EXPLANATION OF CITY-FORM INTERVIEW PROCEDURE

BASIC PURPOSE OF THE INTERVIEW. The interview is used to evoke the reactions of people to the physical, perceptive environment of cities. The structural organization of anyone city, in contrast to another type of city, is more or less susceptible to understanding and perception by its citizens. We are concerned with the comparative results of the interview in American and Italian cities as a clue to improving the techniques and principles of urban design. From the interview responses, we hope to learn certain principles in common (though often unconscious) use by urban people in sensing, or grasping the organization of their cities.

But, of the many aspects of city structure affecting city dwellers, we exclude from this study those which are not directly perceptible to the human senses – sight, hearing, smell, touch, kinesthesia. For purposes of this study, we hope to avoid a respondent’s opinions on the functional and social problems of the city. For example, we are not interested in a citizen’s awareness of a traffic problem in the city center. But, if the presence of many automobiles and their nose is easily noticed and remarked on by a respondent, this sensuous awareness is of interest in the study; it may be an important way of identifying the location of the city center with respect to quieter, traffic-free districts.

In the interviews, we wish to learn how people become sensuously aware of the over-all structure of the city and its parts. This implies that we search for proof that the city has definable character, or large relationship, of its own; that it has distinct parts that are nameable, recognizable, and easy to distinguish; and that these parts have relations to each other and the city as a whole which can be discerned sensuously. To a large extent, the structure of broad parts and interrelations between them may only be perceived as a sequence of events in time, extended in space beyond the limits of visual capacity from any one position. We are concerned with the implications that this extended scope has for physical interrelation of city elements.
It might be said that the satisfaction to the individual city dweller derived from this sense of the broad structure of his city include:

a. **orientation quality:** facilitating the practical problems of movement; the knowledge of where in the city one is, where other points are.

b. **recognition quality:** the feelings of mastery over a complex organism; the sense of security and familiarity.

c. **the heightening of human experience:** through a vivid and poetic environment.

We are concerned with discovering the importance of these satisfactions to the individuals being interviewed. We may discover specific ways in which each type of satisfaction is endowed by the city environment.

In stressing the bias of our city-from study toward that which is sensuously perceived, we must admit that an office interview is, at best, conceptual rather than perceptual. The person interviewed is not confronted with actual urban scenes to which he can react, either to recognize the scene as a familiar one, or to determine his spatial position from it. In the office, the respondent must deal with his own memory of certain city elements. We assume that those elements which do indeed come back to mind are probably the most distinctive elements among the many available. Or, we assume that those descriptive qualities, such as the mention of "red brick," which are easily recalled in interview are probably the most important, noticeable qualities of any given element. The importance of these assumptions in the interview is this: we must use questioning techniques which are calculated to force a subject to be specific and to give information about any given element that is of sensuous relevance. In describing a certain city area, for instance, we try to guide the respondent away from giving factual matter, such as the population size, which is known intellectually but which cannot be seen, heard, or felt. Descriptive answers must refer to things that may be perceived with the senses.
SELECTION OF STUDY AREA. The interview program is built around a specific urban environment. Referring to the interview itself (Appendix A), all sections of it except #1, #2 and #9 deal with a given city with which the respondent is familiar. In very large urban areas it is necessary to be even more limited, both for concentration of our own pilot efforts and because there are limits to people’s various levels of organization. Thus, of questions #3-8, all except #3 refer to a definite study area, to be selected by the interviewer. We offer criteria for this selection as follows:

a. the area should be comparable in size to our own Boston study area – approximately 3 square miles;
b. it should include the city’s principal “core”, the nearest approximation of “downtown”;
c. it should include substantial amounts of several widely-varying types of land use: retail, other commercial, residential, industrial, etc.;
d. the area should be delimitable with boundaries which are widely known to potential interview respondents; preferably, boundaries which can be named and yet whose names do not necessarily imply sensuous qualities.

