

1381

L O N G D I S T A N C E C A L L S

I N E A R L Y 1 9 5 8

July 1958

I N T R O D U C T I O N

This report describes the findings of a study of long distance telephone calls conducted by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan for the American Telephone and Telegraph Company in the latter part of May and June 1958. This study represents a continuation of a series of studies heretofore sponsored by the Michigan Bell Telephone Company. The major emphasis in the present study has been on long distance calls and, in particular, on the impact of the economic recession in 1958 on the use of the long distance telephone.

The Sample

The sample in this survey as in its predecessors is a probability sample of the population of the United States, exclusive of the transient population and those living in institutions. One interview was taken in every family in the sample. Within the family, the respondent was either the husband or the wife, with the selection between the two on a random basis. Altogether 1456 interviews were taken. The response rate on the survey was 86 per cent; that is, 14 per cent of designated respondents were lost because they were not at home after repeated calls, refused to permit themselves to be interviewed, or could not be interviewed for some other reason.

The Staff

This study was carried out by the staff of the Survey Research Center, a division of the Institute for Social Research of the University of Michigan. The Institute is under the direction of Rensis Likert, while the director of the Center is Angus Campbell. The Center's field staff is

directed by Charles Cannell, and the sampling section by Leslie Kish. This study was carried out in the Economic Behavior Program of the Center, George Katona, director. For this project analysis and report writing were the responsibility of John B. Lansing.

C O N T E N T S

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	ii
List of Tables	v
Summary	1
I. The Frequency of Long Distance Calling in Early 1958	3
A. Trends in the Frequency of Long Distance Calling	3
B. Reasons for Never Using Long Distance	5
C. Changes in People's Use of Long Distance in the Last Six Months	7
D. Family Discussions About Long Distance	14
E. Expected Changes in Use of Long Distance	16
II. The Reasons Why People Make Long Distance Calls	21
A. To Whom Calls Are Made	21
B. Reasons for Calling	23
C. Are Long Distance Calls Luxuries?	27
III. Socio-Economic Characteristics of People Who Make Long Distance Calls	31
IV. The Time of Day and Day of the Week When People Call	37
V. Station-to-Station or Person-to-Person?	41
VI. Trends in Telephone Ownership	46
Appendix A. The Questionnaire	54
Appendix B. Sampling Errors	57

LIST OF TABLES

		<u>Page</u>
I.	<u>The Frequency of Long Distance Calling in Early 1958</u>	3-20
	<u>Table No.</u>	
	1 Trend on the Frequency of Long Distance Calls	4
	2 Reasons Why People Never Make Long Distance Calls	6
	3 Reasons Why More or Fewer Long Distance Calls Are Being Made Now Than Were Made Six Months Ago	8
	4 Relation Between Impact of the Recession and Changes in the Use of Long Distance in the Last Six Months	10
	5 Relation Between Change in Rate of Income Compared to a Year Ago and Change in the Use of Long Dis- tance in the Past Six Months	11
	6 Relation Between Family Discussion of Changing the Frequency of Long Distance and Changes in the Use of Long Distance in the Last Six Months	15
	7 Relation Between Past Discussions About Increasing or Cutting Down on Calls and Changes in Calling Expected in the Future	18
	8 Reasons for Expected Changes in Long Distance Calls Six Months From Now	19
	9 Kind of Calls Which Will Be Cut Down in Future	20
II.	<u>The Reasons Why People Make Long Distance Calls</u>	21-30
	<u>Table No.</u>	
	10 To Whom Calls Are Made	22
	11 The Relative Frequency of Different Reasons for Making Long Distance Calls	24
	12 Comparison of the Relation of Different Reasons for Calling to Frequency of Calling	25
	13 Are Long Distance Calls Luxuries or Can They Be Cut	28
	14 Relation Between What Reasons for Calling are Im- portant to People and Whether They Think of Long Distance Calls as Luxuries	29

III.	<u>Socio-Economic Characteristics of People Who Make Long Distance Calls</u>	31-36
	<u>Table No.</u>	
15	Relation Between Frequency of Long Distance Calls and Income	32
16	Relation Between Frequency of Long Distance Calls and Occupation of Head	33
17	Relation Between Frequency of Long Distance Calls and Life Cycle	35
18	Relation Between Life Cycle and Frequency of Long Distance Calls within Broad Income Groups	36
IV.	<u>The Time of Day and Day of the Week When People Call</u>	37-40
	<u>Table No.</u>	
19	Time of Day and Day of the Week When People Call	38
20	Relation Between Time of Day and Day of Week When People Call and Frequency of Calling	40
V.	<u>Station to Station or Person to Person</u>	41-45
	<u>Table No.</u>	
21	Type of Last Long Distance Call by Frequency of Long Distance Calls	42
22	Types of Last Long Distance Call by Income	43
23	Reasons for Calling Station to Station or Person to Person	44
VI.	<u>Trends in Telephone Ownership</u>	46-53
	<u>Table No.</u>	
24	Trend on Telephone Ownership	47
25	Telephone Ownership by Income	48
26	Telephone Ownership by Occupation of Head	50
27	Relation Among Telephone Ownership, Primary Family or Unrelated Secondary Family and Types of Family	51
28	Relation Among Telephone Ownership, Types of Family and Income	53

SUMMARY

Frequency of Long Distance Calling in Early 1958

The proportion of all families who make long distance calls once a month or oftener declined in early 1958. This proportion, which had been stable at around 40 per cent, declined to 35 per cent.

People who have a telephone but never use it for long distance say that the reason is that they have nobody to call or that long distance calls are expensive.

More people report declines than increases in their use of long distance in the last six months. Seven per cent of all families report that they are making more calls, while 11 per cent report fewer calls. Most families report no change. About 3 or 4 per cent of all families have cut back on use of long distance for financial reasons.

The impact of the recession on long distance is cushioned by the fact that most people who use long distance are fairly well off. The people who are most likely to become unemployed are those at the bottom of the income distribution, who are unlikely to make many long distance calls in any event and may not even have their own phone.

Of the families who have talked about increasing or decreasing their use of long distance recently, nearly all say the discussion was about a decrease. Altogether 12 per cent of families report a conversation about long distance; of the 12 per cent, 11 per cent say the discussion was about a decrease.

Most people anticipate no change in their use of long distance. Eleven per cent foresee a decrease compared to 5 per cent who expect an increase.

Reasons Why People Make Long Distance Calls

People are much more likely to call their relatives than any other group. About one in ten of those who place long distance calls from their home phone call business associates. A group of similar size call friends.

More people say that calling in an emergency is very important to them than any other reason. This group is less likely to call often than those who select other reasons for calling as very important.

Calling "just to keep in touch with the family" is very important to about one-third of those who use their home phone for long distance. Those who call for this reason are likely to be frequent callers.

Half of those who use long distance think of calls as too important to cut down. Some others take a middle position, while three out of ten feel calls are luxuries which can be cut back.

People who use the telephone to keep in touch with the family are unlikely to think of long distance calls as luxuries.

Socio-Economic Characteristics of People Who Make Long Distance Calls

Income is closely related to use of long distance. Of those families with incomes under \$3000, 12 to 19 per cent place a call more than once a month. Of those with incomes over \$10,000, 52 per cent call more often than once a month.

The Time of Day and Day of the Week When People Call

Most people do not call on any particular days. Seventy-one per cent report that calls by their family are not made on any particular day, while 18 per cent say they generally call on Sunday.

