

A Methodology to Prioritise Service Quality Attributes for Bus Transit

A case study of Visakhapatnam

by

Tiyali Bose

Senior Research Fellow Department of Architecture and Regional Planning Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur

Dr. Debapratim Pandit

Associate Professor Department of Architecture and Regional Planning Indian Institute of Technology Kharagpur



Structure of the presentation

- Introduction and research background
- Broad research framework
- Study area and data collection
- Results and analysis
 - RIDIT analysis
 - Exploratory factor analysis
 - Confirmatory factor analysis
- Conclusion







Unlimited wants and limited resources

The study aims to:

Develop a methodology that helps transit operators' to identify bus service quality attributes that influences users' decision to use public bus services.



Research objectives

- Identify service quality attributes, both qualitative and quantitative for bus transit users that are of relevance to the city's scenario
- Identify service quality attributes that are *perceived as important to bus users*
- Identify service quality attributes that influence a user's decision to use bus service based on their level of satisfaction





A Typical Public Bus Transport Trip



Bus service quality indicators

SI. No.	Service Quality Attribute	Definitions
1.	Bus stop proximity	Perceived time taken by a user to walk from one's origin/ destination to the nearest bus stop.
2.	Quality pedestrian infrastructure	Provision of good quality, clean, walkable, wide footpaths
3.	Quality para-transit services	Provision of quality para-transit services that act as a feeder and helps in connecting ones origin/ destination to the nearest bus stop.
4.	Feeder services	Availability of reliable feeder services like smaller sized buses connecting the user's origin/ destination to the nearest bus stop.
5.	Service hours	Perceived daily hours of bus service on an average working day.
6.	Waiting time at the bus stop	Perceived time spent by a user at the bus stop before boarding a bus.
7.	Frequency of service	Refers to the perceived time interval between two consecutive buses.
8.	On-time performance of service	Passenger's perception of buses adhering to scheduled arrival and departure timings based on past experience.
9.	Boarding-alighting time	Refers to the perceived amount of time a bus should stop at a bus stop even when there are no passengers waiting at the bus stop.
10.	Delay in total travel time	Refers to the perceived delay in journey time in comparison to other modes
11.	Number of transfers	Total number of change in modes that a user undertakes to reach ones destination.
12.	Transfer distance	Perceived time that a user takes to walk from one mode to the other.
13.	Transfer waiting time	Perceived time that a user spends for waiting while changing from one mode to the other.
14.	Crowding level inside the bus stop	Perceived average occupancy inside the bus stop (average number of passengers standing or seating inside the bus stop in terms of its total capacity).
15.	Crowding level inside the bus	Perceived average occupancy inside the bus (average number of passengers standing or seating inside the bus in terms of its total capacity).



Bus service quality indicators

SI. No.	Service Quality Attribute	Definitions
16.	Availability of seats at the time of boarding	Perceived percentage of times a user gets a seat when they board a bus on their route.
17.	Time spent standing in a bus	Perceived time spent by a user waiting after boarding a bus for a seat.
18.	Route and network information	Provision of route and network information inside buses, at bus stops through information pylons, and through websites and mobile applications.
19.	Arrival and departure information	Provision of real time information on arrival and departure of buses through VMS at bus stops, through websites and mobile applications, and real time information on arrival of next bus stop inside buses.
20.	Real time information on emergencies	Provision of real time information on delay, disruption in service and incidences at bus stops and inside buses.
21.	Fare amount	Perceived amount a commuter spends while undertaking a public transit trip.
22.	Fare structure	 Refers to the various ways by which a fare is charged: Flat fare- fare is same irrespective of the distance travelled Distance based fare- fare increases as distance increases Zone-based fare- city is divided into concentric zones where fare within each zone is same irrespective of the distance travelled within the zone but fare increases as one travels from one zone to the other, based on the distance traversed
23.	Ease in payment of fare	Refers to the users perception of convenience while paying the fare in terms of point at which fare is being paid, mode of payment, ease in fare calculation
24.	Bus stop design	Refers to the user's perception of the over-all design features and quality of the bus stops
25.	Bus design	Refers to the user's perception of the over-all design features and quality of buses
26.	Safety and security	Refers to the user's perception of the over-all safety and security of the bus service system



Source: Das and Pandit, 2014



Prioritization techniques adopted

- Factor analysis and multiple regression
- Factor analysis and ordered logit model
- Generalised ordered choice model (GOC)
- Importance-satisfaction analysis
- Structural equation modelling
- Artificial Neural Networks (ANN)
- Integrated SERVQUAL and VIKTOR approach

