



## Editorial

**RALF RISSER**

*TOTS Editor-in-Chief*

This issue of TOTS reflects both analyses and measures dealing with human behaviour in the realm of traffic and mobility, mostly asking how different factors influence behaviour. Two papers ask for how attempts to influence behaviour are perceived and acknowledged by citizens, and another one, the last one, refers to human behaviour in only an indirect way – the traffic planners approach.

J. A. Boni et al. in their study “Characterizing Technology’s Influence on Distractive Behavior at Signalized Intersections” deal with distraction caused or enhanced by electronic devices and in-vehicle entertainment systems with the help of a field test conducted at three intersections. They could show that technology-induced distraction caused a significant impact on start-up time losses and saturation flow.

Two papers refer to a rather different type of impact source, namely COVID, asking how the pandemic affected traffic and mobility behaviour. In their paper “Analysis of the effects of the first phase of COVID-19 pandemic on mobility choices in Italy by a multi-criteria approach” Tiziana Campisi et al. analysed changes in logistics and mobility in Sicily, when a total lockdown in all of Italy was implemented due to COVID. The results of their before-after study that mobility was reduced significantly by the lock-down, but that especially public transport was effected. Studies like this should provide knowledge and know-how that can be of good use in case of developments similar to those induced by COVID.

In Nigeria, A. A. Faiyetole carried out the study “COVID-19 stimulated travel behavior policy framework with evidence from travel change in southwestern Nigeria”. Their findings show that due to the COVID-19 restrictions the use of the private car viz. of private vehicles was enhanced, while routine trips and leisure time mobility were reduced in both frequency and distance. They conclude that a policy framework be placed that paves the way for sustainably mobility options in similar situations in the future.

It has been assumed and also confirmed for quite some time that involving citizens in activities that serve the public raises the chance of achieving their acceptance and cooperation. In their study dealing with the “Shift from smart mobility to responsive mobility for metro stations in Chennai, India”, S. Sivanewari & D. Karthigeyan involve citizens as the basis for decision making, shifting “From For the citizen to By the citizen”, as they put it. This participatory approach provides successful ideas of how to design metro stations and how to feature surrounding infrastructure.

Acceptance and evaluation of measures by the citizens, viz. by persons involved in those measures is in fact the topic of two studies that are quite different in character. In their project “The perception of the demerit point system by drivers: a comparative focus-groups’ study in Israel”, W. Elias & V. Gitelman attempt to get an estimate a point system is perceived by drivers, with the help of focus-group settings and questionnaires. Not surprisingly, measures that require stronger involvement like remedial driving courses are con-

sidered as non-effective as means of driver improvement. Such assessment most probably does not really refer to the effectiveness of measures but rather to how attractive they are considered by the drivers. Similarly, whether the “... Public Accept(s) Congestion Pricing System(s)...” depends on the attractiveness of the outcome of such pricing measures, as A. Shyamsunder & B. R. Kadali could find. The balance of investment and revenue needs to be positive for the citizens to find such measures useful.

At the end of this issue, N. Partanian & A. K. Rafsanjani look for urban solutions to ensure equity and safety among all types of road users with the help of multi-modal level of service in their study Multi-Model-Level-of-Service-based study of central streets: re-planning Beyhaq St., Sabzevar, Iran”. They find that historical city centres are best served by keeping and enforcing the existing historical structures to a degree as large as possible and with the help conservative approaches that avoid (much) destruction. They present guidelines of how to proceed in this respect. In this last paper, the citizens are not actively involved in the study, nor do the authors directly discuss behaviour. The notion of how citizens/road users might feel and how they might behave lies behind the ponderings, procedures and measures, but are never referred to explicitly.

Maybe, in this issue of TOTS, by looking closely at the last paper and comparing it to the other ones, one can extract some ideas of how to combine the two areas – psychological/sociological approach vs. engineering approach – in a fruitful way. Traffic is the outcome of human behaviour (or “traffic = behaviour) and virtually all measures implemented in the public space affect this behaviour. It needs to be said clearly in which way this happens.