Most people call in the evening. Seventy-seven per cent state specifically that they place their calls from their home phone in the evening.

Station to Station or Person to Person

Of people who ever make long distance calls, 40 per cent state that their last call was person to person. This proportion holds about the same from one income group to another and does not vary greatly from infrequent to frequent users of long distance.

Trends in Telephone Ownership

The proportion of families with a phone at home rose from 1956 to 1957. The best estimate from the survey is that this proportion fell slightly from 1957 to June 1958, but the data are not conclusive.

I. THE FREQUENCY OF LONG DISTANCE CALLING IN EARLY 1958

A. Trends in the Frequency of Long Distance Calling

The proportion of all families who make different numbers of long distance calls has been stable, or has shifted only slowly, over a series of surveys (Table 1). In June 1958, however, the distribution shifted. The proportion who call once a month or oftener, which had been stable at around 40 per cent, declined to 35 per cent. At the same time the proportion of families reporting that they rarely or never make long distance calls from their home telephone rose from 25 to 28 per cent. These shifts suggest that the decline in the level of economic activity in 1958 has had an impact on the use of long distance. Other evidence to be presented below confirms that the recession has had this effect.

Table 1

Trend on the Frequency of Long Distance Calls

<u>Frequency of Long Distance Calls</u>	<u>April 1956</u>	<u>Aug. 1956</u>	<u>Nov. 1956</u>	<u>June 1957</u>	<u>Dec. 1957</u>	<u>June 1958</u>
Every day	1%	*%	1%	*%	1%	*%
Almost every day	1	1	1	1	1	1
Once or twice a week	7	8	8	8	6	7
A few times a month	14	15	15	19	19	16
Once a month	13	15	15	14	13	11
A few times a year	38	35	35	34	34	37
Less often	11	10	11	12	13	10
Never	14	15	14	11	12	18
Not ascertained, Don't know	1	1	*	1	1	*
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases ^{1/}	1294	1014	1091	1035	1174	1117

^{1/} Those with no telephone at home are excluded from this table.

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

B. Reasons for Never Using Long Distance

People who report that they have a telephone at home but never make long distance calls were asked if there are any special reasons why they don't make long distance calls. The replies are tabulated in Table 2. There are only two reasons which people mention: that they have nobody to call and that long distance calls are expensive. People who say they have nobody to call mean simply that they have no close relatives or friends who live at a distance. The frequency of mention of people's financial situation in this context would in itself lead one to expect that anything which affected the income of large numbers of people would also lead to changes in use of long distance.

Table 2

Reasons Why People Never Make Long Distance Calls^{1/}

<u>Reasons</u>	
Nobody to call	55%
Too expensive	20
Technical difficulties	*
No special reason	9
Other comments	9
Don't know, not ascertained	13
Total	<u>**</u>
Number of cases ^{1/}	196

1/ Only those people who say they never make long distance calls are included in this table.

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

** Adds to more than 100% because more than one reason may have been given.

C. Changes in People's Use of Long Distance in the Last Six Months

Those who report that they do not have a telephone at home or have one but never make long distance calls comprise 37 per cent of all families (Table 3). The remaining families were asked whether more, the same, or fewer long distance calls were being made from their home at the time of interview than six months earlier, and they were asked for the reasons for any changes. Of all families 6.8 per cent report that they made more calls. The most common reason was some change in their family situation, such as a special event or someone being away. Most families, 44.8 per cent, report no change in their long distance calling. But 10.7 per cent of all families report that they are making fewer long distance calls from their home telephone. Not all those who have reduced their calls gave any reason for doing so. Some 2.5 per cent of all families, however, reported that they had reduced their calls because they were worse off financially. The size of this group is one measure of the effect of the recession on long distance.

Another measure of the effect of the recession may be developed by comparing the size of the groups making more and making less calls. It is reasonable to assume that special personal situations lead to temporary increases and decreases in calling. Ordinarily these two tendencies should cancel, and the size of the two groups should be equal. In fact in this study 10.7 per cent report fewer calls and only 6.8 per cent more calls, a difference of 3.9 per cent. Thus, this approach suggests that 3.9 per cent of all families were reducing their calls in early 1958 for reasons having to do with the recession.

Another approach to the problem is to classify people according to the impact of the recession upon them, and compare the changes in the use of long distance by the different groups. The people who are most

Table 3

Reasons Why More or Fewer Long Distance Calls
Are Being Made Now Than Were Made Six Months Ago^{1/}

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Percent of All Respondents</u>
<u>More</u>	<u>6.8%</u>
Special events or situations (illness, etc.)	2.0
Someone is away temporarily or visiting temporarily	0.8
Someone moved away	0.3
Someone moved close enough to call	0.1
Increased business use of home phone	0.5
Increased use of phone for clubs, organized social activities	0.1
Phoning replacing some social gatherings	0.2
Phoning is convenient, enjoyable	0.8
Direct dialing is simple	0.1
Telephone company advertising has increased awareness of phone	0.1
Phone has been installed during last six months	0.4
Children are older, using phone more	0.1
Better financial position	0.1
Other	0.3
No reason given	0.9
<u>Same</u>	<u>44.8</u>
<u>Fewer</u>	<u>10.7</u>
Worse financial position	2.4
Calls are expensive, trying to cut down	0.8
Higher telephone company rates	0.3
No emergency, no trip, no reason to call	1.0
Special event, situation is past	2.7
Someone moved closer	0.9
Someone moved too far away	0.3
Person who made calls is no longer in home	0.3
Decreased business use of home phone	0.1
Other	0.5
No reason given	1.2
<u>Not Ascertained</u>	<u>0.5</u>
<u>Does not have home phone or never made long distance calls</u>	<u>37.2</u>
<u>Total</u>	<u>100.0%</u>
Number of cases	1456

^{1/} Based on total sample.

likely to be unemployed are those who are in the lowest income groups and, hence, least likely to use long distance even in normal times. Of those families containing one or more workers who has been unemployed, 54 per cent do not have a telephone or, if they have one, say they never make long distance calls (Table 4). Of those families which have been affected but only by having one or more members work shorter hours, 44 per cent say they never make long distance calls. Finally, of families not affected either by unemployment or shorter hours, only 33 per cent never make long distance calls. This relationship has a tendency to cushion the impact of the recession on the use of long distance. People who are affected are likely to be those who do not use long distance.

Nevertheless, as Table 4 also shows, many people in the affected groups do make long distance calls ordinarily. About one family in six in the affected groups says it has cut down on long distance in the last six months, compared to one in eleven of families not affected by shorter hours or unemployment.

The recession has been felt by people in other ways than unemployment and reductions in hours of work.

In Table 5 families are classified according to whether they are making as much money as they were a year ago. Of those who are making more in spite of the general decline in economic activity, a larger proportion report that they are making more calls than of those whose income is the same or less. This result is not surprising; it suggests that these people are adjusting their use of long distance to their higher income. Of those who are making more, only 10 per cent report that their use of long distance has declined in the past six months, compared to 28 per cent of those who are making less. There is a clear tendency for people whose income falls to reduce their use of long distance.

Table 4

Relation Between Impact of the Recession and Changes
in the Use of Long Distance in the Last Six Months

<u>Changes in Long Dis- tance Calls in Past Six Months</u>	<u>How Family Has Been Affected During the Last Twelve Months</u>			
	<u>ALL</u>	<u>Unemployed^{1/}</u>	<u>Worked Shorter Hours 2/</u>	<u>Family Not Affected</u>
More	7%	5%	7%	8%
Same	45	25	31	50
Fewer	11	15	17	9
Does not have tele- phone, or does not make long distance calls	37	54	44	33
Not ascertained	*	1	1	*
Total	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
Number of cases	1456	240	105	1058

1/ Includes families in which one or more members has been unemployed at some time in the last twelve months.

