- Revis, J. Transportation for the aged: some directions for research and policy. Paper presented at the Interdisciplinary Workshop on Transportation and Aging, Washington, D.C., May 1970.
- Rosenbloom, S. Taxis, jitneys and poverty. Transaction, 1970, 7, 47-54.
- Rosow, I. Social integration of the aged. New York: Free Press, 1967.
- Schmidhauser, J. The political influence of the aged. Journal of Gerontology, 1968, 8, 44-49.

- Srole, L. Social integration and certain corollaries; an exploratory study. *American Sociological Review*, 1956, 21, 706-716.
- Srole, L. et al. Mental health in the metropolis. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Stea, D. Personal communication at Conference on Future of Environmental Psychology. New York: City University of New York, 1970.
- Taves, M. and Shmelzer, J. Mobility, transportation, and aging. Washington, D.C., U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Administration on Aging, 1970.
- Utilization of reduced transit fares by the elderly. Evanston, Illinois: Transportation Center, Northwestern University, 1970.
- Webber, M. Order in diversity: community without propinquity. In L. Wingo (ed.), Cities and Space. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1963.
- Webber, M. and Angel, S. The social context for transportation policy. Ekistics, 1970, 29, 25-28.
- Webber, M. and Webber, C. Culture, territoriality and the elastic mile. In H. Eldridge (ed.), Taming Megalopolis. New York: Praeger, 1967.
- Wellman, B., Hewson, M. and Coates, D. Primary relationships in the city: some preliminary observations. Paper presented at meeting of Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, 1969.
- Williams, P. Low fares and the urban problem. Ekistics, 1970, 29, 28-31.
- Willmott, P. and Young, M. Family and class in a London suburb. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960.
- Willson, H. Specific considerations given to the elderly and the handicapped on the San Francisco Bay Area rapid transit system. Paper presented at Interdisciplinary Workshop on Transportation and Aging, Washington, D.C., 1970.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

TABLE 1
Number of Interviews Attempted
and Completed

	Number
Individuals interviewed	738
Interviews completed	728
Interviews not completed	10
Respondents located but not interviewed	214
Respondent refused	172
Respondent deceased	15
Respondent ill	18
Respondent non-English speaking	9
Respondents who could not be contacted	288
Not at home after three visits	160
Address known to be wrong	98
Individual moved	30

TABLE 2

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents
(N=728)¹

	N	Percent ³
<u>Age</u> ²		
65-69	269	37.3
70-74	219	30.3
75-79	139	19.2
80-85	67	9.3
Over 85	28	2.7
<u>Sex</u>		
Male	286	39.3
Female	441	60.6
<u>Marital Status</u>		
Single	64	8.8
Married	379	52.1
Widowed	276	37.9
Separated or divorced	9	1.2
<u>Race</u>		
Black	49	6.7
White	656	90.1
Other	23	3.1
<u>Religious Preference</u>		
Protestant	106	14.6
Catholic	295	40.5
Jewish	294	40.4
Other	26	3.6
None	7	1.0
<u>Education</u>		
None	30	4.1
Elementary school (1-6 years)	163	22.4
Junior High & some high school (7-11 years)	351	48.2
Graduated high school (12 years)	131	18.0
Some college (13-15 years)	21	2.9
Graduated college (16 years)	13	1.8
Graduate school (over 17 years)	11	1.5

¹Information concerning age is lacking for 6 respondents; for sex, information is lacking for one respondent; for education, information is lacking for eight respondents.

²Since the interviews were conducted the last month of 1969 and the first five of 1970 and since people always count their age from their last birthday, 1969 is used as the base year from which these ages are computed.

³Percentages in this and succeeding tables do not always add to 100% because of incomplete data.

TABLE 3
Location of Respondent
(N=728)

	N	Percent
<u>Residence</u> ¹		
Manhattan	108	14.4
Brooklyn	291	40.0
Bronx	152	20.9
Queens	157	21.5
Staten Island	15	2.1
<u>Length of residence at present address</u>		
More than ten years	415	57.0
Six to ten years	113	15.5
One to five years	187	25.7
Less than a year	13	1.8
<u>Length of residence in New York City</u>		
Sixty or more years	340	46.7
Thirty to fifty-nine years	328	45.1
Under thirty years	53	7.3
No response	7	.9
<u>Length of residence in United States</u>		
Born in United States	282	38.7
Immigrated before 1920	226	31.0
Immigrated before 1940	179	24.6
Immigrated before 1959	40	5.5
Immigrated after 1960	1	.1

¹ There are 5 individuals for whom information is lacking.

TABLE 4
Income and Expenses
(N=728)

	N	Percent
<u>Monthly Household Income</u> ¹		
Under \$100/month	84	14.9
\$100-\$199/month	173	30.8
\$200-\$299/month	166	29.5
\$300-\$399/month	69	12.2
\$400-\$499/month	37	6.6
\$500-\$599/month	14	2.5
Over \$600/month	20	3.6
<u>Source of Income(not mutually exclusive)</u>		
Social Security	670	92.0
Personal savings	199	27.3
Employment	123	16.9
Contributions from relatives	61	8.4
Welfare	31	4.2
Insurance	20	2.7
Other (pension)	206	28.3
<u>Number of Persons Income Supports</u>		
One	318	43.7
Two	369	50.7
Three or more	36	4.9
No response	5	.7
<u>Number of Persons Self-Supporting</u>		
	667	91.6

¹One hundred and sixty-five individuals did not respond to the question concerning household income; percentages are based upon the remaining 563 respondents.

