Dunn, R & Kusumastuti, D



Introduction, Stated Preference:

• Evaluating a person's preferences.

• The conventional way of recroding people's preferences is to **rank/rate** a single factor:

 Not a realistic method as it does not allow for interaction between factors.

• Alternative approaches:

- Revealed Preference, what people are observed to do.
- Stated Preference, what people say they will do.
 - Wide range attributes/characteristics,
 - Varied value/level of factors,
 - Hypothetical scenarios.

Introduction, The Study:

• Aim, investigate the **route choice of cyclist's** in a **Christchurch** context and hence identify their **preferences**.

 Christchurch is in an unusual situation currently hence it cannot fully depend on the outcome of exterior studies.

 Factors that make the investigation of cycling behavior within Christchurch both essential and unique:

- Rapidly evolving,
- The Council's ambitious plans for its cycle networks
- Current lack of cyclists.

UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY

Existing Route Choice Literature:

Previously Studied Attributes

Topography/Gradient

Bicycle Lane/Path

Cyclist's Experience

Road Hierarchy/Traffic Volume

Number of Intersections

Travel Distance/Time

On Street Car Parking

Pavement Surface Condition

Street Width

Street Lighting

Traffic Speed/Speed Limit

Attributes Included in the Survey

Road Hierarchy

Bicycle Lane/Path

Travel Time

On Street Car Parking

2 options, 3 Factors, 3 levels

= $3^3 \times 3^3$ choice combinations

• Hence the need for limited attributes and an efficient design.



The Final Survey, Design:

- Web based format, Qualtrics Online Survey Software.
 - Accessible through a web link,

 Targeted at individuals commuting to Canterbury University, hence primarily university staff and students.

Two isolated sections:

Demographic data,

• Stated Preference.

 The Stated Preference section comprised initially of a description, providing a context for all the subsequent hypothetical scenarios. These scenarios were then depicted by 12 choice sets, the participants were asked to pick their preferred route from the two options presented.



The Final Survey, Layout:

Scenario 3: Please select your preferred route.





Route 1: Travel time of 20 minutes, on a residential road without a Route 2: Travel time of 40 minutes, on a minor road with a bike lane bike lane and without on-street car parking. and on-street car parking.



Results, Stated Preference Survey:

Ultimately, **42 surveys were completed** and to interpret the result **4 models** were constructed.

• The equation for Model 1, linear analysis:

VRouteA=\$\vec{R}outeA+\$\vec{P}ARKPARK+\$\vec{B}LANEBLANE+\$\vec{R}HRH+\$\vec{T}TTT\$ VRouteB=\$\vec{P}ARKPARK+\$\vec{B}LANEBLANE+\$\vec{R}HRH+\$\vec{T}TTT\$

Undesirable road characteristics in terms of cyclist route choice:
Travel Time (-0.92176),
On Street Parking (-0.89264),
Road Hierarchy (-0.58669).

The only **positive** of all the attributes investigated:

• Bike lanes (1.04740)

The positive value of the bike lane is greater than each negative factor in isolation, although not always to a large degree.



Discussion:

This study acted as an introduction into the **conundrum of cyclist route choice**, and hence how **to improve the cycling facilities and so promote cycling as an effective alternative form of transport.**

If this research were to be repeated there would be a number of areas for **potential improvement**:

Photograph obtainment and selection,

• Choice set creation.

Further research: • Larger scale, • Cyclists and non cyclists,

- \circ Priorities shift with experience,
- \odot Stated and observed.



Thank You, Any Questions?