2/ Includes families in which nobody has been unemployed but one or more family members have worked shorter hours at some time in the last twelve months.

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

Table 5

Relation Between Change in Rate of Income Compared to a
Year Ago and Change in the Use of Long Distance in the
Past Six Months

<u>Changes in Long Distance Calls in Past Six Months</u>	<u>All</u> ^{1/}	<u>Income Now Compared to a Year Ago</u>		
		<u>Making More</u>	<u>Same</u>	<u>Less</u>
More	11%	15%	9%	9%
Same	71	74	74	63
Fewer	17	10	16	28
Not ascertained	1	1	1	*
Total	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
Number of cases	914	280	415	210

^{1/} Those who do not have a telephone or never make long distance calls are excluded.

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

Perhaps the most direct way to show the effect of the recession on use of long distance is by description of individual cases. The following quotations are from interviews with people who report fewer long distance calls in early 1958 for financial reasons:

White woman, husband a railroad switch man at a steel company, income \$6000-7499.

R's husband has been unemployed since October 1957. R and daughter are both working. Asked how they made ends meet R replies "We didn't; we're struggling through it; we're behind on our mortgage payments." They have had to borrow money, get help from relatives and fall behind on debt payments. The family is making fewer long distance calls because they are "Too expensive, we can't afford them."

Wife of truck-driver, income \$2000-2999

R's husband started a new business and losing all his savings in it, he then got a job as a truck driver. They are "living from pay-day to pay-day" and R stresses the fact that they are cutting down on all expenses, and gives this as the reason for cutting down long distance calls.

Negro woman, husband a farm laborer; income under \$1000

Husband gets only two or three days work a week hauling labor to the cotton fields; gets no unemployment compensation when out of work. R works as a maid. Makes fewer long distance calls now "because I don't have the money to pay for it." They are behind on payments and have had to borrow money to make ends meet as well as "cutting down on everything."

Male, machinist, income \$6000-7499

R and wife have two children under 18. He has not been unemployed but considers himself lucky "because I'm still working." His reason for cutting down long distance calls is "Expensive."

Widow, white, elderly; lives with son who is a pipe fitter

R explains that they are worse off now than they were a year ago because "my son does not work steady now." Family has cut down on long distance calls because of "No money."

Retired miner, 74 years old, income under \$1000

Lives alone. Has cut down his long distance calls to his daughter
"Because my daughter is making less money and she pays for them."

Elderly woman, a special machine operator, now unemployed, husband is retired, daughter is an office worker. Income last year \$7500-9999.

Expects income to be "much less this year." When asked what measures family has taken to make ends meet, R replied: "Just have to cut down, you can't buy things you would normally." Family has cut down on long distance calls "'count of the money."

Young woman, husband an inspector in an electronics factory, employed but his over time work has been stopped.

R has stopped working because of a new baby. Income \$4000-4999. R says that they have barely managed to make ends meet --"we dipped into our savings." They are making fewer long distance calls because of "The expense of it."

D. Family Discussion About Long Distance

After a series of questions about the use of long distance people whose families ever make long distance calls were asked whether in the past few months they have talked about either increasing or cutting down on long distance calls. In interpreting the answer to this question, not too much stress should be placed on the literal correctness of people's reports of actual conversations. If a person feels that there has been a discussion about cutting down on long distance, that feeling may influence his behavior, while conversations now forgotten are not likely to be important.

Most people, 87 per cent, report no conversation about increasing or cutting down on long distance (Table 6). Of the 12 per cent who do report such a conversation in the few months prior to interview, nearly all, 11 per cent, say the discussion was about decreasing the number of long distance calls. Of those who have talked about decreasing, one third report an actual decrease. Of the others, some report an increase. Presumably their discussions were prompted by the increase, and represent a decision to reverse it in the future. The largest group reports that, at least as yet, there has been no change compared to six months ago.

Table 6

Relation Between Family Discussion of Changing the
Frequency of Long Distance and Changes in the Use
of Long Distance in the Last Six Months

<u>Changes in Long Dis- tance Calls in Past Six Months</u>	<u>Whether Talked About Increasing or Cutting Down</u>				
	<u>All^{1/}</u>	<u>About Increasing</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>About Decreasing</u>	<u>Didn't Talk About Either</u>
More	11%			19%	10%
Same	71			48	75
Fewer	17			33	14
Not ascertained, Don't know	1			*	1
Total	<u>100%</u>	<u>2/</u>	<u>2/</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
Number of cases ^{1/}	914	9	1	105	790
Per cent of families who make calls	100%	1%	*	11%	87%

^{1/} Those who don't have a telephone at home or never make a long distance call are excluded.

^{2/} Too few cases to percentagize.

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

E. Expected Changes in Use of Long Distance

People who do make long distance calls were asked whether they expect that there will be more long distance calls made from their home six months from now. About four out of five expect no change (Table 7). Eleven per cent expect a decrease, compared to 5 per cent who expect an increase. Of those who have had a discussion recently about decreasing the number of calls, half expect a decrease in the number of calls from their phone in the next six months.

Those who expect a change were asked the reason. Their answers fall into three principal categories, those that refer to their family situation, those that refer to their financial situation, and those that refer to business use of the home telephone (Table 8). This result is reminiscent of the answers given by a different group of respondents in explaining why they never make long distance calls; they, too, talked in terms of finances and of their family situation (Table 2).

Financial reasons are mentioned by about 10 per cent of those who expect to increase their calls, but by 35 per cent of those who expect to decrease them. More people seem to have definite intentions to decrease their calling for financial reasons than the opposite set of intentions.

It may be that more people expect to decrease than to increase calling partly because it is easier to foresee the end of a temporary situation which requires calling than to foresee the development of a new situation which will tend to create a need for calls. And it must be kept in mind that calls need not be planned far in advance. Most people, quite reasonably, do not now expect their calling behavior to change in the next six months.

Those who do expect to cut down on their calls may not have in mind any definite category of calls. Of those who do mention such a category, the largest group expect to cut down on calls which they make to keep in touch with their family (Table 9).

Table 7

Relation Between Past Discussions About Increasing or Cutting
Down on Calls and Changes in Calling Expected in the Future

<u>Expected Number of Future Calls Six Months from Now Compared to Now</u>	<u>Whether Talked about Increasing or Cutting Down During Past Few Months</u>				
	<u>All</u>	<u>About Increasing</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>About Decreasing</u>	<u>Didn't Talk About Either</u>
More	5%			8%	4%
Same	79			42	85
Fewer	11			48	6
Not ascertained, Don't Know	5			2	5
Total	<u>100%</u>	<u>2/</u>	<u>2/</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
Number of cases	914	9	1	105	790

1/ Those who don't have a telephone at home or never make a long distance call are excluded.

2/ Too few cases to percentagize.