TABLE 5
Occupations

	N	Percent
<u>Previous Life-long Occupations</u>		
Professional, business owner or manager	63	9.8
White collar worker	118	18.4
Skilled worker	112	17.5
Semi-skilled worker	131	20.5
Unskilled worker	64	10.0
Housewife	152	23.8
Total	640	
<u>Current Occupations</u>		
Professional, business owner or manager	17	19.7
White collar worker	23	26.9
Skilled worker	13	15.4
Semi-skilled worker	13	15.4
Unskilled worker	20	23.4
Total	86	

TABLE 6
Accessibility of Transportation
(N=728)

	N	Percent
<u>Distance from nearest subway</u>		
Within 2 blocks	206	28.3
3-5 blocks	248	34.0
6-10 blocks	102	14.0
More than 10 blocks	21	2.8
"Not in neighborhood"	151	20.7
<u>Distance from nearest bus</u>		
Within 2 blocks	534	73.3
3-5 blocks	136	18.7
6-10 blocks	23	3.1
More than 10 blocks	4	.5
"Not in neighborhood"	31	4.3
<u>Transit zone for typical trip</u>		
One-fare zone	414	56.9
Two-fare zone	302	41.5
No response	12	1.6
<u>Other transportation facilities</u>		
Car sometimes available	126	17.3
Frequent use of taxis	57	7.8

Sample of 738 people in all

TABLE 7

Trip Record for Two Days Prior to Follow-up Telephone Call¹

	N	Percent
<u>Purpose of the Trip</u>		
Shopping	133	35.8
For a walk or local errand	37	9.9
Visit relative	40	11.9
Visit friend	52	14.0
Work	36	9.7
Church	24	6.4
Doctor	14	3.8
Entertainment	20	5.4
Club meeting	15	4.0
<u>Mode of Travel</u>		
Walking	132	35.6
Bus	96	25.9
Subway	65	17.5
Bus and subway	21	5.7
Car	45	12.1
Taxi	6	1.6
Other	5	1.3
<u>Time Required</u>		
Under 10 minutes	79	21.3
10-29 minutes	128	34.5
30-60 minutes	79	21.3
Over an hour	66	17.8

325 people made 0 trips

413 made avg of .9 trips in 2 days

Overall avg of .5 trips per day or 1.75/7 days

¹ Based upon 56.1% of persons contacted who went out at least once. One person could not remember the mode of travel, 19 people could not remember the time required.

TABLE 8

Percent of Trips by Different Modes
Within Each Time Interval¹
(Two-Day Trip Record)

Time in minutes

<u>Mode</u>	<u>0-9</u>	<u>10-19</u>	<u>20-29</u>	<u>30-39</u>	<u>40-49</u>	<u>50-59</u>	<u>60+</u>
Walking	46.3	30.8	9.0	5.3	1.2	1.4	5.3
Bus	12.6	28.3	25.2	17.3	6.3	3.2	6.3
Subway	2.3	3.4	9.2	20.7	12.6	19.5	29.8
Bus and Subway	0	3.1	9.4	12.5	9.4	21.9	43.8
Automobile	8.8	32.4	7.4	16.2	4.4	8.8	20.6
Taxi	0	23.1	30.8	23.1	0	15.4	7.7

¹In each case from 1 to 3 people did not know how long the trip required.
Therefore percentages do not add to 100.

TABLE 9

Use of Communications Systems

	N	Percent
<u>Number of individuals with whom respondent corresponds by letter</u>		
None	317	43.5
One	82	11.3
Two	101	13.9
Three or more	215	29.4
No response	14	1.9
<u>Number of individuals with whom respondent visits by telephone</u>		
None	106	14.6
One-three	234	32.1
Four-six	214	29.4
Seven or more	160	22.0
No response	14	1.9
<u>Voting in local election</u>		
Voted in mayoral election	557	76.5
Did not vote in mayoral election	167	22.9
No response	4	.5

TABLE 10

Use of Mass Media

	N	Percent
<u>Television viewing</u>		
None	20	2.7
Once a week or less	49	6.7
Every day	414	56.9
More than three hours a day	241	33.1
No response	4	.5
<u>Radio listening</u>		
None	46	6.3
Once a week or less	57	7.8
Every day	432	59.3
More than three hours a day	189	26.0
No response	4	.5
<u>Newspaper reading</u>		
None	50	6.9
Once a week or less	64	8.8
Daily paper	483	66.3
Two or more newspapers every day	126	17.3
No response	5	.7

TABLE 11

Anomia: Feelings of Alienation From Society

<u>Item</u>	<u>Response Percent</u>			
	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>N.I.</u>
1. You can always find something ahead of you which makes life worth living.	88.9	5.6	4.4	1.1
2. In spite of what people say, the life of man is getting worse.	44.6	12.1	41.3	1.9
3. The future looks bright for today's children.	45.3	12.9	40.5	1.2
4. It is useless to plan for tommorrow. All we can do is live for the present.	64.0	4.0	30.9	1.1
5. It is sad for children to have to grow up in this world the way things look for the future.	47.7	10.7	40.1	1.6
6. These days a person doesn't know who he can count on.	45.0	6.0	37.4	1.6
7. The lives of most people will get better in the next few years.	51.4	25.3	21.2	2.1
8. You can trust most people.	45.6	26.0	26.4	2.1
9. The government will assure (see to it) the people of this country a better life.	49.2	16.6	32.4	1.8
10. It is useless to write to public officials because your problems do not interest them.	41.6	10.7	46.4	1.2

*Anomic Response=2 Don't Know=1 Non-anomic Response=0
 For questions 1, 3, 7, 8, 9 the anomic response is "disagree"
 For questions 2, 4, 5, 6, 10 the anomic response is "agree"