- Average weighted technique
- Index numbers
- Bayesian networks
- Multinomial logistic regression
- ANOVA
- Manifest analysis and latent analysis
- Classification and Regression Trees (CART) algorithm
- RIDIT analysis

This study uses a combination of RIDIT analysis and factor analysis to identify attributes that are of higher priority to the



STATUTE OF CHARGE OF CHARG

users

Framework of the study



Study area



- GVMC area- 681.96 sq. km. (Census 2011)
- Population- 20, 91,811 (Census 2011)
- Bus service operator- APSRTC
- No. of bus routes- 121
- Bus fleet size- 670
- Passengers per day -2.9 lakh
- Proposed services- 2 BRT corridors
 - Pendurthi Transit Corridor (20.4 km) and
 - Simhachalam Transit Corridor (22.6 km)





APSRTC bus in Visakhpatnam



Bus stops along the BRT corridor are partially enclosed structures with specific entry and exit points to the bus

Most buses have physical segregation for men and women in the form of a door





Sample details

Total sample size	380				
Socio-economic Groups	Percentage of respondents	Socio-economic Groups	Percentage of respondents		
Gender of respondents	lents Vehicle ownership of respondents				
Male	74	Vehicle owner	59		
Female	26	Vehicle non-owner	41		
Age of respondents		Income of respondents			
<30 years	40	Low income	45		
30- 59 years	55	Middle income	53		
≥60 years	5	High income	2		
11 th Conference & Expo 2018			ALL STATES		

RIDIT Analysis

Sorvice Attribute	RIDIT	RIDIT		
Service Attribute	Rank			
Ease in fare calculation	0.5948	1		
Ease in fare payment	0.5924	2		
Frequency of service	0.5466	3		
Fare amount	0.5349	4		
Transfer waiting time	0.5183	5		
Waiting time at bus stops	0.5149	6		
On-time performance of service	0.5122	7		
Safety and security	0.5100	8		
Crowding at bus stops	0.5097	9		
Quality of pedestrian infrastructure	0.5093	10		
Quality of customer service	0.5085	11		
Transfer distance	0.5074	12		
Quality of para-transit services	0.5023	13		
Bus stop design	0.4934	14		
Bus design	0.4870	15		
Quality of bus driving	0.4838	16		
Transit information	0.4762	17		
Service hours	0.4757	18		
Crowding inside buses	0.4704	19		
Delay in total journey time	0.4571	20		
Boarding and alighting time	0.4400	21		
Proximity to bus stops	0.4334	22		
Route directness	0.4217	23		

Service quality attributes perceived as important:

- Fare services
- Service operation attribute related to waiting at bus stops
- Safety and security
- Accessibility



Exploratory Factor Analysis

Rus Sanvica Attributas	Factor Groups							.35
Bus Service Attributes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bus stop proximity
Factor Group 1 (TVE: 11.70%; α: 0.744)								
Quality of para-transit services	0.723							(3) 1 Quality of para-transit services 1.23
Quality of pedestrian infrastructure	0.713							.42 (ef 1 Service hours
Frequency of service	0.557							25 1.38 1.38 29
Waiting time at bus stops	0.536							.34
Bus stop proximity	0.518							(e6) Frequency of service
Service hours	0.489							Fare amount 1.00 .28
Factor Group 2 (TVE: 9.73%; α: 0.754	1)							$\textcircled{1.33}_{20} \qquad \qquad$
Ease in fare calculation		0.841						Ease of fare payment
Ease in fare payment		0.796						e ¹⁰ 1 → On-time performance of service →
Fare amount		0.736						ett
Factor Group 3 (TVE: 8.98%; α: 0.593	3)							.39 .06 FG_3 .06 .15
On-time performance of service			0.657					.44
Bus design			0.584					eta Bus design
Bus stop design			0.574					e11 1 Route directness 1.00 .21
Boarding and alighting time			0.557					FG_4
Factor Group 4 (TVE: 8.88%; α: 0.673	3)							e10 Transfer waiting time
Transfer waiting time				0.768				.18 (1)
Transfer distance				0.757				.43
Route directness				0.692				22
Factor Group 5 (TVE: 7.64%; α: 0.694	1)							Crowding at bus stops
Quality of bus driving					0.802			Crowding inside buses
Quality of customer service					0.772			all Transit information
Factor Group 6 (TVE: 7.42%; α: 0.786	5)							e22 1 Safety and security
Crowding inside buses						0.831		
Crowding at bus stop						0.774		- Chi square- 442 35. df- 188. RMR- 0 035.
Factor Group 7 (TVE: 6.73%; α: 0.351)								
Safety and security							0.670	GFI- 0.902; AGFI- 0.869; CFI- 0.868;
Transit information 0.657						- DNISEN O 60		
KMO: 0.798; Bartlett's test of sphericity: 2108.331; p-value: 0.000 KIVISEA- 0.00								