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

Table 8

Reasons for Expected Changes in Long Distance Calls
Six Months From Now

<u>Expected Change and Reasons for the Expectation</u>	<u>Expected Future Calls</u>		
	<u>All</u>	<u>More</u>	<u>Fewer</u>
<u>Reasons for increasing calls:</u>	<u>5.3%</u>	<u>92%</u>	<u>*</u>
Financial reason	0.5%	10%	
Family situation will change	2.0	36	
Business reasons	1.8	30	
Social reason, committee work	*	*	
Others	1.0	18	
 <u>Reasons for decreasing calls:</u>	 <u>10.2</u>		 <u>93%</u>
Financial reason	3.8		35%
Family situation	3.4		31
Business reason	0.3		3
Friends, associations less	0.3		2
Others	2.4		22
 Not ascertained, Don't Know	 <u>1.0</u>	 <u>8</u>	 <u>3</u>
 No reason given	 <u>83.7</u>	 <u>*</u>	 <u>4</u>
Total	<u>**</u>	<u>**</u>	<u>**</u>
Number of cases	914	50	99

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

** Respondents might mention more than one reason for expecting a change in the number of calls.

Table 9

Kind of Calls Which Will Be Cut Down in Future^{1/}

<u>Kind of Calls Which Will Be Cut Down</u>	<u>Percentage Distribution of Those Who Expect to Cut Down</u>
Those keeping in touch with the family	34%
Those keeping in touch with friends	9
Greetings	1
Emergency calls	6
When planning or making a trip	1
When worried about someone	2
Those in connection with work	3
Others	24
Not Ascertained, Don't Know	21
Total	<u>100%</u>
Number of cases	99

^{1/} Includes only those who own a telephone, make long distance calls and mentioned that fewer long distance calls will be made from their home six months from now.

II. THE REASONS WHY PEOPLE MAKE LONG DISTANCE CALLS

Several approaches were used in this study to the question of what are the reasons why people make long distance calls: people were asked to whom calls are generally made by their family; they were asked which of a series of reasons for making calls applied to them; and they were asked if they think of long distance calls as luxuries.

A. To Whom Calls Are Made

People's answers to the question about to whom calls are made are summarized in Table 10. Some 57 per cent of those who use long distance said simply that "we call our relatives," without specifying what relatives. Twenty per cent did specify that the calls were to their parents or to their children. A much smaller group, 6 per cent, mention siblings. It is apparent that the overwhelming majority of people who place long distance calls from their homes do so to talk to relatives.

In addition to relatives, about one family in ten which uses long distance mentions that they call friends. Another group of about the same size place business calls from their home telephones. Very few people mention long distance calls on personal business to doctors, hospitals and the like or calls to institutions such as hotels and stores.

Table 10

To Whom Calls are Made

<u>Type of Person Called</u>	<u>Percent of Those Who Make Long Distance Calls</u>
<u>Family</u>	
Son, daughter, father, mother	20
Siblings	6
Spouse	2
Relatives other than those mentioned above	5
Relatives, relationship not specified	57
Friends	11
Business associates	13
Other associates: e.g. church work, civic affairs, doctors, hospitals, etc.	1
Institutions: e.g. reservations, hotels, stores, etc.	*
Not ascertained	2
Total	<u>**</u>
Number of cases	914

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

** Adds to more than 100 because more than one mention was permitted.

B. Reasons for Calling

On the basis of previous studies of long distance calls a list of seven reasons for calling was prepared. People who make long distance calls were shown the list and asked for which of these reasons they make long distance calls. They were also asked which of these reasons were very important to them. The frequency of mention of the different reasons is shown in Table 11.

Fifty-eight per cent of all those who make long distance calls say that calling in an emergency is very important. The next largest group, 36 per cent, say that calling just to keep in touch with the family is very important to them. The third largest group, 24 per cent, report that calls "when I have had no news from someone and am anxious about them" are very important to them.

Table 11 also indicates the proportion who do not mention a particular reason for calling as important to them. Three-quarters of the population mention calling "in an emergency" as important; only 24 per cent make no mention of this reason. At the other extreme 82 per cent do not mention calling "just to keep in touch with friends" as important; only 18 per cent refer to it as important.

For a person to say that a reason for calling is "important" to him is not equivalent to saying that he places large numbers of calls for that reason. In Table 12 the relation between people's reasons for calling and their actual frequency of calling is shown. In preparing the first row in the table, a group was formed consisting of all those who mention calling "just to keep in touch with the family" as very important. The frequency of calling of these families was tabulated, and it proved that 42 per cent of them state that they place calls more frequently than once a month. In preparing the second row, a similar sequence of steps was carried

Table 11

The Relative Frequency of Different Reasons for
Making Long Distance Calls

<u>Reasons for Calling</u>	<u>This Reason Very Important</u>	<u>Makes Call for This Reason but Does Not Select It as Very Important</u>	<u>No Mention of This Reason</u>	<u>Total</u>
Just to keep in touch with the family	36%	30%	34%	100%
Just to keep in touch with friends	4	14	82	100%
For birthday or holi- day greetings	8	22	70	100%
In an emergency	58	18	24	100%
When planning or making a trip	9	23	68	100%
When I have had no news from someone and am anxious about them	24	25	51	100%
In connection with your work	16	10	74	100%

Number of cases 914.

Table 12

Comparison of the Relation of Different Reasons
for Calling to Frequency of Calling

<u>Reason for Calling</u>	<u>Per Cent of Those Who Say This Reason is Very Important to Them Who Call More Than Once a Month</u>	
Just to keep in touch with the family	42%	n = 324 ^{1/}
Just to keep in touch with friends	48	n = 35
For birthday or holiday greetings	44	n = 68
In an emergency	28	n = 529
When planning or making a trip	33	n = 83
When I have had no news from someone and am anxious about them	37	n = 214
In connection with your work	55	n = 149
Average for all those who ever call	31%	

^{1/} Since an individual might mention several reasons as very important to him, respondents may appear in this table several times.

out for those few people who say that it is very important to them to call "just to keep in touch with friends." For each row a similar procedure was followed. As a result it is possible to rank the reasons according to the per cent of those who say that reason is very important who are frequent callers. On this system, the highest ranking reason for calling is "in connection with your work." As shown in the preceding table only 16 per cent mention this reason as very important, but those who do are frequent callers. It also seems to be true that the very small group who say it is very important to them to call "just to keep in touch with friends" are frequent callers. At the other extreme, people who say it is very important to call "in an emergency" constitute a large group, but they are the least likely of all to be frequent callers. Those to whom it is very important to call "just to keep in touch with the family" form a sizeable group, and they also tend to be frequent callers.

C. Are Long Distance Calls Luxuries?

The vulnerability of long distance to economic recession may reasonably be assumed to depend on whether people think of them as luxuries which can easily be cut down or whether they think they are so important that they can't be cut. Respondents in the survey were asked this question directly. Their replies are tabulated in Table 13.

Half of the respondents state that they feel that long distance calls are important and cannot easily be cut. About 14 per cent feel that some but not all calls can be cut. Three out of ten state that in their opinion calls are luxuries which can be cut down. These answers were given to a question which immediately followed the sequence about reasons for calling and which reasons were important to the individual. Thus, the context of the question was such that people were thinking about how important calls are. In a context in which they were thinking about the virtues of thrift, their answers might have been less favorable to long distance calls. It seems safe to conclude, however, that there is a substantial group of people who are not likely to think of long distance calls as the first thing to be cut in times of financial pressure. There is another group, however, who speak as if they would be willing to cut their outlays for this purpose.