TABLE 12

Correlations Between
Travel Mode and Predictor
Variables for Two-Day Interval

	Percentage of Walking Trips	Percentage of Mass Transit Trips	Percentage of Automobile Trips
Demographic and Socio-economic:			
Age	-.094	.104	-.023
Sex	-.089	-.001	-.013
Health Status	-.007	-.078	-.057
Location	-.098	.003	.059
Education	.002	.043	.019
Occupation	-.077	.020	-.013
Income	.012	.115	.021
Environmental:			
Distance from Children	-.001	.035	.029
Distance from Relatives	-.022	.122	-.002
Distance from Friends	-.078	.205	-.035
Mediated Contact	.017	.075	.041
Access to Public Transit	.065	-.003	-.028
Live Alone	-.008	-.052	-.032
Life Style Characteristics:			
Social Space	-.020	-.052	-.032
Face-to-Face Contact	.094	.136	.005
Benefits of Reduced Fare	.023	.139	-.075
Anomia	-.024	-.070	-.001
Agree Response Set	.021	-.021	-.023
Attitude Toward Reduced Fare	.018	-.023	-.056
Difficulty Getting Around N.Y.C.	.049	-.006	.029

TABLE 13

Percent of Trips by Walking for Two-Day Interval

Regression Analysis

Multiple R = 0.2895
 Multiple R² 0.0828

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Partial R</u>	<u>Beta-Coeff</u>	<u>R</u>
Education	-.0497	-.0535	.0014
Health	-.0864	-.1329	.0072
Access to Public Transit	.1247	.1998	.0647
Social Space	-.0076	-.0086	-.0204
Distance from Children	-.0540	-.0636	-.0006
Distance from Relatives	-.0527	-.0553	-.0219
Distance from Friends	-.1186	-.1270	-.0779
Sex	-.0950	-.0956	-.0889
Occupation	-.0932	-.0964	-.0767
Face-to-face Contact	.1297	.1465	.0939
Income	-.0397	-.0432	-.0113
Age	-.1301	-.1319	-.0939
Anomia	-.0321	-.0348	-.0243
Agree Response Set	.0289	.0315	.0212
Attitudes Toward Reduced Fare	.0198	.0196	.0185
Live Alone	-.0419	-.0420	-.0078
Location in City	-.1285	-.1291	-.0982
Difficulty Getting Around N.Y.C.	.0454	.0453	.0490

TABLE 14

Percent of Trips by Mass transit for Two-Day Interval

Regression Analysis

Multiple R_2 = 0.3281
 Multiple R^2 = 0.1077

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Partial R</u>	<u>Beta-Coef</u>	<u>R</u>
Education	-.0104	-.0110	.0431
Health	-.0475	-.0718	-.0779
Access to Public Transit	.0397	.0624	-.0029
Social Space	.0733	.0828	.1600
Distance from Children	-.0224	-.0260	.0351
Distance from Relatives	.0696	.0722	.1221
Distance from Friends	.1371	.1450	.2050
Occupation	.0871	.0885	.0199
Face-to-face Contact	.0126	.0141	.1357
Benefits of Reduced Fare	.1119	.1118	.1387
Income	.0973	.1044	.1150
Age	.1309	.1309	.1043
Anomia	-.0496	-.0532	-.0697
Agree Response Set	.0097	.0103	.0213
Attitudes Toward Reduced Fare	-.0498	-.0494	-.0231
Live Alone	-.0414	-.0401	-.0523
Location in City	.0273	.0269	.0032
Difficulty Getting Around N.Y.C.	-.0320	-.0315	-.0064

TABLE 15

Percent of Trips by Automobile for Two-Day Interval

Regression Analysis

Multiple R₁ = 0.1735
Multiple R² = 0.0301

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Partial R</u>	<u>Beta Co-ef</u>	<u>R</u>
Education	.0171	.0190	.0195
Health	-.0639	-.1008	-.0575
Access to Public Transit	.0048	.0077	.0278
Social Space	-.0445	-.0506	-.0196
Distance from Children	.0576	.0688	.0285
Distance from Friends	-.0564	-.0616	-.0351
Sex	-.0161	-.0168	-.0132
Mediated Contact	.0534	.0610	.0411
Benefits of Reduced Fare	-.0742	-.0756	-.0752
Income	.0153	.0168	.0205
Age	-.0140	-.0145	-.0232
Anomia	.0077	.0086	.0009
Agree Response Set	-.0133	-.0150	-.0229
Attitudes Toward Reduced Fare	-.0489	-.0506	-.0563
Live Alone	-.0546	-.0564	-.0323
Location in City	.0670	.0690	-.0591
Difficulty Getting Around N.Y.C.	.0283	.0288	.0293

APPENDIX B
SCALES AND INDICES

Appendix B

Scales and Indices

Income

Considering the financial condition of elderly residents of New York City, the Mayor's Office for the Aging (Cantor, 1969) estimated that if a two person household was used as an income base - each person making 50% of the household income, a single person living along would require 55% in order to match the purchasing power of the two person household. In other words, using the two person family as the base group, the income required was 10% less than those members in the group base. In order to extend this formulation to include persons in three and four person households the following formula was derived to demonstrate comparative purchasing power:

$$\text{Family Purchasing Power} = \frac{T(12-N)}{10}$$

Where T = Total Income

N = Number of Family Members

Base Group

If T = 100

$$N = 2 \quad \frac{100(12-2)}{10} = \$100$$

Examples:

For T = 100

N	1	2	3	4
FPP	\$110	\$100	\$90	\$80

Socio-economic status based upon occupation

a) definition: Three questions were asked of the respondents; "What do you do?" "What did you do?" and for women who were married, "What does (did) your husband do?" Women, unless single are usually considered to obtain their SES designation from their husbands' employment rather than their own which often require a lower level of skill. Consequently, for women the designation was derived from the latter question, "What did you do?" when different from their present job, took priority. Only if the person was still working in a life-long position, was the response to "What do you do?" used. The categories used to estimate socio-economic status based upon income was as follows:

01. Large business and professional:

Includes bankers, manufacturers, large department store owners, managers, physicians, dentists, professors, teachers, ministers, engineers, lawyers, registered nurse, architect, etc.