One additional problem of geographical selection by the interviewer is required: the goals of the trip involved in Section #6 of the interview (see Appendix A). On inspection, the beginning and ending points of the trip should be selected in such a way that the straight line between them acts as a diameter of the area selected for study. This line should not be easily traversed as a straight, unchanging path; the trip should require turning movements. The beginning and ending points should each be widely known by name to potential respondents. To maintain interest of respondents, the trip should be no longer than 1½ miles in length.

NUMBER AND SELECTION OF INTERVIEW RESPONDENTS. We would propose that a total of 15 persons be interviewed. In choosing people to be interviewed, the following criteria should be followed:
a. All persons should be articulate and of high intelligence, possibly meaning that they must have some formal higher education. This will enhance comparability with similar interview programs already completed.

b. All persons should live and/or work within the boundaries of the city area being studied, so as to ensure a normal standard of familiarity with the area. The 15 persons must be from work or home addresses which are equally distributed throughout the various parts of the city study area. It may be of interest to interview one or two foreigners for comparison purposes. If this is done, these should be in addition to the total 15 natives.

c. None of the respondents should be an architect, a city planner, an engineer, or any other persons likely to have special training in the visualization of the environment or in making drawings or maps of it.

**ADMINISTRATION OF THE INTERVIEWS.** The interviews should be held in a quiet room, free of interruptions and giving maximum privacy to the individual being interviewed. This will be important in establishing his self-confidence and will produce more positive answers. Equipment required for the interview will include a drawing surface, tracing paper pad, black and colored pencils. In our own Boston experience, we have recorded all interviews on tape, and we have then had these recordings transcribed verbatim by typists. This procedure is difficult to coordinate. Instead of this, we would propose that tape recordings of all interviews be made, and the tapes for the last 12 of 15 interviews be sent to M.I.T. for transcription. The tape record permits comparison of the voice inflections, sense of enthusiasm, and other subtle indices of individual response with the interviews given in other cities. Tape recording has other advantages over note-taking during interviews: it is more accurate and complete; it provides time to absorb meaning of respondents’ statements. An ordinary table-model recorder and magnetic tape are needed.

It will be necessary to use at least the first 3 of the 15
respondents as practice in perfecting the manner of questioning. It is important to develop a sequence of questions and wording which is natural to one’s own manner of speaking. But the working should be standardized as much as possible for the sake of comparability of answers. For the last 12 respondents, questions should be given in the same way to each person. One of the purposes of practice in interviews is to condense the time taken for each interview to no more than 1 hour. This brevity is essential to maintain interest on the part of the respondent, as well as to keep the responses within manageable limits for interview evaluation and interpretation.

TECHNIQUES OF QUESTIONING. Out of the practice interviews the interviewer will gain a technique of questioning. (See Appendix A). We can list here a few suggestions from our own experience in giving these interviews:

a. avoid suggestion of answers or ways of expressing them; let respondents give their own, undirected responses.
b. cut short respondents’ attempts to give factual information which is irrelevant or obviously not perceived by the senses.
c. when responses are lacking in sensuous detail, ask the same question in a different way.
d. when responses are vague or do not refer adequately to available sensuous detail, force the respondent to remember the detail. For example, if a respondent describes his choice of direction in an imaginary trip as, “… when I arrive at Piazza S. Piero Maggiore from Borgho Albizzi, I turn right…,” the interviewer should respond with at least two prompting questions:
   1) “When you are travelling on Borgho Albizzi, what do you see, hear, or smell that reminds you that you have arrived in Piazza S. Piero?
   2) “As you turn right at Piazza S. Piero, describe what you would see ahead of you or what you would be leaving behind you that would assure you of being on the right path?”
e. Relate questions to human experience. For example, if a respondent omits description of a certain part of his trip, tell a brief
story that illustrates the importance of his answer in a vivid way: “… if you were riding, asleep, in an automobile and suddenly awoke from your sleep on Via Cavour, what would you see along here that would immediately tell you that this is Via Cavour?"

f. Always leave the respondent with a sense of security and confidence. Never suggest that he is mistake. In map-drawing, explain that only a quick, un-precise drawing is expected, that no one else ever has an easy time drawing the map.