In an attempt to understand why some people fall in one group, and one in the other, a table has been prepared which relates whether people think of long distance calls as luxuries to the reasons for calling which are important to them. In Table 14 two groups are shown for each reason, those who think calling for this reason is very important, and those who make no mention of calling for this reason. Within each group the proportion who think calls are a luxury is shown. The major

Table 13

Are Long Distance Calls Luxuries or Can They Be Cut?^{1/}

<u>Feeling About Whether Calls are Luxuries</u>	<u>Per Cent of Those Who Make Long Distance Calls</u>
<u>Positive feeling; long distance calls are too important to be cut</u>	51%
<u>Middle position; some can be cut but not all</u>	14
<u>Negative feeling; calls are luxuries which can be cut down</u>	31
Don't know; feelings about calls not ascertained	4
Total	<u>100%</u>
Number of cases	914

1/ The exact question was: Some people think of long distance phone calls as luxuries which can easily be cut down. To others they are so important that they can't be cut down. How do you feel about it?

Table 14

Relation Between What Reasons for Calling are
Important to People and Whether They Think of
Long Distance Calls as Luxuries

<u>Reason for Calling</u>	<u>Per Cent of Those Who Say This Reason is Very Important Who Think of Calls as Luxuries</u>		<u>Per Cent of Those Who Make No Mention of Calls for This Reason Who Think of Calls as Luxuries</u>	
Just to keep in touch with the family	22%	n = 324	39%	n = 313
Just to keep in touch with friends	31	n = 35	30	n = 746
For birthday or holiday greetings	29	n = 68	31	n = 638
In an emergency	31	n = 529	33	n = 221
When planning or making a trip	25	n = 83	31	n = 620
When I have had no news from someone and am anxious about them	24	n = 214	34	n = 467
In connection with your work	24	n = 149	34	n = 672

Average for all those who ever call 31%.

result is that of those who say that calling "just to keep in touch with the family" is important only 22 per cent say calls are a luxury, while of those who do not mention this reason as important for them, 39 per cent think of calls as luxuries. People who think of long distance for keeping in touch with their families tend not to think of long distance calls as luxuries.

The other reasons for calling seem to be less closely related to whether people think of long distance calls as luxuries. There does seem to be a tendency for people who call in connection with their work not to think of calls as luxuries. To the extent that they were thinking of business calls, one would not expect people to see them as luxuries. There also is some tendency for people who say it is very important to them to use the phone "when I have had no news from someone and am anxious about them" to feel that calls are not luxuries.

III. SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PEOPLE
WHO MAKE LONG DISTANCE CALLS

The data collected in this survey permit an analysis of the relation between the social and economic characteristics of a family and the frequency of long distance calls by the family. This analysis is essentially similar to that carried out in earlier studies, and the results are similar. The independent variables analyzed here are the income of the family, the occupation of the head of the family, and its stage in the family life cycle.

Of these variables family income is easily the most powerful (Table 15). Of those families with incomes under \$3000, about 12 per cent to 19 per cent call more often than once a month. Of those families with incomes over \$10,000, about 52 per cent call more often than once a month. Similarly, of those with incomes below \$3000 from 24 to 32 per cent report that they never call, while of those with incomes over \$10,000 only 6 per cent say they never call.

Since the income of a family typically depends upon the occupation of the head, it is to be expected that families whose head is in a well-paid occupation will make more calls than families whose head is in a poorly-paid occupation. Thus, it is not surprising that over 40 per cent of families whose head is a professional or technical worker place calls more than once a month, compared to 16 per cent of families whose head is a laborer (Table 16). The results for other occupations can be interpreted similarly. Self-employed businessmen and managers are better paid than clerical workers, and their families place more long distance calls.

Table 15

Relation between Frequency of Long
Distance Calls and Income^{1/}

Frequency of Long Distance Calls	All	Income								
		Under \$1000	\$1000 -1999	\$2000 -2999	\$3000 -3999	\$4000 -4999	\$5000 -5999	\$6000 -7499	\$7500 -9999	\$10,000 and Over
Every day	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	1%	2%
Almost every day	1	*	*	*	1	1	1	1	1	3
Once or twice a week	7	2	1	2	4	5	5	6	10	20
A few times a month	16	17	10	10	17	11	13	17	19	27
Once a month	11	2	8	12	9	12	11	16	12	13
A few times a year	37	27	34	41	31	41	48	32	39	24
Less often	10	22	14	8	12	11	7	9	9	5
Never	18	30	32	24	26	19	15	18	9	6
Not ascertained	*	*	1	3	*	*	*	1	*	*
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	1117	41	73	78	113	175	168	139	162	119

^{1/} Those who do not have a telephone at home are excluded.

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

Table 16

Relation between Frequency of Long Distance Calls and Occupation of Head

Frequency of Long Distance Calls	All	Profess- ional, Technical	Self- employed Business- men, Managers	Clerical	Sales Personnel	Craftsmen	Laborers	Farm Operators	Retired	House- wives	Students, Unemployed
Every day	*%	*%	1%	1%	1%	*%	*%	*%	*%	*%	*%
Almost every day	1	1	4	*	1	*	*	4	*	*	*
Once or twice a week	7	11	16	7	20	5	2	*	4	2	4
A few times a month	16	29	23	10	23	11	14	28	13	9	4
Once a month	11	8	13	10	12	13	4	14	7	17	13
A few times a year	36	32	30	40	17	41	38	42	33	37	35
Less often	10	5	8	7	9	13	12	2	13	12	5
Never	18	11	5	24	17	17	29	10	29	23	39
Not ascertained	1	3	*	1	*	*	1	*	1	*	*
Total	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
Number of cases	1118	124	158	78	66	348	104	50	84	65	23

1/ Those who do not have a telephone at home are excluded.

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

There also appears to be a relation between frequency of long distance calls and stage in the family life cycle, though the effect is not powerful. Young, married couples with young children seem to be less likely to be frequent callers than those at other stages. Of those in this group 15 per cent call more than once a month, compared to 30 per cent of the young couples with no children, 30 per cent of the young, single people, and about 30 per cent of the couples with older children.

There is some correlation between income and stage in the family life cycle, and in Table 18 the relation between stage in the cycle and calling is shown separately for two income groups. Within the income group over \$5000 the number of young couples with children under two who call more than once a month is only 16 per cent, compared to 30 per cent or more of those at every other stage. Under \$5000 the pattern is similar, though the general level of use of long distance is lower, and there is a tendency for use of long distance to fall off among people in the later stages of the cycle. Of the older single people under \$5000, 45 per cent rarely or never make long distance calls.

Table 17

Relation between Frequency of Long Distance Calls and Life Cycle^{1/}

	Life Cycle									
		Young, Single	Young, Married, No Children	Married, Youngest Child 1 1/2 Years	Married, Youngest Child 11/2-41/2 Years	Married, Youngest Child 41/2-141/2 Years	Married, Youngest Child 14 1/2-18 Years	Older, Married, No Children	Older, Single	Other
Frequency of Long Distance Calls	All									
Every day	7%	3%	7%	7%	1%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%
Almost every day	1	*	*	2	3	1	*	*	1	*
Once or twice a week	7	6	9	5	7	7	10	11	3	3
A few times a month	16	22	21	8	20	21	20	12	15	15
Once a month	11	6	8	13	12	14	18	9	12	3
A few times a year	37	22	38	39	31	38	37	37	32	52
Less often	10	11	6	9	12	9	2	11	10	9
Never	18	28	19	24	14	10	13	20	26	18
Not ascertained	*	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	1117	36	80	130	143	246	51	254	135	33

^{1/} Those who do not have a telephone at home are excluded.