02. Small business owner, manager, contractors and farm owner:

Includes small retail dealers, contractors, proprietors of repair shops employing others, both owners and managers. Any person who owns or manages a farm, ranch, grove, C.P.A., super, staged horse shows, etc.

03. White collar workers (sales people) and semi-professional:

Includes clerks and kindred workers, salesmen, agents, semi-professional workers, technicians, actor, bartender, secretary, advertising - writing copy, etc.

04. Skilled foreman and inspector, policemen, firemen:

Includes carpenters, plumbers, masons, printers, foremen, barbers, cooks, makers of mens clothes, tailor, butcher, shoemaker, seamstress, makes ladies handbags, auto mechanic, inspector or small arms, blacksmith, typewriter repair, telephone maintenance, plasterer, interior house painter, etc.

05. Semi-skilled workers:

Includes truck drivers, machine operators, service station attendants, waiters, countermen, postoffice worker, sewing machine operator, cab driver, examiner of mens suits, factory making trucks, longshoremen, transit worker, assemblyline hearing aid business, clothing mens cutter, driving cars for automotive company, mens clothing operator, millinery line-trimming, maintenance engineer, fur dyer, fireman, waiter, colorist for textile products, presser, milk carrier, conductor, painter, etc.

06. Unskilled workers and farm laborers:

Includes garage laborers, sweepers, porters, janitors, street cleaners, construction workers, and all non-owning, non-renting farm workers except those who work on their own father's farm, housekeeper, chamber maid, kitchen work, doorman, etc.

07. Housewife:

Never worked

b) programming instructions:

Card II	<u>Column</u>	
	32 & 33	if 98 or 99, go to:
	30 & 31	" "
	26 & 27	" "

Number of trips reported

- a) definition: This is a measure of the number of trips a person reported having taken irrespective of destination or frequency.
- b) programming instructions: Obtain the sum of the numbers of entries in "Mode" Card IV, V & VII.

Locus of trips

- a) categories:
 - 1) immediate neighborhood: anywhere an individual can walk to in under ten minutes.
 - 2) close by: anywhere an individual walks to regardless of time, or anywhere an individual can travel, by any mode, in under 20 minutes.
 - 3) a trip: any destination 20 to 59 minutes distant.
 - 4) a journey: any trip taking over an hour.

b) programming instruction:

Immediate neighborhood:	Card No.	Punch	
	IV V & VI	Mode (1)	Time (1)
Close by	"	Mode (1)	Time (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)
or	"	Mode (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)	Time (1) (2)

A Trip	"	Mode (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)	Time (3) (4) (5) (6)
A Journey	"	Mode (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)	Time (7)

Social Space

a) definition: The population has been divided into four classifications depending upon the length of trips taken monthly. These categories were delineated in the following ways:

- 1) Those people who took at least one trip of an hour or more in length at least once a month were placed in category 1.
- 2) From the rest of the population, those people who took at least a half-hour trip once a month were selected. (Some individuals who had taken hour long trips did not do so frequently enough to meet the criterion for category 1. When this occurred, any hour-long trips taken were combined with half-hour trips to see whether they met the criterion for the second category, i.e., they had taken at least a 30 minute trip at least once a month.)
- 3) From those remaining, people who took at least a ten minute trip once a month were selected in a similar manner. (If a person had not met the criterion for category 2, but had taken a trip of half an hour, the half-hour trips were added to the ten minute trips.)
- 4) Finally, we were left with those individuals who did not leave the immediate neighborhood (nine minutes from home) as often as once a month. These are the people with a severely restricted social space.

b) programming instruction:

The social space categories were generated from the following table:

Category	Frequency — Time	1/month or more	2/year	1/year	Weight Total
1	60+ min.	1	1/6	1/12	Category 1
2	30 - 59 min.	1	1/6	1/12	Category 1 + 2
3	10 - 29 min.	1	1/6	1/12	Category 1+2+3
4	< 10 min.	1	1/6	1/12	Category 1+2+3+4

Those who meet the criterion for a category are pulled out before the next category is established.

Face-to-face contact:

a) definition: This measures the number of different trips reported and visits both in his home and elsewhere.

b) programming instruction:

Sum:	Card No.	Punch
	IV	No. of ITEM (delete (9))
	V	No. of RELATIVES (delete (9))
	IV	No. of FRIENDS (delete (9))

Mediated contact:

a) definition: It is possible to maintain contact with people, groups and ideas without meeting with someone in a face-to-face situation. At least one group of investigators have found the telephone to be at least as important as face-to-face encounters for maintenance of social contact among the elderly (Wellman, Hewson & Coates, 1969). The amount of mediated contact is derived from items concerning the number of people that the respondent contacts via telephone or by letter, whether or not he reads a newspaper, listens to the radio, watches television, subscribes to magazines, or voted in the last election. All the activities included serve to provide a feeling of contact with society.

b) programming instruction:

Card No.	Column	Punch	Score
	11	all	Total(delete (9))
	12	all	"

