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**Abstract**

*[The dataset presented in this article would be advantageous to give intuition about the experience of daily travel and its psychological impact on travelers, ranging from positive feelings of enjoyment in some to the sensation of stress in many others. This dataset particularly examines the feelings of stress by users of active and motorized modes of transportation. Furthermore, it also investigates the importance that travelers attach to their feelings of stress. This allows us to explore the concept of “limited horizons”, the normalization of subpar experiences by those less able to adapt. This data provides information about commuters in terms of their individual characteristics, health-related factors while using transportation modes, feelings and emotions towards different modes of travel, own decisions, social interaction, attitudes towards nature and sustainability, shifts between modes, attitudes towards built environment, traveling to work. Data for the research are drawn from a survey conducted in Santiago, Chile, based on a quota-sampling method based on the information from Pre-Census of 2012, and in total, 451 persons validly completed the survey. Use of ordinal models for attitudinal variables provides further support to the notion that active travelers are less stressed. However, lower income people are less likely to give greater importance to stress despite reporting higher levels of stress than higher income people.]*

**Key words:** *limited horizons, transport inequalities, stress, travel behavior, Santiago, Well-being, Built environment*

**Specifications Table** *[please fill in right-hand column of the table below]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Subject area | *Transportation, Geography, Public Health and Health Policy, Urban development* |
| More specific subject area | *Transport inequalities, Stress and limited horizons, Travel behavior, Global South* |
| Type of data | *R Data Package* |
| How data was acquired | *The survey conducted using questionnaire. The instrument contains descriptive data of respondents and 5-Likert scale questionnaire regarding most sections of the questionnaire* |
| Data format | *Raw Data* |
| Parameters for data collection | *The survey collected by a quota-sampling method based on the information from Pre-Census of 2012, and in total, 451 persons validly completed the survey and face-to-face in Santiago, Chile in 2016.* *The survey collected information on a wide range of travel-related issues (socio-demographics, health-related, perceptions and travel behavior, travel choices and planning, social interaction factors, built environment, among others)* |
| Description of data collection | *Data was acquired through the 5-Likert scale questionnaire regarding most sections of the questionnaire, using a face-to-face and quota-sampling method for individual characteristics* |
| Data source location | *Santiago, Chile* |
| Data accessibility | *State if data is with this article or in public repository. If public repository, please explicitly name repository and data identification number and provide a direct URL to data* |

**Value of the data** *[Describe in 3-5 bulleted points why this data is of value to the scientific community.* *Broadly explain to other researchers how the data could be potentially valuable to them, with an eye towards possibly opening up doors for new collaborations. For example, how could this data: be compared to other data for further insight, serve as a benchmark for other researchers, be used in the development of further experiments in a particular area, etc. Please do not offer interpretative statements or conclusions about the data, nor state why this data was valuable for an already-published research study.]*

* **A large body of the data has made inroads investigating psychological impact on travelers ranging from positive feelings of enjoyment in some to the sensation of stress in many others that can affect the effectiveness of policy measure (in the case of positive feelings) and are known to affect health outcomes (in the case of stress). This would be interesting for those with transport policies concerns.**
* **Dataset contribute to psychological impact on travelers both active and motorized modes of transportation to examines not only the feeling of stress, but also how these effects are experienced by travelers and investigates the importance that travelers attach to their feelings of stress which makes it valuable for researchers who focused on public sector development and health-related policies.**
* **This dataset allows us to explore the concept of “limited horizons”, the normalization of subpar experiences by those less able to adapt, an advantageous resource for further research regarding transport inequalities, index of stress, travel behavior in the region or even as a representative for other areas with similar attributes.**
* **The dataset provides a wide range of travel-related issues such as socio-demographics, health-related, perceptions and travel behavior, travel choices and planning, social interaction factors, built environment, among others.**

**Data**

[*Briefly describe the data you are sharing with this data article here, to give the reader context before you describe the materials and methods]*

*The data collected shows gender differences in terms of income between males and females, with males having higher income levels. Significant differences are also evident when considering income and main transport mode – as there is a high inequality in mode access (and mode usage) by income in Santiago. The analysis reveals that low-income groups tend to use primarily public and active modes, whereas high-income groups tend to mostly use private modes. Table 1 shows the socio-economic categories and the analysis between males and females, based on descriptive statistics.*