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

Table 18

Relation between Life Cycle and Frequency of
Long Distance Calls within Broad Income Groups

Frequency of Long Distance Calls	Income Under \$5000					
	Young, No Children	Married, Youngest Child Under 1 1/2 Years	Married, Youngest Child 1 1/2-4 1/2	Married, Youngest Child 4 1/2 up to 18 Years	Older, Married, No Children	Older, Single
Every day	*%	*%	*%	*%	*%	*%
Almost every day	*	*	2	1	*	*
Once or twice a week	2	6	8	3	2	3
A few times a month	18	7	17	14	12	12
Once a month	8	13	12	12	7	11
A few times a year	30	31	27	44	42	28
Less often	17	8	19	9	12	13
Never	23	35	15	16	25	32
Not ascertained	2	*	*	1	*	1
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	40	54	48	89	120	102

Frequency of Long Distance Calls	Income Over \$5000					
	Young, No Children	Married, Youngest Child Under 1 1/2 Years	Married, Youngest Child 1 1/2-4 1/2	Married, Youngest Child 4 1/2 up to 18 Years	Older, Married, No Children	Older, Single
Every day	1%	*%	1%	1%	1%	*%
Almost every day	*	3	3	1	1	4
Once or twice a week	11	5	6	8	18	4
A few times a month	24	8	20	23	12	25
Once a month	7	14	13	16	12	14
A few times a year	35	43	36	36	32	46
Less Often	3	11	8	7	10	*
Never	19	16	13	8	14	4
Not ascertained	*	*	*	*	*	3
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	72	74	90	195	121	28

1/ Those who do not have a telephone at home are excluded.

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

IV. THE TIME OF DAY AND DAY OF THE WEEK WHEN PEOPLE CALL

Respondents in this survey were asked whether calls are generally made from their home Sundays, weekdays, or no particular day. They were also asked whether long distance calls are generally made from their home in the daytime or the evening.

The answers to these questions are shown in Table 19. Seventy-one per cent report that calls are not made on any particular days, 18 per cent say they generally call on Sunday, and 11 per cent generally call on weekdays. No doubt the last group includes some of the respondents who place business calls from their home phones.

There is a large majority who state that they place their calls from their home phones in the evening. Seventy-seven per cent make this statement, compared to 14 per cent who generally make their calls in the day time. A small group, 8 per cent, insist that they call both in the day time and in the evening.

What is the distribution of families by time of day and day of week both considered at the same time? The central portion of Table 19 is designed to answer this question. Of all respondents, 3 per cent state that their families generally call on Sundays and also state that they generally call in the day time. Fourteen per cent state that they generally call on Sunday and that they generally call in the evening. Since the two statements were made separately by the respondents, this result is not quite the same as if 14 per cent had stated that they call Sunday evenings. It is clear from the table that the largest group of respondents do not call on any particular days but call in the evening. Over half of all respondents gave that pair of answers.

Table 19

Time of Day and Day of the Week When People Call

<u>Long Distance Calls Made in the Daytime or in the Evening</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>When Long Distance Calls are Made</u>		
		<u>Sunday</u>	<u>Weekday</u>	<u>No Particular Days</u>
Daytime	14%	3%	3%	8%
Evening	77	14	11	55
Both, either	8	1	*	8
Not ascertained, don't know	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	18%	11%	71%
Number of cases ^{1/}	914	150	97	652

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

1/ Includes only those who do make long distance calls.

Since some people call more than others, a distribution of respondents by the time when they call is not the same as a distribution of calls. In an attempt to reduce the gap between these two types of distribution, a table was prepared similar to Table 19 but with respondents divided into three groups, those who call often, those who call some, and those who call little. The results appear in Table 20.

In general the distributions in the three parts of Table 20 are rather similar. The frequent callers do seem to be more likely to state that they call both in the day time and in the evening and on no particular day. Seventeen per cent of them give this combination of answers, compared to 6 or 7 per cent of the other two groups. Frequent callers also are more likely to state that they call on weekdays. Altogether 22 per cent of them say their calls are generally made on weekdays, compared to 10 per cent of the other groups of callers.

Table 20

Relation Between Time of Day and Day of Week
When People Call and Frequency of Calling

<u>Time of Day</u>	<u>Call Often ^{1/}</u>				<u>Call Some ^{1/}</u>				<u>Call Little ^{1/}</u>			
	<u>All</u>	<u>Sunday</u>	<u>Weekday</u>	<u>No Parti- cular Day</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Sunday</u>	<u>Weekday</u>	<u>No Parti- cular Day</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Sunday</u>	<u>Weekday</u>	<u>No Parti- cular Day</u>
Daytime	21%	2%	7%	11%	13%	4%	2%	8%	13%	3%	2%	8%
Evening	62	7	14	41	80	19	8	53	78	12	7	59
Both, either, makes no difference	17	*	1	17	7	*	*	6	8	1	*	7
Not ascertained, don't know	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	*
Total ^{2/}	100%	9%	22%	69%	100%	23%	10%	67%	100%	16%	10%	74%
Number of cases	97	9	21	67	304	68	32	202	513	83	44	383

^{1/} The division into groups on frequency of calling is as follows: call once or twice a week or more - call often; call once a month or a few times a month - call some; call a few times a year or less - call little.

^{2/} Detail may not add to sub-totals owing to rounding.

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

V. STATION TO STATION OR PERSON TO PERSON?

People placing long distance calls may call station to station or person to person. Who calls one way rather than the other, and why? The approach to this problem taken in this study was to focus attention on the very last long distance call made from his home phone by the respondent himself. He was asked which way he placed that call, and why.

Of all respondents who ever make long distance calls, 40 per cent stated that their last call was person to person, 53 per cent stated that it was station to station, and only 7 per cent could not say which way the call was placed (Table 21). The choice of type of call does not seem to have varied greatly among people with different frequency of long distance calls. If anything, those who call once a week or more are more likely to call station to station. About 40 per cent of those who call less often than once a week made their last call person to person. Regardless of frequency of calling, more people call station to station than call person to person.

The choice of type of call is not strongly influenced by income. The proportion whose last call was person to person does not differ to any extent as among low, middle, and higher income groups (Table 22).

People were asked why they placed their last long distance call in the way in which they did. The most common reason given for calling person to person was that the person calling wanted to talk to one person in particular (Table 23). Seventy per cent of those calling in this way stated this reason. Sixteen per cent stated that calling person to person is cheaper because the person you are calling may be away. These comments, of course, are not mutually exclusive. The impression they leave is that

Table 21

Type of Last Long Distance Call by
Frequency of Long Distance Calls

<u>Type of Last Long Distance Call</u>	<u>Frequency of Long Distance Calls</u>					
	<u>All</u>	<u>Very^{2/} Often</u>	<u>A Few Times a Month</u>	<u>Once a Month</u>	<u>A Few Times a Year</u>	<u>Less Often</u>
Person to person	40%	33%	42%	39%	41%	41%
Station to station	53	58	52	59	52	46
Not ascertained, Don't Know	7	9	6	2	7	13
Total	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
Number of cases ^{1/}	914	97	179	125	404	109

1/ Those who don't have a telephone at home, or those who never made a long distance call, are excluded.

2/ Includes those who call "every day," "almost every day" and "once or twice a week."

