# ARTICLE IN PRESS

Journal of Safety Research xxx (2017) xxx-xxx



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Journal of Safety Research



journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jsr

### Q3 Special report from the CDC

## <sup>2</sup> Pedestrian crossing behaviors at uncontrolled multi-lane mid-block

3 crosswalks in developing world

### Q5 Q4 Cunbao Zhang, <sup>a,\*</sup> Bin Zhou, <sup>a</sup> Tony Z. Qiu, <sup>a,b</sup> Shaobo Liu <sup>a</sup>

5 <sup>a</sup> Intelligent Transport System Research Center, Wuhan University of Technology, Heping Road, Wuhan 430063, China

6 <sup>b</sup> Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Alberta, Edmonton T6G 1H9, Canada

### 8 ARTICLE INFO

9 Article history:

10 Received 24 June 2016

Received in revised form 2 October 2017Accepted 5 December 2017

13 Available online xxxx

16 \_\_\_\_\_

34 Keywords:

7

35 Pedestrians' crossing behaviors36 Crossing strategy

37 Mid-block crosswalk

38 Gap acceptance model39 Lane-based gap (LGAP)

#### ABSTRACT

*Introduction:* The gap acceptance theory was primarily used to study pedestrian crossing behaviors, in accordance 19 to static gaps that are calculated in the light of the cross section of crosswalk. However, pedestrians will face a 20 series of dynamic gaps (especially at any uncontrolled multi-lane crosswalk) when they decide to cross the 21 street, thus, pedestrians' decisions are made based on the dynamic gaps of each lane. *Method:* Pedestrians' cross-22 ing behaviors at uncontrolled multi-lane mid-block crosswalk were investigated in this study. The lane-based 23 gap (LGAP) was defined and five mid-block crosswalks were selected for observation in Wuhan, China. Pedes-24 trians' behaviors and the corresponding traffic statuses were videoed as collected data, whose statistical analysis 25 indicates that most pedestrians choose the rolling gap crossing strategy, which is different from existing research. 26 Moreover, a logistic regression model was established to evaluate various influencing parameters (such as gen-27 der, age, waiting time and traffic volume) on the pedestrians' crossing strategy, whose accuracy is not satisfying. 28 Therefore, the pedestrian dynamic gap acceptance (PDGA) model was put forward to describe pedestrians' cross-29 ing behaviors at any multi-lane crosswalk based on detailed analysis of the pedestrians' decision procedure. *Re-30 sults:* The corresponding results show that its accuracy may be up to 88.6% to well describe pedestrians' crossing 31 behaviors. 32

© 2017 National Safety Council and Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. 33

**40** 42

06

#### 44 1. Introduction

45 With the rapid growth of automobiles in the developing world, pedestrian safety is a serious problem. According to the World Health Or-46 47 ganization (WHO, 2013), about 270,000 pedestrians were killed in 2010 all over the world, and a high proportion of the casualties occurred in 48 49 developing countries. Many pedestrian-vehicle crashes occurred at mid-block crosswalks (Aziz, Ukkusuri, & Hasan, 2013) because of the 50 low yielding rate of vehicles at crosswalks in developing countries 51 52 (such as China and India), even though traffic laws give priority to pedestrians over motorized vehicles at any non-signalized crosswalk. In 53 54 light of the road traffic accident statistics report of China (Traffic 55 Management Bureau of the Ministry of Public Security, 2013), 15,221 56 pedestrians were killed in 2012, which accounts for 25.37% of the total 57 traffic accident fatalities. The situation was even worse in India where, for example, 57% of road fatalities from 2008 to 2012 were pedestrians 58 59 in Mumbai (Pawar & Patil, 2015).

\* Corresponding author. *E-mail address:* zhangcunbao@163.com (C. Zhang).

Pedestrian crossing behaviors must be understood in detail to im- 60 prove their safety. Studies generally focused pedestrian crossing behav- 61 iors at mid-block crosswalks (Pawar & Patil, 2015; Rastogi, Chandra, 62 Vamsheedhar, & Das, 2014; Sun, Ukkusuri, Benekohal, & Waller, 2003; 63 Yannis, Papadimitriou, & Theofilatos, 2010) based on the pedestrian 64 gap acceptance (PGA) theory. Most scholars presumed that pedestrians 65 made decisions based on the current gaps calculated in the light of the 66 cross section of the whole road (See Fig. 1(a)). Only the nearest vehicle, 67 rather than other vehicles close to the crosswalk, is taken into account. 68 On the other hand, pedestrians may actually face a series of complicated 69 and dynamic gaps and usually observe the gaps for each lane, then 70 adopt the appropriate gap to cross the street in developing countries 71 (Kadali & Vedagiri, 2013). The crossing procedures are generally discon-72 tinuous or even lane by lane. The gap should be calculated for each lane 73 called as a lane-based gap (LGAP, see Fig. 1(b)) to describe the above 74 crossing mode accurately. However, few studies have investigated pe-75 destrians' crossing behaviors based on LGAP so far. 76

Pedestrians' crossing behaviors at multi-lane mid-block crosswalks 77 were investigated in this study. The traffic survey was carried out at 78 five uncontrolled mid-block crosswalks in Wuhan, China. Then, 79

0022-4375/© 2017 National Safety Council and Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Please cite this article as: Zhang, C., et al., Pedestrian crossing behaviors at uncontrolled multi-lane mid-block crosswalks in developing world, *Journal of Safety Research* (2017), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2017.12.018

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2017.12.018

#### 2

# **ARTICLE IN PRESS**

#### C. Zhang et al. / Journal of Safety Research xxx (2017) xxx-xxx

pedestrian crossing behaviors were analyzed and a pedestrian dynamic
 gap acceptance (PDGA) model was established based on LGAP to accurately depict pedestrians crossing procedures at multi-lane crosswalks.