PROCEDURE FOR NOTE-TAKING. In addition to full tape recordings of interviews, it will be important to make as complete notes as possible for certain sections of each interview. These should include:

a. basic personal data (see Interview Section #1, Appendix A);

b. generalized description of the respondent’s manner of answering each interview section; his sense of confidence, interest, emotional response, etc.;

c. generalized notes on the relative importance respondent seems to attach to one element as against another, either as an orientation device, or as a pleasure-giving experience;

d. interpretative comments on the respondent’s opinions as given in the post-interview, free discussion (see Interview Section #9, Appendix A.);

e. notes during map-drawing (see p.10).

ORGANIZATION OF INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AND SPECIFIC EXPLANATIONS OF PURPOSE. Each section of the interview has its own purpose, or its own method of evoking the sensuous reactions of interview respondents. The summary of these below refers to the numbered headings of the interview itself. Appendix A. As written in the appendix, the interview is phrased in language that we would suggest the interviewer use. We recognize, however, that each interviewer must make minor modifications to suit his own manner of delivery or the nationality of people being interviewed. An interviewer may wish to write down several alternative ways of asking the same question. Or he may wish
to remind himself in writing of minor, detailed questions that can lead a respondent to offer more concrete, sensuous information than is given at first. The summary here, then, is to explain the purpose of each interview section and to suggest alternate and amplifying questions. With guidance of this summary, an interviewer can make appropriate minor changes in the interview terminology.

**Interview Section #1.** At the beginning of each interview, basic personal data is listed. This factual information will furnish certain bases of comparison between the city of observers of varying characteristics. It is important to state clearly the type of work done by the respondent; his educational level (whether university graduate, lower, or higher); the number of years over which the respondent has lived or worked in the area under study; and where the respondent spent his childhood years. Respondents’ home and work addresses should be clear enough to locate them on available city maps.

**Interview Section #2.** Here we are concerned with determining respondents’ abstract, stereotyped, impressions of the city and some of its parts. We assume that terms in popular usage among people dealing with city areas must also have physical or sensuous characteristics associated with them. If there is concurrence among many people in respect of these characteristics, then we shall have some indication of what qualities of recognition we must provide in new city areas in order to continue, minimize, or heighten people’s sensuous associations with functional city elements. In such efforts affecting sensuous associations we will be guided by a knowledge of what people need to see, hear, or feel in order to have a sense of recognition or familiarity.

The terms we have used in the interviews in Boston are a list of land for divisions of the city. Thus, we include one term “city” for the whole urban complex; then, one term for each of the five major parts of the city:
- “downtown” – the core, or central land uses, including shopping, offices, warehousing, terminal and transport facilities, entertainment activities, etc.
- “factory area” – manufacturing activities, together with related storage and transport activities.
- “shopping center” – retail shopping and personal services occurring in geographical proximity to where people live; outlying commercial facilities not included by the term “downtown”.
- “residential area” – residential land uses; in the U.S. the term usually implies outlying or suburban single-family houses.
- “apartment district” – residential land uses; in the U.S., usually implying large buildings close to the “downtown” area.

In questioning, it will be important to guide respondents away from describing particular city areas they have known. This is a test of their generalized categories, or systems of classification. If, however, the respondent clearly has no abstract picture and in all cases thinks immediately of certain areas of his acquaintance, this fact should be noted.

**Interview Section #3.** Here we are again concerned with people’s generalizations or abstractions, in this case particularized for one certain city but undetailed with respect to its particular parts. We hope to learn what people generally associate with Los Angeles against other cities of their acquaintance. What constitutes the recognition quality, the “familiar face.” of Los Angeles that distinguishes it from other cities of America or of California?