Table 22

Types of Last Long Distance Call by Income

<u>Types of Last Long Distance Call</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Family Income</u>			
		<u>Under \$3000</u>	<u>\$3000- 4999</u>	<u>\$5000- 7499</u>	<u>\$7500 or Over</u>
Person to Person	40%	37%	45%	38%	41%
Station to Station	53	53	51	56	52
Not ascertained, don't know	<u>7</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	914	135	225	256	250

Table 23

Reasons for Calling Station to Station
or Person to Person ^{1/}

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Type of Last Call</u>		
	<u>All</u>	<u>Person to Person</u>	<u>Station to Station</u>
<u>Reasons for Calling Station to Station:</u>	<u>59%</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>109%</u>
Station to Station is cheaper	21	1	38
Did not care to whom to talk	27	1	50
Others	11	1	21
<u>Reasons for Calling Person to Person:</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>98</u>	<u>1</u>
Person to Person is cheaper, because the person you're calling may be away	7	16	*
Want to talk to one person in particular	28	70	*
Others	5	12	1
<u>Not ascertained, don't know</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>No reason given</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	<u>**/</u>	<u>**/</u>	<u>**/</u>
Number of cases	914	368	483

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

**/ Adds to more than 100 per cent since people might mention several reasons.

people frequently want to talk to one person and know that there is a possibility that someone else will answer the phone, while the person they want may not be immediately available.

The reasons given for talking station to station are the exact reverse. People comment that this type of call is cheaper, or they note that they do not care to whom they talk. Anyone likely to answer to phone is acceptable.

VI. TRENDS IN TELEPHONE OWNERSHIP

This survey continued a trend on answers to the question, "Do you have a telephone here at home?" The proportion who answer "yes" to this question has moved slowly upward. In 1956 the average proportion saying "yes" for the three surveys taken in that year was 74 per cent (Table 24). In 1957, it was 77 per cent. This increase is too large to be attributed to sampling error.

The statistics show a decline from November 1957 to June 1958 from 78 to 77 per cent. This decline is not large enough to be statistically significant. That is, the best estimate from the survey is that the proportion of families with a telephone at home declined by one per cent, but this apparent decline may be due only to random error arising from the fact that interviews were taken only with a sample of 1456 families. Thus, telephone ownership appears to be less sensitive to recession than is use of long distance.

Telephone ownership is related to a number of socio-economic characteristics of the family, as has been shown by previous studies. Tables 25-28 review the relation between telephone ownership and family income, occupation of the head of the family, and whether the family is a primary or secondary family.

The proportion who own a telephone rises with income from 37 per cent of those families with income under \$1000 to 57 per cent of those in the range \$1000 to \$1999 (Table 25). At the income level \$7500 and over only two to three per cent of all families are without their own phone. Of course, even people who do not have a phone in their own home may have access to a phone, especially if they live in a structure which includes more than one family.

Table 24

Trend on Telephone Ownership

<u>Telephone Ownership</u>	<u>May</u> <u>1956</u>	<u>Aug.</u> <u>1956</u>	<u>Nov.</u> <u>1956</u>	<u>June</u> <u>1957</u>	<u>Nov.</u> <u>1957</u>	<u>June</u> <u>1958</u>
Yes	74%	73%	75%	76%	78%	77%
No	25	25	25	24	21	23
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	1731	1350	1447	1356	1493	1456

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

There is a correlation between the income of a family and the occupation of the head of the family, as has been discussed in Chapter III, Socio-Economic Characteristics of People Who Make Long Distance Calls. It is not surprising to find over 90 per cent telephone ownership among families headed by professional and technical workers, self-employed businessmen and managers, and clerical and sales workers (Table 26). For the occupations which are less well paid the level of telephone ownership is lower. For example, twenty-two per cent of the families of craftsmen and skilled workers do not have their own phone, and 42 per cent of families of laborers do not have their own phone.

There is a relation between the type of housing arrangement which people have and whether they have a phone (Table 27). Of those families who own their own home, 87 per cent have a telephone. Of those who rent a house or apartment, 62 per cent have a telephone. Of those who have some other arrangement but are the principal family in a dwelling unit, about the same proportion have their own phone as of the renters. (This last group includes a variety of arrangements. Some people receive a house or apartment as part of the remuneration for their job, for example, some gardeners, custodians, or members of the clergy. Others receive their housing as a gift, perhaps from some member of their family who owns more than one dwelling.)

There is, finally, a small group of families (or single individuals) who live in a dwelling which is owned or rented by someone else. This last group includes servants, boarders, and the like. Many of them do not have their own phone.

Table 25

Telephone Ownership by Income

Telephone Ownership	All	Under \$1000	Family Income							
			\$1000 -1999	\$2000 -2999	\$3000 -3999	\$4000 -4999	\$5000 -5999	\$6000 -7499	\$7500 -9999	\$10,000 & Over
Yes	77%	37%	57%	54%	69%	83%	36%	90%	97%	98%
No	23	63	43	45	30	17	14	10	2	2
Not ascer- tained	*	*	*	1	1	*	*	*	1	*
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	1456	110	129	145	163	213	195	155	167	121

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

Table 26

Telephone Ownership by Occupation of Head

<u>Telephone Ownership</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Profes- sional</u>	<u>Self-empl. Business Managers</u>	<u>Clerical</u>	<u>Sales Personnel</u>	<u>Craftsmen</u>
Yes	77%	93%	94%	93%	92%	78%
No	23	7	5	7	8	22
Not ascertained *	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	1456	133	169	84	73	450

<u>Telephone Ownership</u>	<u>Laborers</u>	<u>Farm Operators</u>	<u>Retired</u>	<u>House- wives</u>	<u>Students, Unemployed</u>
Yes	58%	56%	72%	71%	55%
No	42	42	27	29	45
Not ascertained	<u>*</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	180	90	116	92	42

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

Table 27

Relation Among Telephone Ownership, Primary Family
or Unrelated Secondary Family and Types of Family

<u>Have Telephone at Home</u>	<u>Primary Family</u>				<u>Unrelated Secondary Family</u>
	<u>All</u>	<u>Own Home</u>	<u>Pay Rent</u>	<u>Others</u>	<u>All</u>
Yes	77%	87%	62%	58%	52%
No	22	13	38	40	48
Not ascertained	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	1433	837	431	65	23

* Less than 0.5 per cent.

Two main factors related to telephone ownership are shown in Table 28. This table is restricted to primary families who either own or rent their own home. Of the owners with incomes below \$5000, 76 per cent have a phone, while of the owners with incomes over \$5000, 95 per cent have a phone. Of the renters below \$5000, only half have a phone, but of the renters with incomes over \$5000, about 84 per cent have a telephone. At each income level owners are more likely to have a phone than renters.

Table 28

Relation Among Telephone Ownership,
Types of Family and Income

<u>Have Telephone</u> <u>at Home</u>	<u>All</u> <u>Families</u>	<u>Types of Family</u>			
		<u>Primary-Own Home</u>		<u>Primary-Pay Rent</u>	
		<u>Under</u> <u>\$5000</u>	<u>\$5000</u> <u>or More</u>	<u>Under</u> <u>\$5000</u>	<u>\$5000</u> <u>or More</u>
Yes	77%	76%	95%	51%	84%
No	23	23	5	49	15
Not ascertained	<u>*</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of cases	1456	387	466	315	147

APPENDIX A - THE QUESTIONNAIRE

L1. Do you have a telephone here at home? /Yes/ /No/

IF R HAS NO TELEPHONE, OMIT QUESTIONS L2 to L12.

L2. Altogether, about how often are out of town or long distance calls made from your telephone - say to places more than fifty miles from here?