*A clear difference relates to the type of occupation (p=0.03), where most respondents work full-time (57 per cent) and primarily use private transport, followed by participants studying (22.5 per cent) who tend to use public transport. In the case of students, the percentage of females and males is quite similar. However, the category of full-time workers is mostly occupied by men presenting a significant difference of almost 6 per cent between genders. Differences were also found with duties related to housework, where woman have a much higher percentage of domestic work (7.4 per cent versus 0.5 per cent for men). This shows a conventional patriarchal tendency in Chile, although women have managed to enter the labour market, they still have had to undertake the domestic work in the household. In terms of education, most respondents have some degree of technical or professional education (68.3 per cent), 6.4 per cent of the sample have a postgraduate degree. A 23.1 per cent of the participants have achieved secondary education, while just 2.2 per cent have only primary education. This aspect (though not the focus of this research) is a critical element in the discussion of equity in countries. According to OECD (2017b), in Chile, people who have a primary education score 30.7 per cent lower in adult skills sets than people who have a tertiary education. The inequalities by education level also show significant differences between males and females (p=0.01). This is also noted in the OECD (2017a) inequality index between countries. On average, in Chile, women score 6.5 per cent lower than men in adult skills sets (PIAAC), while in the average OECD countries, women score 2.7 per cent lower than men.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Female | Male | p- Fisher | Private | Public | Active | p- Fisher |
|  | **53.7%** | **46.3%** |  | **31.0%** | **59.9%** | **9.1%** |  |
| Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Less than 18 | 0.4% | 1.0% | **0.45** | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.0% | **<0.01** |
| 18 - 24 | 30.2% | 64.1% |  | 10.7% | 78.6% | 6.4% |  |
| 25 - 24 | 25.6% | 59.8% |  | 25.7% | 52.1% | 11.4% |  |
| 35 - 54 | 30.2% | 64.6% |  | 47.9% | 40.0% | 8.6% |  |
| 55 - 64 | 12.0% | 21.1% |  | 12.9% | 16.4% | 2.1% |  |
| 65 or more | 1.7% | 4.8% |  | 2.1% | 4.3% | 0.7% |  |
| Income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low | 34.7% | 25.4% | **0.05** | 17.2% | 36.3% | 36.6% | **<0.01** |
| Middle | 35.6% | 34% |  | 35.7% | 35.2% | 29.2% |  |
| High | 28.5% | 39.2% |  | 46.5% | 26.7% | 34.2% |  |
| Occupation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Full time employee | 54.1% | 60.3% | **0.03** | 70.7% | 49.6% | 58.5% | **<0.01** |
| Part time employee | 2.1% | 1.9% |  | 2.1% | 2.2% | 0.0% |  |
| Independent worker | 5.4% | 6.2% |  | 3.6% | 5.2% | 17.1% |  |
| Unemployed | 1.7% | 1.0% |  | 1.4% | 1.5% | 0.0% |  |
| House keeper | 7.4% | 0.5% |  | 6.4% | 3.3% | 2.4% |  |
| Student | 22.3% | 22.5% |  | 9.3% | 30.4% | 14.6% |  |
| Student and part time | 3.7% | 4.3% |  | 1.4% | 5.2% | 4.9% |  |
| Retired | 1.2% | 1.4% |  | 2.1% | 1.1% | 0.0% |  |
| Other | 1.7% | 1.9% |  | 2.1% | 1.5% | 2.4% |  |
| Education |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary school | 2.9% | 1.4% | **0.01** | 1.4% | 2.2% | 4.9% | **<0.01** |
| Secondary school | 21.9% | 24.4% |  | 10.7% | 28.9% | 26.8% |  |
| Technical education | 23.6% | 12.9% |  | 26.4% | 15.2% | 14.6% |  |
| University education | 47.5% | 51.7% |  | 53.6% | 48.1% | 43.9% |  |
| Postgraduate | 4.1% | 9.1% |  | 7.9% | 5.2% | 9.8% |  |
| Disabilities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 3.3% | 3.8% | **0.80** | 5.0% | 2.6% | 4.9% | **0.32** |
| No | 96.7% | 96.2% |  | 95.0% | 97.4% | 95.1% |  |
| Journey time |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0-20 | 25.2% | 14.8% | **0.02** | 30.7% | 7.0% | 73.2% | **<0.01** |
| 20-40 | 21.5% | 24.4% |  | 26.4% | 22.6% | 12.2% |  |
| 40-60 | 24.4% | 25.8% |  | 27.1% | 27.0% | 4.9% |  |
| 60+ | 25.6% | 34.0% |  | 12.1% | 41.9% | 7.3% |  |

*Table 1 Descriptive analysis by gender and primary transport mode.*

*Regarding modal split, 31 per cent of participants use motorized transport as a primary transport mode (82.1 per cent of this is for car users). 59.9 per cent of the sample uses public transport and 9.1 per cent active modes. The results show a significant relationship between journey times and main transport mode, as public transport users have much lengthier commutes versus other modes – 41.9 per cent take more than one hour in getting to work.*

*Although this is a descriptive but revealing summary of the main differences according to socio-demographic groups, it has highlighted gender differences and inequalities produced by modal split. This first exploration of the data was followed by the analysis of the health-related factors indicated in the first part of the chapter, revealing even more significant differences among groups.*

**Experimental Design, Materials and Methods**

[*Complete description of the Experimental design and methods used to acquire the data and where applicable, in the analysis. Include any relevant figures/tables needed to fully understand the data. Please also provide, where applicable, any code files used to provide base-level analysis or filtering of the data.*]

*Bivariate Ordinal Regression*

*[(NO) Conclusions/Summary: DiB papers are distinctly different from research articles and should* **not** *include interpretations and conclusions. Do not include a Conclusion or Summary section.]*
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