Card No.	Column	Punch	Score
	13	(1) (2) (3)	+1
	14	(1) (2) (3)	+1
	15	(1) (2) (3)	+1
	16	(1)	+1
	17	(1)	+1

sum: _____

Social isolation:

a) definition: Another scale of social contact, that of social isolation, has been applied to this data. This scale which is selective rather than inclusive was similarly devised by Ruth Bennett and the present author (Granick & Nahemow, 1961) for use with individuals entering homes for the aged. The scale has been tested for internal consistency and reliability of report over time and has the advantage of providing the information in a form which is comparable to other groups. It consists of five areas of commonly activated role relationships, namely, contact with children, siblings, friends, other relatives, and membership in organizations or long standing social groups. The purpose is to measure the breadth of social contact maintained in old age. Each category is assigned a maximum of two points. For example, a person who has no children or who has not seen any of his children for a year is given a score of zero; if he has a relationship with one child, one point is assigned; with two or more children two points are assigned. A similar procedure is followed for organizations, friends, etc. The minimum total score obtainable is zero and the maximum is ten.

b) programming instruction:

<u>Social Isolation:</u>	Card No.	Punch
Sum up to 2	IV	ITEM (4) (5)
points for	V	RELATIVE (2)
each item:	V	RELATIVE (9)
	VI	FRIEND All columns punch
	V	RELATIVE (3) (4) (5) (6) (7)

Anomia:

a) definition: The anomia scale which measures an individual's feelings of alienation from society, was first devised by Srole, (1956) and has been widely used subsequently. The present form of the instrument has been expanded from the original five item scale to a ten item scale containing both positively and negatively worded items. The scale was devised by the present author for use with the elderly, and has been applied extensively. Modifications were made in the wording to make it comprehensible, as well, to people whose native language is not English. The scale includes items 70-79, on pages 15-16 of the questionnaire. As an example, the anomic response to item 70, "You can always find something ahead of you which makes life worth living." is "disagree". The anomic response to item 71, "In spite of what people say the life of man is getting worse." is "agree". Whether stated in positive, "agree", or negative "disagree", terms, the anomic response is scored +2, and the non-anomic response is scored 0. These scores are summed, providing a scale which ranges from zero to 20.

b) programming instruction:

Card VII

<u>Column</u>	<u>Score</u>		
18	1=0	2=+2	8=1
19	1=+2	2=0	8=1
20	1=0	2=+2	8=1
21	1=+2	2=0	8=1
22	1=+2	2=0	8=1
23	1=+2	2=0	8=1
24	1=0	2=+2	8=1
25	1=0	2=+2	8=1
26	1=0	2=+2	8=1
27	1=+2	2=0	8=1

Agreement Response Set (Anomia): Items 70-79 which comprise the Anomia scale were also scored for agreement response set, since it has been found that older persons tend to agree with questions. All agree responses were scored +2 all "disagree" responses were scored 0. A person who agreed to every item would receive an agreement response score of +20 and an Anomia score of +10.

Attitudes towards reduced fare:

a) definition: The sum of items 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90, 93, 94, 96, 98, 100 and 101 is scored so that a very positive response = 5 and a very negative response = 0, as indicators of the respondent's attitude toward the reduced fare program.

b) programming instruction:

Card VII	<u>Column</u>	<u>Score</u>
	32	1=+1
	33	1=+1
	34	1=+5
	36	1=+1
	37	1=+1
	38	1=+5
	39	1=+5
	42	1=+1
	44	1=+5
	46	1=+5
	48	1=+5
	49	1=+1

when 1=+1, 2=+2, 3=+3, 4=+4, 5=+5,

when 1=+5, 2=+4, 3=+3, 4=+2, 5=+1

9=+3 unless more than half of the items are coded 9. In that case, delete scale.

Access to public transit: This item combines the responses to three discrete questions, nos. 10, 12 & 56, to find out whether a bus or subway is within comfortable walking distance from the respondent's home.

Benefits of reduced fare: This item combines two responses, 7 & 8 to find out whether the person either saves enough money to make a difference in his budget or travels more as a consequence of the reduced fare program.

Distance from children:

a) definition: an arithmetic average was obtained for the time it took to travel to children the respondent visited.

b) programming instruction:

<u>Card No.</u>	<u>Punch</u>	<u>Time</u>
V	Relative (2)	(1) = 5
		(2) = 15
		(3) = 25
		(4) = 35
		(5) = 45
		(6) = 55
		(7) = 65

Sum

No. of Relative (2)

Distance from relatives: This is the same as the above except that in the RELATIVE column punches (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) & (7) were used.

Distance from friends: Same as above but comes from card VI.

Weather: A weather code was established which took into account average temperature, precipitation and wind conditions for each day. Information was obtained from the U.S. Weather Bureau.

1. Temperature - mean for the day

warm	55=	3
medium	41-54	2
cold	32-40	1
freezing	31-	0

2. Precipitation - 12 hours ending 7 P.M.

0.		2
.01-.99		1
1.00)		0

3. Wind

low		2
12-19		1
20) max.		0

sum of scores for items 1,2,3 above = code number
for weather

APPENDIX C
QUESTIONNAIRE

	Col.
Card No.	1
S. S. No.	2-10
Zip Code	11-13
Birth Date	14-19

Card I

Col. 1-19

Hello, are you _____? I'm _____
 from City University. Did you get our letter? The Mayor's Office of Aging
 has asked us to find out what you think of the reduced fare system on the
 subways and buses. May I ask you a few questions?