/Everyday/ /Almost everyday/ /Once or twice a week/ /A few times a month/

/Once a month/ /A few times a year/ /Less often/ /Never/

(IF NEVER L2a. Are there any special reasons why you don't make long
ASK L2a, distance calls?
THEN SKIP
L3 - L12)

IF EVER MAKES LONG DISTANCE CALLS ASK L3 - L12.

L3. To whom are these calls generally made?

L4. Would you say that more, the same, or fewer long distance calls are being made from your home now than were made 6 months ago?

/More/ /Same/ /Fewer/

(IF MORE L4a. Are there any special reasons why (more) (fewer)
OR FEWER) calls are made now?

L4b. Any other reasons?

L5. When are long distance calls generally made from your home, Sundays, weekdays, or no particular days?

/Sundays/ /Weekdays/ /No particular day/

L6. Are long distance calls generally made from your home phone in the day-time or in the evening?

/Daytime/ /Evening/

L7. Now, about the very last long distance call you, yourself, made from your home phone: Was it person to person or station to station?

/Person to person/ /Station to station/ /Don't know/

L7a. Why did you call (person to person) (station to station)? _____

L8. Here is a list of some of the reasons people make long distance calls from their homes. For which of these reasons do you make long distance calls?

	Check if makes calls for this reason	Check if this reason is very important
a) Just to keep in touch with the family	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Just to keep in touch with friends	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For birthday or holiday greetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In an emergency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) When planning or making a trip	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) When I have had no news from someone and am anxious about them	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) In connection with your work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(IF MENTIONS TWO
OR MORE REASONS
FOR CALLING)

L9. Which of these reasons for calling are very important to you?

(Check very important reasons in the second column above).

L10. Some people think of long distance phone calls as luxuries which can easily be cut down. To others they are so important that they can't be cut down. How do you feel about it?

L11. During the past few months have you people talked about either increasing or cutting down on long distance calls?

(IF NOT L11a. Did you talk about increasing or cutting down on calls?
CLEAR)

/Increasing/ /Cutting down/ /Both/

L12. As you size up things now, would you say that there will be more, the same, or fewer long distance calls made from your home 6 months from now?

(IF MORE L12a. Why do you say so?
OR FEWER)

(IF FEWER) L12b. Which kind of calls do you think you will cut down?

APPENDIX B - SAMPLING ERRORS

Sample statistics are affected by errors which arise when only a fraction of the population is selected for measurement. The proportion of families in the sample having a given attitude, income, age, etc., will usually be somewhat larger or smaller than the population value. (The population value is defined as the proportion of units which would be found to have a given characteristic if the whole population were measured.)

If the sample is selected by probability methods, the expected variation of a sample statistic from the corresponding population value can be calculated. The sampling error is a measure of the range of expected variation of a sample statistic from its population value; it does not measure the actual error of a particular sample estimate. The sampling error, as used here, is equal to two standard errors; it is the range chosen frequently in social research in order to obtain the 95 per cent level of confidence. The sampling error indicates the range on either side of the sample estimate within which the population value can be expected to lie with 95 chances in 100. In about five of every 100 cases the population value can be expected by chance to lie outside this range. Most of the time the actual variation of sample estimates from the population value will be less than the sampling error defined above; in about 67 cases of every 100 the population value can be expected to vary within a range of one-half the sampling error from the sample estimates.

Table A presents the sampling errors which attach to the data presented in this monograph. The low estimate is the sampling error which would attach to a finding derived from an unclustered random sample. The high estimate makes a very generous allowance for the increase in sampling error which may result from the clustering of the sample. The sampling error applicable to most of the findings in this monograph lies somewhere between the low and high limits indicated in Tables A and B.

Table A

Approximate Sampling Errors of Reported Percentages
(Expressed in Percentages)

Reported percentage	NUMBER OF INTERVIEWS ON WHICH THE PERCENTAGE IS BASED					
	2000	1000	700	500	300	200
50%	2.2-3.3	3.2-4.4	3.8-5.2	4.5-6.0	5.8-7.6	7.1-9.2
30 or 70%	2.1-3.2	2.9-4.0	3.5-4.8	4.1-5.5	5.3-6.9	6.5-8.4
20 or 80%	1.8-2.7	2.5-3.5	3.0-4.1	3.6-4.8	4.6-6.0	5.7-7.4
10 or 90%	1.3-2.0	1.9-2.6	2.3-3.1	2.7-3.6	3.5-4.6	4.2-5.5
5 or 95%	1.0-1.5	1.4-1.9	1.6-2.2	1.9-2.5	2.5-3.3	3.1-4.0

Table B

Approximate Sampling Errors of Differences
(Expressed in Percentages)

Size of sample or subgroup	SIZE OF SAMPLE OR SUBGROUP						
	2000	1500	1000	700	500	300	200
FOR PERCENTAGES FROM ABOUT 35% TO 65%							
2000	3.2-4.7	3.4-5.0	3.9-5.5	4.4-6.1	5.0-6.8	6.2- 8.3	7.4- 9.8
1500		3.7-5.3	4.1-5.8	4.6-6.4	5.2-7.0	6.3- 8.4	7.5- 9.9
1000			4.5-6.2	4.9-6.8	5.5-7.4	6.6- 8.8	7.8-10.2
700				5.4-7.3	5.9-7.9	6.9- 9.1	8.0-10.5
500					6.3-8.4	7.2- 9.6	8.4-11.0
300						8.2-10.7	9.1-11.9
200							10.0-13.0
FOR PERCENTAGES AROUND 20% AND 80%							
2000	2.5-3.8	2.7-4.0	3.1-4.4	3.5-4.9	4.0-5.5	5.0- 6.6	5.9- 7.8
1500		2.9-4.2	3.3-4.6	3.7-5.1	4.1-5.6	5.1- 6.8	6.0- 7.9
1000			3.6-5.0	3.9-5.4	4.4-5.9	5.3- 7.0	6.2- 8.2
700				4.3-5.8	4.7-6.3	5.5- 7.3	6.4- 8.4
500					5.1-6.8	5.8- 7.7	6.7- 8.8
300						6.5- 8.6	7.3- 9.5
200							8.0-10.4
FOR PERCENTAGES AROUND 10% AND 90%							
2000	1.9-2.8	2.1-3.0	2.3-3.3	2.6-3.7	3.0-4.1	3.7- 5.0	4.5- 5.9
1500		2.2-3.2	2.4-3.5	2.7-3.8	3.1-4.2	3.8- 5.1	4.5- 6.0
1000			2.7-3.7	3.0-4.1	3.3-4.4	3.9- 5.3	4.7- 6.1
700				3.2-4.4	3.5-4.7	4.1- 5.5	4.8- 6.3
500					3.8-5.1	4.3- 5.8	5.0- 6.6
300						4.9- 6.4	5.5- 7.1
200							6.0- 7.8
FOR PERCENTAGES AROUND 5% AND 95%							
2000	1.4-2.1	1.5-2.2	1.7-2.4	1.9-2.7	2.2-3.0	2.7- 3.6	3.2- 4.3
1500		1.6-2.3	1.8-2.5	2.0-2.8	2.2-3.1	2.8- 3.7	3.3- 4.3
1000			1.9-2.7	2.1-2.9	2.4-3.2	2.9- 3.8	3.4- 4.4
700				2.3-3.2	2.6-3.4	3.0- 4.0	3.5- 4.6
500					2.8-3.7	3.1- 4.2	3.6- 4.8
300						3.6- 4.7	4.0- 5.2
200							4.4- 5.7