Again it is important to lead respondents away from describing particular nameable parts of L.A., such as Wilshire Boulevard. We want abstracted, descriptive terms, not a division of the city. However, if respondents are unable to generalize for
the city as a whole and insistently refer to particular scenes within the city, note this fact.

In many cases there is indeed a particular position of viewing a city that symbolizes, in one sweep of the eyes, everything about the city; for example, the panoramic view of Firenze from Ple. Michelangelo. A follow-up question after 3.a. might be:
“What is your favorite view of the city? Does this view generally symbolize or summarize what you see in L.A.? How?”

**Interview Section #4.** The map-drawing of the city area under study, is possibly the most important material to be gained from the interview. An absolute time-limit of 15 minutes for this drawing is imposed. Obviously there are people who could revise and detail a map indefinitely, achieving greater and greater accuracy. The time limit narrows the inter-personal differences of analytical capacity and emphasizes the relative subjective reactions. Thus, under time limitations, a person will ordinarily put down the most important sensuously-known elements which are of high-to-low order of significance to him.

When the map is requested, the respondent may be confused about the limits of the area he is to draw. The interviewer must then define the area geographically without referring to strong, sensuously-defined physical boundaries. In the case of Firenze, it might be stated as “all that which lies within the governmental jurisdiction of the Comune.” In other cities where only a part of the metropolitan complex is involved, this problem must be solved by the interviewer.

The map should be drawn on white tracing paper approximately 11” x 18' with a black lead pencil. Anything added to the map in Interview Sections #7 and #8 should be done in red-colored pencil. If within the 15-minute period the respondent wants to begin his map again, turn over another sheet and let him trace over his original drawing if desired. If, at the end of 15 minutes, the respondent wishes to continue his drawing, let him do it on another sheet., but keep the 15-minutes drawing separate.
Note-taking by the interviewer during the time of drawing is especially important. These notes should include the following:

1. where the map is in relation to the person drawing it: whether, for instance, the Arno River is on the edge of the sheet nearest him.

2. complete sequence of each element as it is drawn on the map: for example, if the respondent draws first the Arno River, then the hills surrounding, then Piazza Repubblica, then Via Calzaioi, etc., list these in order. In this sequence list, note the points at which the respondent pauses to reflect or seems confused; note the elements which are erased and redrawn and what the change is.

3. note the interviewer’s own interpretation of what is being drawn: whether, for example, the respondent seems to think of the city as a grid with axes intersecting at Piazza Repubblica, or whether he seems to think of the city as a succession of things related in distance and direction from the Arno River.

Interview Section #5 and #6. In these sections we are using the device of an imaginary trip through the city to evoke memory of city elements. An imagined trip forces the respondent to find his way from point to point in the city. In this process he will usually remember specific elements which he has experienced. The fact that any element is mentioned in going from one location to another suggests that his element is at least generally fixed in its location. Some elements are relatively free of locational or directional significance - worthy of mention only for their distinctive appearance. Others are relatively more important for their direction-giving or location-giving qualities. We wish to induce respondents to mention both of these types of elements and at least some descriptive, qualifying information about them.

There are two required follow-up questions. Sub-question 5.a. and 6.d., “Do you have any particular feelings about various
parts of this trip?”, attempts to evoke emotional attitudes - what is poetic, pleasant, or what is abhorrent, confusing, disturbing? Sub-question 5.b. and 6.b. is a request for an estimated dimension of the city, the respondent's sense of size. Frequently the answer is given in terms of time rather than distance, but this should be left to the discretion of the respondent.

There are several possible intermediate questions, following the introduction of #5 of #6 and preceding part a. and b. These should be asked only if the respondent's description is not specific or sensuously detailed. For example,

(a) Would you describe (place or beginning rip) and tell me what you notice here that gets you started in the right directions?
(b) How would you describe or identify (route named by respondent) so that a stranger could be certain of being on the right path?
(c) How would you describe (turning point named by respondent), where you turned (or “had a choice”), so that a stranger would know where to turn (or “make a decision”)?
(d) How could you identify or describe the destination to a stranger?