Interviewer _____ 20 21
 () ()

Date of Interview _____ 22 23 24 25 26 27
 () () / () () / () ()
 month day year

Time started Interview _____

Section I. Reduced Fare

1. Have you used your reduced fare card? 28
Yes ()1
No ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
2. Do you always carry it with you? 29
Yes ()1
No ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
3. Do you plan your day so that you can travel during the reduced fare hours? 30
Yes ()1
No ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
4. Are there times when you could use the card but chose not to? 31
Yes ()1 (go to Q. 5)
No ()2
DK ()8 } go to Q. 6)
NA ()9
5. Why? _____

_____ 32 33
() ()
6. If the card was acceptable at any time, would you use it during the rush hours 7-10 A.M. and 4-7 P.M? 34
Yes ()1
No ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
7. Do you think that you travel more now that a trip costs you less? 35
Yes ()1 (go to Q. 8)
No ()2
DK ()8 } go to Q. 9)
NA ()9

8. Do you make particular trips more frequently? 36 37
() ()
-
9. Do you save enough money with the reduced fare to make a difference in your budget? 38
- Yes () 1 (go to Q. 10)
No () 2 *
DK () 8 (go to Q. 11)
NA () 9
10. Do you do anything in particular with the money saved? What? _____ 39
- Yes () 1
No () 2
DK () 8
NA () 9
11. Do friends visit you more since the reduced fare program went into effect? 40
- Yes () 1
No () 2
DK () 8
NA () 9
12. How do you usually travel within the city? 41
- Walk () 1
Bus () 2
Subway () 3
Bus & Subway () 4
Car () 5
Taxi () 6
Other () 7
DK () 8
NA () 9
13. How many times a week do you take a bus or subway? 42
- Less than 1/wk. () 1
1/wk. () 2
2/wk. () 3
3/wk. () 4
4/wk. () 5
More () 6
14. How many blocks do you walk to get to the subway that you most frequently use? 43 44
() ()

blocks

15. How many blocks do you walk to get to the nearest bus 45 46
_____ () ()
16. To get most places you want to go, do you have to pay more than one fare? 47
Yes ()1
No ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
17. Do you think that New York City is a difficult place for older people to live? 48
Yes ()1
No ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
18. Why? _____ 49 50

() ()
19. Is it difficult for older people to get around in the city? 51
Yes ()1
No ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
- 19a. Why? _____ 52 53

() ()
20. Do you think the reduced fare program has made it easier for older people to get around? 54
Yes ()1
No ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
21. Why do you think the city started the reduced fare program _____ 55 56

() ()
22. Do you have any suggestions for improving the reduced fare system that we should report to the Mayor's Office?

_____ 57 58
() ()

Card II	Col.
Card No.	1
S. S. No.	2-10

Section II. Demographic

I would like to ask you a few questions about yourself.

23. Where were you born? 11
 U.S.A. (Write in State) _____ () (go to Q. 25)
 Other (Write in Country) _____ () (go to Q. 24)
24. When did you come to this country? 12
 After 1960 () 1
 1940-1960 () 2
 1920-1939 () 3
 1900-1919 () 4
 Before 1900 () 5
 DK () 8
 NA () 9
25. How long have you lived in New York City? 13 14 15 16
 () () / () ()
 years months
 (if less than a year)
26. How long have you lived where you live now? 17
 Less than a year () 1
 1-5 years () 2
 6-10 years () 3
 More than 10 years () 4
 DK () 8
 NA () 9
27. Who else lives here? 18
 _____ Number of other people ()

 _____ Household consists of: 19
 Spouse () 1
 Children's family () 2
 Other relatives () 3
 Unrelated () 4
 Alone () 5
 Other () 8

28. How many rooms do you have? _____ 20 21
 () ()
 number of rooms

29. Do you have a telephone? _____ 22
 Yes () 1
 No () 2
 NA () 9

30. What is your religious preference? 23
 Protestant () 1
 Catholic () 2
 Jewish () 3
 Other _____ () 4
 specify
 None () 5

31. Are you now single-married-widowed-divorced- 24
 separated? Single () 1
 Married () 2
 Widowed () 3
 Separated/
 divorced () 4
 Other () 8

32. Are you employed now? 25
 Yes () 1 (go to Q. 33)
 No () 2 (go to Q. 35)
 NA () 9

33. What do you do? _____ 26 27
 () ()

34. How many hours a week do you work? _____ 28 29
 () ()
 hours

35. What did you do? _____ 30 31
 () ()

36. If woman and married:
 What does (did) your husband do? _____ 32 33
 () ()

37. Would you please tell me your approximate income each month?
34 35 36 37
\$ () () () ()

38. How many people does this income support?
38
()
number of people
(self = one person)

Check ones that apply:

39. Does this come from:
Social Security 39 ()1 ()2
Savings 40 ()1 ()2
Relatives 41 ()1 ()2
Insurance 42 ()1 ()2
Welfare 43 ()1 ()2
Employment 44 ()1 ()2
Other 45 ()1 ()2
specify

40. Do you have to pay for your room and board:
46
Yes ()1
No ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9

41. Is your income enough to cover the necessities of life for you?
47
Yes ()1
No ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9

41a. What isn't covered? _____
48
()

42. What is the last grade you finished in school? _____
49 50
() ()

Section III. Health Status

43. How is your health, would you say that it is good, fair or poor?
51
Good ()1
Fair ()2
Poor ()3
NA ()9

44. Do you have any trouble getting around by yourself? 52
Yes ()1 (go to Q. 45)
Sometimes ()2
No ()3 (go to Q. 47)
NA ()9

