Missed journeys: The importance of discretionary and social travel
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Driving cessation

• Most likely in early – mid 70s?
  – aged 72 (UK) (Rabbit et al 1996),
  – significant reduction from 75 (Sweden) (Rimmö & Hakamies-Blomqvist 2002),
  – Mid to late 70s (Norway) (Hjorthol 2012)

• Health main reason for giving up driving – most frequently related to vision

• Self-regulation, drivers reduce distance driven over time,
  – quieter roads, not after dark, bad weather etc
Needs for mobility

**PRIMARY MOBILITY NEEDS**
Practical/utilitarian Needs
e.g. get from A to B as safely, reliably, cheaply and comfortably as possible.

**SECONDARY MOBILITY NEEDS**
Social/affective Needs
e.g. The need for independence, control, to be seen as normal. Linked to status, roles, identity, self-esteem. Impression management

**TERTIARY MOBILITY NEEDS**
Aesthetic Needs
e.g. The need for the journey itself, for relaxation, visit nature. No explicit purpose.

(Musselwhite, C. and Haddad, H. 2010)
A reduction in mobility can result in an increase in isolation, loneliness and depression and an overall a poorer quality of life.

**PRIMARY MOBILITY NEEDS**
Practical/utilitarian Needs
- e.g. get from A to B as safely, reliably, cheaply and comfortably as possible.

**SECONDARY MOBILITY NEEDS**
Social/affective Needs
- The need for independence, control, to be seen as normal. Linked to status, roles, identity, self-esteem. Impression management
- Isolation, no longer part of society, no longer feel normal

**TERTIARY MOBILITY NEEDS**
Aesthetic Needs
- The need for the journey itself for relaxation, visit nature, use and test cognitive skills

On giving-up driving this level of needs is adversely affected

- Not so easy to ask for discretionary travel
-  friends
-  accessible transport
-  public transport
-  teleshopping?

“Okay, you can’t ask other people to take you out for “a drive”. They’d think you’d lost their senses. Anyway, they have got better things to be doing with their time, then ferrying me about just for the sake, like”
(Female, gave-up driving at 80)

“It’s hard to explain I suppose. You just don’t seem like you belong. I suppose yes there are feelings that you might be ready for the scrapheap now. The first step to it, you know”
(Male, given-up driving at 76)

“Well Dorothy and David from number 3 take me shopping every week, we all go, we have a bit of a time of it you know, it’s a kind of outing. I never expected that.”
(Female, gave-up driving at 80)
The role of mobility in ‘activity’

• Individual ‘wellbeing’
  – ‘Activity theory’, role replacement (e.g. volunteering)
  – Informal, formal and solitary activity
  – Informal activity (with ‘familiar’ people) has most affect on wellbeing, more so for women (Ritchey et al 2001, Warr et al 2004)

• Social sustainability of communities
  – Social capital, greater social cohesion, reduced exclusion, stronger communities (Field 2003, ’Stanley et al 2010)
  – ‘Repeated social interactions between individuals and groups’ creates social capital (Lee et al 2005)

• Activity needs mobility
From individual to shared mobility

Necessary journeys

Discretionary journeys

Individual mobility

Driving cessation

Shared mobility

Ageing and / or disability

Necessary journeys

Discretionary journeys?
Options for (shared) mobility?

- **Bus**
  - Commercial
  - Subsidised

- **Taxi**
  - Cost
  - Availability

- **Community Transport**
  - Volunteers
  - Stigma
  - Availability

- **Lifts**
  - Availability
  - Burden

- **Virtual mobility**
  - Replace need for mobility?

Personal mobility also an issue!
Case study – community transport

87% said they did not have household access to a car (250 out of the 287 who answered the question.)

82% were female (241 out of the 295 who answered this question.)

303 Passengers completed survey
Community transport - benefits

• Mobility for those that wouldn’t otherwise have it?
  – ‘Independence’ a key benefit

“The (community) bus enables me to get a whole weeks shopping, I don't know what I should do without it”

“Community transport here is essential to someone like me - a non-driver. Getting to the surgery or hospital would be difficult or impossible by a certain time otherwise”

“Without dial-a-ride I would be completely housebound”

– Social contact with other passengers / drivers
– Role for oversight / checking on people
Do you have sufficient transport available to make journeys to visit friends and family?

- **Community car**: 100% Not enough, 0% Some needs met, 0% Enough
- **Dial-a-ride**: 88% Not enough, 12% Some needs met, 0% Enough

**n = 43 / 80**
Evidence of Isolation?

• Evidence of isolation from survey questions...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very isolated</th>
<th>Some isolation</th>
<th>Very Socially Connected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car scheme users (n=33)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General population 60+ years old</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Over the last four weeks I have felt isolated’

- 43% Always
- 37% Most of the time
- 11% About half of the time
- 7% Occasionally
- 2% Not at all

n=267

Comparison of scores on the ‘Friendship Scale’
“I have no social life since my widowhood ... and would like reasonable transport evenings to go out to theatre, or dances,... or going to pub to meet friends and socialise”

“I have friends in the village who it would be nice to have lunch with sometime and none of us has a car and we are too far away to walk to and far too expensive to get a taxi... so all we can do is phone each other”
Constraints on mobility?

- Operating hours?
- Availability of volunteers
- Needs of other users
- Resources

Use of community transport

- Every day: 1%
- 2-3 times a week: 12%
- Once a week: 47%
- Once or twice a month: 16%
- Occasionally: 24%
Important because... ageing UK

**UK Population***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UK Population by age band***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[chart showing UK population by age band with values for 75 and over, 60-74, 30-59, and 0-29 for 2010, 2020, and 2030]

*Office for National Statistics (ONS)., 2011. 2010-based national population projections - principal projection and key variants.*
Conclusions

• Loss of individual mobility inevitable for many older people through driving cessation
• ‘Shared’, community transport can be a lifeline
• But the focus on meeting necessary journeys could restrict discretionary travel, and ‘activity’
• Implications for individual wellbeing and for social capital in communities
• If this is the case, then this has implications for policy and planning
Any Questions?

Contact details:
Charles Musselwhite: c.b.a.musselwhite@swansea.ac.uk
Ian Shergold: Ian2.Shergold@uwe.ac.uk
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