The essential difference between the two trips of #5 and #6 is that the first one given is a trip with which the respondent is thoroughly familiar, as compared with the second, a trip he is required to imagine. The second allows comparison of the differences in route and distinctive elements between all respondents. The first and second together allow investigation of the importance of habit and frequent use in the process of organizing the elements of our environment. At least, we shall find that on an habitual trip the respondent will distinguish many more elements and on basis of subtler differences or sensuous distinctions. The habitual trip, given first in the interview, establishes the respondent's self-confidence before he must face the more difficult task of recalling the less familiar trip.
Interview Section #7: Here, by contrast with the indirect manner of the imaginary trips, we are directly asking respondents to list those particular city elements which they think are distinct and vivid. Major emphasis here is on the descriptive qualities of elements by which they may be remembered and recognized, as well as the emotional connotation that these have. The location- or direction-giving qualities of these elements are relegated to secondary importance.

The statement of the question is highly important here. The interviewer must not suggest that he wants only a list of small points in the city, such as Piazza Repubblica, the Duomo, etc. He likewise must avoid the suggestion that he wants a list of broad areas, such as Quartiere S. Croce, Quartiere S.M. Novella, etc. The respondent should be induced to mention particular, namable quality, etc. Only in this manner will we learn what are the popular methods of organizing the city into parts.

From the first comprehensive list of elements made by the respondent, the interviewer should select one each of the various orders of size mentioned. Thus, if piazza, quartieri, and streets are named, one of each of these groups should be selected for thorough description by the respondent. The respondent should be given plenty of time in which to name as many particular elements as he wishes, but he should not be forced to add to his list. There are 4 orders of size into which all elements can fall:

a. An object that can be seen more or less as a whole from a single position of the eyes (a detail, a building)

b. An object or complex that can be seen more of less as a whole only by moving one’s eyes or by scanning from a single position of the body (e.g., large piazza, small parks)

c. A complex which can be seen as a whole in respect to its width, but which stretches out of sight from a single position of view in its length (e.g., streets or rivers)
d. A complex which extends out of sight from a single viewpoint in all
directions (e.g., a residential quartiere),

If the respondent’s first list of elements only includes only one or two
different size orders, at least three different elements should be described,
regardless of whether they are of a single order of size.

It is important that respondents give descriptive material appropriate to
the size of the element named. Thus, if it is a long street which is considered to
be distinctive, what are the qualities that are common to its entire length by which
it could be recognized as a street rather than as a succession of distinct, small
points? What are the qualities that give a common character to a broad area, that
makes it more than a geographical grouping of many contrasting things?

In asking for the description of each of the three or four elements, it is
important to determine how well each one is distinguished from other similar
things. Therefore, the question is stated as a matter of being taken “blindfolded”
to the element, stressing that the respondent could not depend on knowing
where he is being taken by seeing a progression of related objects leading up to
the goal. The respondent must be made to realize that, in an actual test, he might
well be taken to Street A instead of Street B and that only his knowledge of the
distinction between the two would give him a sure sense of where he had been
taken.

Once the description of an element is completed, additional questions
might be asked, depending on the nature of response. These might include the
following:

a. “Are there any particular (emotional) feelings that you have with
regard to this (name of element)?”

b. “What features distinguish one side or part of (name of element) from
another?”

The second question (b.) may be used to determine in a rough way
whether the element has enough distinctive parts within it to
furnish a sense of direction. For example, if one end of Via Cavour is of red-colored buildings and the other of grey, the progressive movement from one color to the other is a sensuous reminder of direction.

Additional location and directional information may be gotten by asking respondents to locate the element described on the map they have previously drawn. In many cases, these elements will have already been indicated during map-drawing. If they have not been, the respondent should be furnished a red-colored pencil and asked to locate them. For elements of large orders of size, the respondent should be asked to draw the boundary or limits of the element. On completion of these boundaries, he should be asked why he has chosen each of the limits drawn. These questions may be phased as follows:

“Why do you show a boundary here (point to one of his drawn boundaries)? What particular change of character occurs here?”

