TRB 2020 ANNUAL MEETING
99TH Annual Meeting
Washington, D.C.
January 12–16, 2020

#20-03448

Investigation of Traffic and Safety Behavior of Pedestrians Texting or Web-Surfing

Marilia Ropaka
Dimitrios Nikolaou
Stergios Mavromatis, Ph.D.
George Yannis, Ph.D.

Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering,
National Technical University of Athens

Introduction

- An important aspect of road traffic injuries' problem is vulnerable road users such as pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists.
- Pedestrians suffer, due to their vulnerability to the speed of vehicles and increased exposure to multiple vehicles in high traffic volumes.
- In 2017 there were 5,220 pedestrian fatalities due to road crashes in the EU (21% of all road fatalities).
- Pedestrian actions and behavior may account for 15% of pedestrian fatalities.
- The expansion of mobile phones has caused a rising number of pedestrians who use mobile phones in their daily traffic activities by the roadside or even when crossing the street.

Objectives

- To investigate **traffic and safety behavior** of pedestrians who are texting or web-surfing when passing through signalized pedestrian crossings.
- Examine the differences between the behavior of **distracted** and **non-distracted** pedestrians.
- **Analyze data** derived from an experimental process through video recording in real road conditions.

Data Collection (1/2)

- An experimental process through video recording was carried out in real road conditions, in three signalized intersections in the center of Athens in Greece (daylight, peak hours, good weather conditions).
- The selection of the pedestrian crossings was based on the high pedestrian volumes typically found in the area, ensuring sufficient sample size, and the presence of a pedestrian traffic light on each crossing.
- Pedestrian crossings chosen:
  - Akadimias Street (3 lane road) at intersection with Ippokratous Street
  - Ippokratous Street (2 lane road) at intersection with Akadimias Street
  - Skoufa Street (1 lane road) at intersection with Filikis Eterias Square

Data Collection (2/2)

- The extracted data used for this study were:
  - Pedestrian distraction
  - Pedestrian gender
  - Pedestrian age estimate 0-17 (child), 18-34 (young), 35-64 (middle) and 65+ (old)
  - Pedestrian crossing length and width
  - Crossing time
  - Pedestrian speed
  - Number of road lanes
  - Pedestrian volume
  - Pedestrian accompanied by someone else
  - Pedestrian traffic lights
  - Pedestrians' trajectory
  - Conflict with other pedestrian
  - Illegal vehicle passing
  - Vehicle on crossing
  - Weekday
  - Waiting time for pedestrian green light
  - Near miss (temporal headway between pedestrian and vehicle less than two seconds)

- The videos were examined frame by frame with the ability to pause and rewind all the pedestrian times and the calculation of pedestrian speed (m/s) was cross-checked by multiple researchers.

Distraction	Count	Percentage
Distracted Texting/Web-Surfing	142	6.2%
Distracted Music (headphones)	124	5.4%
Distracted Talking	113	5.0%
Non-Distracted	1,901	83.4%
Total	2,280	100.0%

Methodological Approach

- Statistical analyses were carried out using **two modelling approaches**; multiple linear regression and binary logistic regression models.
- The basic equation of the **multiple linear regression** model is $Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1*X_{1i} + \beta_2*X_{2i} + \ldots + \beta_\nu*X_{\nu i} + \varepsilon_i$ and the accuracy of the model is assessed through the coefficient of determination R squared.
- Where the dependent variable is binary, **binary logistic regression** is the statistical technique used to predict the relationship between predictors and a predicted variable.
- If the "**utility function**" is given by $U=\beta_0+\beta_i*X_i$, then the **probability** P is given by $P=e^U/(e^U+1)$.
- The goodness of fit of the logistic regression model can be assessed with the **Hosmer & Lemeshow Test.**



Models for Pedestrian Speed (1/2)

	Distracted Pedestrians			Non-Distracted Pedestrians		
Independent Variables	β_i	t	Sig.	β_i	t	Sig.
Age	-0.018	-1.781	0.077	-0.033	-6.562	0.000
Accompanied	-0.052	-2.093	0.038	-0.063	-6.194	0.000
Crossing length	0.021	7.676	0.000	0.026	15.231	0.000
(Pedestrian Volume)^2	-6.056E-005	-2.662	0.009	-3.627E-005	-3.200	0.001
Adjusted R^2		0.638			0.556	

- It can be observed that the independent variables affect similarly the speed of distracted and non-distracted pedestrians, as the signs of the β coefficients are the same in both cases.

Models for Pedestrian Speed (2/2)

- Figures based on sensitivity analysis were also developed to better understand the influence of the independent variables on the speed of the two types of pedestrians.



- At low pedestrian volumes distracted children move at higher speeds than non-distracted young pedestrians, as children are very familiar with the use of the mobile phone and their speed is not greatly affected.

- At high pedestrian volumes, distracted pedestrians who were texting or web-surfing on their mobile phone present lower speed than non-distracted pedestrians, regardless of their age, as they may be not aware of traffic conditions due to distraction and therefore they have higher crossing times.