Confirmatory Factor Analysis



Observed Variable	Latent Variable	RW	SE	Р	SRW
Bus stop proximity		1.000			0.536
Quality of pedestrian infrastructure	Accessibility	1.469	0.198	0.000	0.684
Quality of para-transit services		1.423	0.191	0.000	0.642
Service hours		1.000			0.432
Waiting time at bus stops		1.505	0.217	0.000	0.665
On-time performance of service	Service operation	1.448	0.229	0.000	0.545
Boarding and alighting time		1.436	0.214	0.000	0.596
Delay in total journey time		1.175	0.190	0.000	0.512
Route directness		1.000			0.658
Transfer distance	Quality of transfer	1.080	0.133	0.000	0.660
Transfer waiting time		0.861	0.110	0.000	0.597
Crowding at bus stop	Crowdodposs	1.000			0.850
Crowding inside buses	crowdeaness	0.830	0.095	0.000	0.694
Quality of bus driving	Quality of personnel	1.000			0.977
Quality of customer service	Quality of personner	0.567	0.164	0.000	0.544
Fare amount		1.000			0.655
Ease in fare calculation	Fare system	1.329	.135	0.000	0.858
Ease in fare payment		0.977	0.099	0.000	0.637

Chi square- 203.25; df- 120; RMR- 0.028; GFI- 0.944; AGFI- 0.920; CFI- 0.947; RMSEA- 0.043

Conclusion

Sarvica Attributa	RIDIT	
	Score	
Ease in fare calculation	0.5948	
Ease in fare payment	0.5924	
Frequency of service	0.5466	
Fare amount	0.5349	Bu
Transfer waiting time	0.5183	Qu
Waiting time at bus stops	0.5149	Qu
On-time performance of service	0.5122	Se
Safety and security	0.5100	- Or
Crowding at bus stops	0.5097	Bo
Quality of pedestrian infrastructure	0.5093	De
Quality of customer service	0.5085	Ro
Transfer distance	0.5074	Tra
Quality of para-transit services	0.5023	Tra
Bus stop design	0.4934	Cr
Bus design	0.4870	0
Quality of bus driving	0.4838	Qu
Transit information	0.4762	Fa
Service hours	0.4757	Ea
Crowding inside buses	0.4704	Ea
Delay in total journey time	0.4571	
Boarding and alighting time	0.4400	
Proximity to bus stops	0.4334	
Route directness	0.4217	

-										
)	Observed Variable	Latent Variable	RW	SE	Р	SRW				
)	Bus stop proximity		1.000			0.536				
3	Quality of pedestrian infrastructure	Accessibility	1.469	0.198	0.000	0.684				
)	Quality of para-transit services		1.423	0.191	0.000	0.642				
2	Service hours		1.000			0.432				
)	Waiting time at bus stops		1.505	0.217	0.000	0.665				
, 7	On-time performance of service	Service operation	1.448	0.229	0.000	0.545				
	Boarding and alighting time		1.436	0.214	0.000	0.596				
3	Delay in total journey time		1.175	0.190	0.000	0.512				
5	Route directness		1.000			0.658				
ł	Transfer distance	Quality of transfer	1.080	0.133	0.000	0.660				
3	Transfer waiting time		0.861	0.110	0.000	0.597				
1	Crowding at bus stop	Crowdedness	1.000			0.850				
ז	Crowding inside buses	Crowdedness	0.830	0.095	0.000	0.694				
, ,	Quality of bus driving	Quality of personnel	1.000			0.977				
5	Quality of customer service	Quality of personnel	0.567	0.164	0.000	0.544				
2	Fare amount		1.000			0.655				
7	Ease in fare calculation	Fare system	1.329	.135	0.000	0.858				
ł	Ease in fare payment		0.977	0.099	0.000	0.637				
L										
)					URBAN	TRANS				
1					UTE Q	POR I				
t					E					

Thank you