Interview Section #8. This question is given at the end of the interview so as to avoid, in Sections #5 and #6, suggesting that compass points are an important way of describing direction. The north arrow should be drawn on the respondent’s map in red-colored pencil.

Interview Section #9. The discussion period is used to allow respondents an opportunity of offering undirected evaluations of the importance of the satisfactions derived from a sense of city structure. (See ages 1 and 2) The questions we include in Section #9 are suggested ways of beginning discussion. If the interviewer flexibility adapts himself to discussing the respondent’s own observations and arguments, the best results will be achieved. There is no standard in this section; we are concerned only with amplifying a respondent’s opinions about sensuously-perceived city form.
FIELD TRIPS AND INTERVIEWER’S REPORT. We would suggest that before interviews are begun the interviewer should subject himself to the same procedure which he will later use for the 13 respondents. He should write down (or record), within 2 hours’ time, his own responses to the interview, including drawing a map from memory. We in Boston will do likewise for the same city, relying on our own memory where the city is among our acquaintances. These self-testings will furnish a basis of interesting comparison between the trained and untrained city observer.

In addition, we would suggest that the interviewer actually make the same trip required on the interview (trip in Interview Section #6, Appendix A). Placing himself at the beginning of it, he should then go on foot, without maps or directions from other people, to the end. At each point of decision, he should describe his reasons for the choice of direction he eventually makes. He should note as he goes along the factors which recall for him his location and direction to other points. Whenever he is reminded of points out of sight, he should note this and the distance and direction from his own position he supposes these points to be. He should record his actual location and route by listing street and place names at each point of turning. On completion of the trip, he should make a sketch of the path he actually took.

After office interviews are completed, one of the persons interviewed might be asked to make the same trip in the field, leading the interviewer to the indicated goal. The interviewer should continuously note what the subject sees that recalls location and direction or that prompts him to choose certain directions; where these choices are made; and where certain invisible points are with respect to the subject’s position. A sketch of the actually path should be made.

These field trips will enable comparison of the way in which a trip is imagined with the actually reality of making the trip with the benefit of prompting visual scenes.

We would suggest, on completion of 15 office interviews, the interviewer’s self-testing, and the two field trips, that a brief interpretative reports be made. This report should include any conclusions
which the interviewer wishes to express. It might include opinions of the degree of concurrence between the 15 persons interviewed; opinion on what the concurrence of interviews says concerning the organization of L.A.; opinion as to the validity of this implied structure in L.A.; comments on the importance of these problems of perceptible, sensuous city structure; suggestions for other types of study; etc. The report should be written as a brief guide to the analysis and interpretation of the Los Angeles interviews. This will greatly benefit the staff at Massachusetts Institute of Technology in their work of analyzing, mapping, and interpreting the results of the interviews.

DOCUMENTATION AND SUBMISSION. The submission to M.I.T. on completion of all work should include:

a. typed notes for each of 15 interviews, indicating the dates on which given, covering material described on pages 6, 9 and 10.

b. 15 maps on tracing paper, with clarifying notes as necessary for place names and to distinguish parts drawn in response to Interview Section #4 from those drawn for Section #7 and #8 (See Appendix A.)

c. a tape record on ordinary magnetic tape, of all interviews (if made).

d. a typed copy of the questions, as actually given for the last 12 interviews.

e. interviewer’s self-testing, typed.

f. typed notes on the field trips made by the interviewer and one of the respondents, together with the two sketches of actual paths taken.

g. interviewer’s brief report, typed.

h. maps and photographers to aid M.I.T. staff in appraising general nature of area studied; additional and specific materials of this sort may be requested at a later date.