45. Can you get out of the house alone? 53
Yes ()1 (go to Q. 47)
Sometimes ()2
No ()3 (go to Q. 46)
NA ()9

46. Is there anyone to help you go out? 54
Yes ()1
Sometimes ()2
No ()3
NA ()9

47. How often are you able to get out? 55
More than 1/wk. ()1
1/wk. ()2
Less than 1/wk. ()3
NA ()9

48. Do you usually stay in all day when the weather is nasty? 56
Yes ()1
No ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9

49. How far can you walk to the store without becoming tired out? 57 58
() ()

blocks

End Card II

Card III. Col.
 Card No. 1
 S. S. No. 2-10

Section IV. Sample Trips

50. Did you go out yesterday or the day before?

- 11
 Yes ()1 (go to Q. 48)
 No ()2 (go to Q. 49)
 NA ()9

51.* Fill in answers in boxes below:

- Where did you go? - PLACE
 Where is it? - LOCATION
 How did you get there? - MODE
 How long did the trip take? - TIME
 Did you come back the same way? - RETURN

PLACE	LOCATION	MODE	TIME	RETURN
Specify	Specify	Walk (1) Bus (2) Subway (3) Bus & Subway (4) Car (5) Taxi (6) Other (7) NA (9)	1-9 (1) 10-19 (2) 20-29 (3) 30-39 (4) 40-49 (5) 50-59 (6) 60 + (7) DK (8) NA (9)	Same (1) Different (2)
12				
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()

* Place a (-) in the box after the last response in each category.

Section V. Network of Associations

52. Fill in answers in boxes below. Use additional paper if necessary.*

Do you go shopping? (Repeat for each of the items listed below.) - ITEM

Where is it? - LOCATION

How do you get there? - MODE

How long does it take you to get there? - TIME

How often do you go? - FREQUENCY

ITEM	LOCATION Specify	MODE	TIME	FREQUENCY
Marketing, shopping (1)		Walk (1)	1- 9(1)	More than once/wk (1)
Clinic, doctor, dentist(2)		Bus (2)	10-19(2)	Once/wk-once/3wks (2)
Library, museum,movies,(3)		Subway (3)	20-29(3)	Once/mo-once/11mos(3)
other entertainment		Bus & (4)	30-39(4)	Once/yr or less (4)
Church, synagogue (4)		Subway	40-49(5)	
Club, organization, (5)		Car (5)	50-59(6)	
informal goup		Taxi (6)	60+ (7)	
Business (6)		Other (7)	DK (8)	
Other (7)		NA (9)	NA (9)	
	()	()	()	()
	()	()	()	()
	()	()	()	()
	()	()	()	()
	()	()	()	()
	()	()	()	()
	()	()	()	()
	()	()	()	()
	()	()	()	()
	()	()	()	()
	()	()	()	()

*Place a (-) in the box after the last response in each category.

53. Fill in answers in boxes below. Use additional paper if necessary.*

Do you visit with any members of your family? Who? Anyone else? Do you have any (relatives not mentioned) _____? - RELATIVE
Where do you get together? - MEETING PLACE
How do you get there? - MODE
How long does the trip take? - TIME
How often do you see _____? - FREQUENCY

RELATIVE	LOCATION	MODE	TIME	FREQUENCY
Sister, brother (1)	Specify	Walk (1)	1- 9(1)	More than once/wk (1)
Children (2)		Bus (2)	10-19(2)	Once/wk-once/3wks (2)
Son-in-law, (3)		Subway (3)	20-29(3)	Once/mo-once/11mos(3)
daughter-in-law		Bus & (4)	30-39(4)	Once/yr or less (4)
Grandchildren (4)		Subway	40-49(5)	
Nieces, nephews (5)		Car (5)	50-59(6)	
Cousins (6)		Taxi (6)	60+ (7)	
Other (specify) (7)		Other (7)	DK (8)	
		NA (9)	NA (9)	
11 ()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()
()	()	()	()	()

*Place a (-) in the box after the last response in each category.

Fill in answers in boxes below. Use additional paper if necessary.

54. Do you get together with friends or acquaintances? Who? Is there anyone else you get together with to play cards, sit and talk, or do anything? - PERSON
 Where do you get together with _____? - LOCATION
 How do you get there? - MODE
 How long does the trip take? - TIME
 How often do you get together? - FREQUENCY

PERSON Specify	LOCATION Specify	MODE		TIME		FREQUENCY
		Walk (1)	Bus (2)	1-9 (1)	10-19 (2)	More than once/wk (1)
		Subway (3)	Bus & Subway (4)	20-29 (3)	30-39 (4)	Once/wk-once/3 wk (2)
		Car (5)	Taxi (6)	40-49 (5)	50-59 (6)	Once/mo-once/11mo. (3)
		Other (7)	NA (9)	60 + (7)	DK (8)	Once/yr or less (4)
				NA (9)	NA (9)	
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()
()	()			()	()	()

* Place a (-) in the box after the last response in each category.

Card VII.	Col.
Card No.	1
S. S. No.	2-10

55. How many people do you write letters to?

11
()

56. How many people do you visit with on the telephone?

12
()

57. How often do you watch television?

13

More than 3 hrs/day ()1
 Everyday ()2
 At least 1/wk ()3
 Less than 1/wk ()4
 Never ()5
 DK ()8
 NA ()9

58. How often do you listen to the radio?

14

More than 3 hrs/day ()1
 Everyday ()2
 At least 1/wk ()3
 Less than 1/wk ()4
 Never ()5
 DK ()8
 NA ()9

59. How often do you read a newspaper?

15

Two or more newspapers/day ()1
 Everyday ()2
 At least 1/wk ()3
 Less than 1/wk ()4
 Never ()5
 DK ()8
 NA ()9

60. Did you vote in the last Mayoral election?

16

Yes ()1
 No ()2
 DK ()8
 NA ()9

Section VI. Transit Problems

These are some of the complaints people have about subways and buses in New York City. Which do you think are problems?