Models for Near Misses (1/2)

	Distracted Pedestrians				Non-Distracted Pedestrians			
Independent variables	β_i	Wald	Sig.	Exp(β_i)	β_i	Wald	Sig.	Exp(β_i)
Red Pedestrian Traffic light	3.287	11.399	0.001	26.756	2.269	8.095	0.004	9.671
Pedestrian Volume	0.083	3.711	0.054	1.086	-0.074	4.328	0.037	0.928
Log(Speed)	6.158	2.354	0.125	472.401	3.866	1.860	0.173	47.742
Crossing Length	-0.820	19.907	0.000	0.441	-0.543	25.724	0.000	0.581
Hosmer & Lemeshow Test	0.954				0.578			

- In these statistical models the occurrence of a near miss is the dependent variable; this variable takes two values (0: no near miss and 1: near miss observed).
- Pedestrian volume does not affect in the same way the probability of a near miss for distracted and non-distracted pedestrians. The positive sign in the distracted pedestrians' model shows that as pedestrian volume increases, the probability of a near miss for distracted pedestrians with a vehicle is higher. However, the sign of pedestrian volume in the non-distracted pedestrians' model is negative indicating that an increase in pedestrian volume leads to lower probabilities of a near miss.

Models for Near Misses (2/2)

- The following figure shows the change in the probability of a near miss depending on the pedestrian volume for both distracted and non-distracted pedestrians who started crossing the street with red pedestrian traffic light.



- Distracted Pedestrians: the probability of a near miss increases with increasing pedestrian volume as the more pedestrians who occupy the pedestrian crossing the more difficult is for them to observe carefully the rest traffic.
- Non-Distracted Pedestrians: the probability of a near miss decreases with increasing pedestrian volume. This may be attributed to the fact that they are fully aware of the traffic conditions and they can perceive the danger early by observing the behavior of other pedestrians.
- The probability of a near miss for non-distracted pedestrian remains very low and almost equal to zero when pedestrian volume increases, while for distracted pedestrians it presents an increasing trend.

Models for Conflicts among Pedestrians (1/2)

	Distracted Pedestrians				Non-Distracted Pedestrians			
Independent variables	β_i	Wald	Sig.	Exp(β_i)	β_i	Wald	Sig.	Exp(β_i)
Constant	-7.877	17.638	0.000	0.000	-3.598	42.292	0.000	0.027
Pedestrian Volume	0.122	13.149	0.000	1.129	0.116	39.185	0.000	1.123
Non Accompanied	2.509	3.927	0.048	12.293	-0.900	10.591	0.001	0.407
Weekend	1.041	3.203	0.073	2.831	-0.409	1.656	0.198	0.664
No Vehicle on crossing	1.048	1.907	0.167	2.853	0.646	3.555	0.059	1.908
Hosmer & Lemeshow Test	0.856				0.696			

- Conflict among pedestrians is the dependent variable and it takes two values (0: no conflict among pedestrians occurred and 1: a conflict among the pedestrians occurred)
- The positive sign of "Non Accompanied" for distracted pedestrians indicates that there is a higher probability of conflict for distracted pedestrians who are not accompanied. This may be explained due to the fact that distracted pedestrians' attention is on their mobile phone's screen and there is no one next to them to guide and show to them another route in order to avoid the conflict. On the other hand, the probability of a conflict for non-distracted pedestrians who are not accompanied by someone else is lower.
- On weekends a conflict for distracted pedestrians is more likely to occur because the purpose of their trip is often for entertainment and not for work and they may send messages to people that they are going to meet. On the contrary, for non-distracted pedestrians the probability of a conflict is higher on working days may due to the fact that the purpose of their trip is related to work and they may be in a hurry or tired from their work and they are less careful.

Models for Conflicts among Pedestrians (2/2)

- The following figure based on the sensitivity analysis shows the change in the probability of a conflict among pedestrians depending on the pedestrian volume for both accompanied distracted and non-distracted pedestrians on weekends without vehicle on crossing.



- In the case of low pedestrian volume, the probability of a conflict remains low for all pedestrians.

- In the case of high pedestrian volume, distracted pedestrians who are accompanied by other pedestrians tend to move away from others and avoid conflicts as they are guided by their companion, while those who are non-distracted and accompanied have higher possibilities for a conflict with other pedestrians may due to the fact that they are talking with their companion and they are not so careful while crossing the street.

Conclusions

- Distraction caused by texting or web-surfing on the mobile phone **affects negatively** pedestrians' main traffic and safety characteristics.

- At high pedestrian volumes, **distracted pedestrians** who were texting or web-surfing on their mobile phone present **lower speed** than non-distracted pedestrians, regardless of their age, and therefore they have **higher crossing times.**

- Moreover, at high pedestrian traffic, mobile use not only decreases pedestrians' speed but also **increases their probability** of being involved in a crash with an oncoming vehicle.

Recommendations

- Educational campaigns aiming to sensitize pedestrians to the risks of texting or web-surfing while crossing the street.
- A type of restriction on walking while using a mobile phone might also be foreseen in busy roads.
- Mobile applications warning pedestrians that they are moving towards a pedestrian crossing or that a vehicle is approaching them.
- Mobile phones' GPS could recognize that the pedestrians are moving and disable some specific features while walking.
- Engineering solutions in the design of road crossings and public places (e.g. green and red lights on the ground).

Future research

- More results could be obtained by observing the same variables on a larger sample of pedestrians.
- Expand the experiment in signalized intersections located in different areas and conduct a comparative analysis to identify which pedestrians incur higher risks.
- Carry out the same experiment during the nighttime in order to identify the differences in pedestrians' behavior between nighttime and daylight hours.
- Take into account traffic volume.

TRB 2020 ANNUAL MEETING
99TH Annual Meeting
Washington, D.C.
January 12–16, 2020

#20-03448

Investigation of Traffic and Safety Behavior of Pedestrians Texting or Web-Surfing

Marilia Ropaka
Dimitrios Nikolaou
Stergios Mavromatis, Ph.D.
George Yannis, Ph.D.

Department of Transportation Planning and Engineering,
National Technical University of Athens