EXPENSES OF THE INTERVIEWS. M.I.T. will meet the following expenses incurred in this work:

a. costs of stenographers, but not including transcription of tapes.

b. rental of a tape recorder for one month.
c. expenses of telephone, postage, interviewer’s travel in the city, and expenses attached to securing interviewing space.

d. expenses for supplies: paper, pencils, filing folders, stamps, erasers, etc.

If the amount of all these expenses is estimated to be more than a total of $200, we would appreciate a realistic estimate of them from the interviewer before he proceeds with his work.
APPENDIX A: CITY-FORM INTERVIEW FOR FOREIGN CITIES

1. (Record basic personal data pertaining to respondent: sex, age, occupation, level of education, length of time associated with city area or city being studied, where the respondent spent his childhood years; and street addresses for respondent at his home and his place of work. Also note date of interview.)

2. I am going to mention some words for city areas that mean different things to different people. As I mention each one, please describe to me the physical characteristics you immediately associate with each word. I am not referring to any particular city but to your general associations with city areas:
   1) city
   2) downtown
   3) factory area
   4) shopping center
   5) residential area
   6) apartment district

3. What first comes to your mind when I say “Los Angeles” - what are its physical symbols or generalized pictures for you?
   a. Do you have any particular way of remembering the look of Los Angeles at night? in the summer? the winter?
   b. Are there any physical characteristics you associate with Los Angeles such as materials, colors, textures, kinds of buildings, kinds of streets, crowdedness, smells, noises, cleanliness, age, etc.? This list is not meant to be comprehensive -- I want you to tell me what physical characteristics you think are most important.

4. Please make for me a quick map of Los Angeles, as if you were making a rapid description of the city for a stranger. Not an accurate drawing, just a rough sketch.

5. Please give me complete directions for your usual trip from home to
work (or "work to home," whichever will end in the study area). Picture yourself actually making the trip, and describe all the familiar things you see, hear and smell along the way, including those that would give a stranger the clues he needs to make the decisions you have to make. Remember that we are interested in your pictures of physical things; it does not matter if you cannot remember the names of streets and places. Please be very thorough, including every little insignificant pathmarker that has become important to you. As you proceed, tell me how you can distinguish one place of turning from another, one route from another, or how you know you have made the right choice of directions along a given street.

a. Do you have any particular (emotional) feelings about various parts of your trip?

b. How long do you think this trip would be between your home and where you work?

6. Now, let me ask you for a description of another, less familiar trip. Please imagine for me how you would go, walking on foot, from (beginning point) to (ending point). Describe this as thoroughly as you can, just as before, remembering that we want pictures of the physical things you would distinguish along your route.

a. Do you have any particular (emotional) feelings about various parts of your trip?

b. How long do you think this trip would be from start to finish?

7. Now, I would like to know what particular physical elements of Los Angeles you think are most distinctive or vivid. They may be very large or small, but they should be ones that are easy to remember or identify any time you are in, near, or on them. They might be streets, large city areas, open spaces, buildings, details, or other sorts of things. Would you quickly name or identify those elements you think most distinctive?
a. Would you quickly describe (insert name), in such a way that I can be sure that, taken there blindfolded, you would immediately know where you were when the blindfold was removed.
b. (repeat question 7a. for another element mentioned)
c. (repeat question 7a. for a third element mentioned)
d. (repeat question 7a. for a fourth element mentioned if desired).

8. Would you show me on your map the direction of north?

9. The interview itself is over, but it would be helpful if we could have a few minutes of free discussion:
   a. First, I would like to know your idea of the purpose of this interview. What do you think we are trying to find out?
   b. In your opinion, of what importance in the everyday lives of citizens is this matter of knowing where one is in the city, or of what importance is the ability to recognize the various parts of the city?
   c. What sort of pleasure or displeasure do you feel, either from knowing where you are and where you are going in a city, or from being unsure of the identity of your location or of other city parts with respect to your location?
   d. Do you find Los Angeles a city easy or difficult to find your way in, or to distinguish one part from another? Why?
   e. What cities of your acquaintance have a good quality of this kind? Why?