For example:

There are no benches near bus stops. Do you find that a PROBLEM? Would you say that it was NOT A PROBLEM? or would you call it a SERIOUS PROBLEM?

- a) Problem b) Not a problem c) Serious problem

I will now read you a list of statements that some people consider to be problems of transportation in New York City. Please tell me if you think they are problems or not and if you think it is a problem, is it a serious problem?

PROBLEM = P
NOT A PROBLEM = N.P.
SERIOUS PROBLEM = S.P.

61. There are no benches to sit on while you wait for a bus. 17
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P. ()
62. The buses do not come often enough. 18
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P. ()
63. The bus drivers are rude. 19
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P. ()
64. The subway stations are too cold. 20
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P. ()
65. The people on the buses are not courteous. 21
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P. ()
66. The hours of the reduced fare are too few. 22
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P. ()

67. The bus driver does not give you enough time to sit down before he starts moving. 23
N.P. ()
P ()
S.P.()
68. The doors on the subway close too quickly. 24
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P.()
69. The subway stations are not lit well enough. 25
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P.()
70. The steps to get on the bus are too high. 26
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P.()
71. There are not enough seats on the subway. 27
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P.()
72. The subway trains are dirty and smelly. 28
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P.()
73. Transportation still costs too much even with the reduced fare. 29
N.P. ()
P ()
S.P.()
74. The subways are very confusing and it is easy to get lost. 30
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P.()
75. The driver stops too far away from the curb. 31
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P.()
76. There are undesirable people riding on the subway. 32
N.P. ()
P. ()
S.P.()

77. It is hard to climb up and down the subway steps.

33
P. ()
N.P.()
S.P.()

Section VII. Anomia

Now I would like to read some statements to you. Please tell me if you AGREE or DISAGREE with them. They are ideas expressed by other people and there is no right or wrong answer. Please give me your opinion.

78. You can always find something ahead of you which makes life worth living.

34
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9

79. In spite of what people say, the life of man is getting worse.

35
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9

80. The future looks bright for today's children.

36
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9

81. It is useless to plan for tomorrow. All we can do is live for the present.

37
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9

82. It is sad for children to have to grow up in this world the way things look for the future.

38
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9

83. These days a person doesn't know who he can count on. 39
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
84. The lives of most people will get better in the next few years. 40
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
85. You can trust most people. 41
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
86. The government will assure (see to it) the people of this country a better life. 42
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
87. It is useless to write to public officials because your problems do not interest them. 43
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
88. Most people in this community don't care what really happens to its Senior Citizens. 44
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
89. Most Senior Citizens today do not feel lonely. 45
A ()1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9
90. Thinking back on my life, I feel I don't have much to be proud of. 46
A () 1
D ()2
DK ()8
NA ()9

Section VIII. Transit Attitudes

I will now read you some more statements. Please tell me if you agree or disagree with them. For the first few responses say: "Do you agree (disagree) strongly?"

	Strongly Agree	(1)
	Agree	(2)
	Undecided	(3)
	Disagree	(4)
	Strongly Disagree	(5)
	NA	(9)
91. I enjoy riding the subway.		47 ()
92. The reduced fare makes very little difference to older persons.		48 ()
93. Older persons should pay the same fare as anyone else.		49 ()
94. The reduced fare has been a big help to older persons.		50 ()
95. It is dangerous to ride on the subways.		51 ()
96. The reduced fare should be in effect at all hours.		52 ()
97. Bus drivers resent the reduced fare program because it causes them extra trouble.		53 ()
98. My friends like the reduced fare program.		54 ()
99. Everybody who has a reduced fare card uses it.		55 ()
100. I hate riding the subway.		56 ()
101. Older persons should be allowed to travel free on the buses and subways.		57 ()

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 102. Reduced fare for older persons is like receiving charity | 58
() |
| 103. Subway trains get worse year after year. | 59
() |
| 104. I am able to get around more now that the fare has been reduced. | 60
() |
| 105. They should have reduced fare for the poor as well as older people. | 61
() |
| 106. Nobody feels ashamed to show a reduced fare card. | 62
() |
| 107. The condition of the buses in my neighborhood is a disgrace. | 63
() |
| 108. The city did a good thing in reducing the fare for older people. | 64
() |
| 109. Many older persons feel ashamed to show their reduced fare cards. | 65
() |
| 110. Subway trains are getting better. | 66
() |

End Card VII.

Thank you very much for your cooperation. I've asked all the questions that I want to ask. Are there any questions that you would like to ask me?

Do you mind if I call you in a month or so, so that I can ask you a few questions about the trips you took that day? What is your phone number?

Card VIII Col.
Card No. 1
S. S. No. 2-10

Section IX. Observations

Race-Ethnic 11
Black ()1
White ()2
P.R. ()3
Other
specify ()4

Sex: 12
Male ()1
Female ()2

Weather Conditions: Consult chart on bulletin board
13
Day prior to interview ()
14
Two days prior to interview ()

Level of Communication.
15
Full understanding of ()1
questions and answers.
Difficulty on some items ()2
Serious doubts about general()3
understanding

Attitude toward Interviewer
16
Very cooperative ()1
Cooperative ()2
Antagonistic ()3

Did anyone other than the respondent participate in the interview?

Explain _____ 17
No ()1
Yes ()2

Describe respondent _____
18
()

Describe household _____

Time Interview Ended _____

Length of Interview _____

Additional Comments _____