#### 83 2. Literature review

Crossing an uncontrolled multi-lane crosswalk is not easy for any pedestrian. Analysis of crashes at mid-block crosswalks and intersections
revealed that 79% to 89% of crashes took place at selected uncontrolled
mid-block crossings (Sandt & Zegeer, 2006). According to Chu (2006),
crossing at mid-block locations is becoming more deadly than that at
intersections.

Many studies were carried out to observe pedestrian crossing behav-90 91 iors and safety, whose influencing factors primarily include several human and environmental factors, demography, roadway characteris-92 93 tics, and vehicular characteristics. Many studies focused on statistical analysis (Almodfer, Xiong, Fang, Kong, & Zheng, 2015; Sandt & Zegeer, 94 95 2006), influencing factors (Abdel-Aty, Chundi, & Lee, 2007; Das, Manski, & Manuszak, 2005; Hamed, 2001; Oxley, Ihsen, Fildes, 96 Charlton, & Day, 2005; Sun et al., 2003; Zegeer, Stewart, Huang, & 97 Lagerwey, 2001; Zhuang & Wu, 2013), and different models to reflect 98 pedestrian crossing behaviors (Cherry, Donlon, Yan, Moore, & Xiong, 99 100 2012; Papadimitriou, Yannis, & Golias, 2009; Petzoldt, 2014). Hamed 101 (2001) investigated pedestrians' waiting time to understand its effect 102 on pedestrians' crossing behaviors. Zegeer et al. (2001) studied safety 103 effects of marked and unmarked crosswalks at uncontrolled locations. Papadimitriou et al. (2009) discussed a discrete choice model to de-104 105 scribe pedestrians' decision while they are crossing street. Abdel-Aty et al. (2007) pointed out that the number of lanes, median type, speed 106 limits, and speed ratio were correlated to the frequency of crossing 107 crashes for pedestrians. Das et al. (2005) noted that pedestrian crossing 108 behaviors were related to their standing at roadsides or central zones. 109 110 Chandra, Rastogi, and Das (2014) carried out a detailed analysis to de-111 termine various influencing parameters for pedestrians' crossing behav-112 iors and to find that the accepted gaps vary with conflicting traffic and 113 crossing speed of pedestrians. Cherry et al. (2012) studied illegal midblock pedestrian crossings in China, and established a conflict model 114 to evaluate the accident risk of pedestrians. Petzoldt (2014) found that 115 pedestrians were apt to make their decisions based on systematically 116 distorted time rather than physical distance to arrival estimates. 117

The pedestrian gap acceptance (PGA) model is popular to analyze pedestrians' crossing behaviors (Kadali & Perumal, 2012; Kadali & Vedagiri, 2013; Yannis et al., 2010). Moreover, central tendency, dispersion, and distribution of gap acceptance data were presented and the size of traffic gaps rejected or accepted by pedestrians was discussed in several research findings (Chandra et al., 2014; Koh & Wong, 2014; Pawar & Patil, 2015). The probability of pedestrian gap acceptance was estimated by some scholars (Kadali & Perumal, 2012; Koh & 125 Wong, 2014; Sun et al., 2003) to show that the gap size, number of 126 waiting pedestrians, and age are critical influencing factors for pedes- 127 trians' crossing behaviors. Other influencing factors such as vehicle 128 speed, pedestrian crossing direction, gap size, and age of the decision- 129 making pedestrian were also studied (Pawar & Patil, 2015; Petzoldt, 130 2014; Yannis et al., 2010; Zhou, Zhang, Peng, Lv, & Qiu, 2016). Sun 131 et al. (2003) used the probabilistic model and the binary logistic regres-132 sion model, respectively, to describe pedestrian gap acceptance behav- 133 iors and driver yielding behaviors at mid-block locations. Oxley et al. 134 (2005) carried out traffic simulation tests to analyze the influencing fac- 135 tors (such as pedestrian age, traffic speed, and time headway) for gap 136 acceptance behaviors. Kadali and Perumal (2012) and Kadali and Q8 Vedagiri (2013) established a pedestrian gap acceptance model to re- 138 flect pedestrians' crossing behaviors. Yannis et al. (2010) investigated 139 pedestrians' gap acceptance for mid-block crosswalks in urban areas, 140 and the results reveal that this type of crossing decision is largely deter-141 mined by the distance from incoming vehicles and the waiting time of 142 pedestrians. Pawar and Patil (2015) observed the probability of 143 accepting spatial gaps and found that pedestrians accepted smaller 144 gaps while the conflicting vehicles were smaller, such as two-wheel 145 motorcycles. 146

In summary, there is research that help to understand pedestrian 147 crossing behaviors at uncontrolled crosswalks, where the gap is usually 148 calculated according to the cross section of any crosswalk and the cur-149 rent gap was generally supposed to dominate pedestrian decisions. As 150 shown in Fig. 1(a), the gap based on the cross section is too small to 151 be accepted for pedestrians at roadsides. However, many pedestrians 152 decided to cross the road from our observation, because the gaps for 153 Lanes 1 and 2 are long enough (see Fig. 1(b)), the first vehicle in Lane 154 3 passed the crosswalk when pedestrians passed Lane 2; therefore, pe-155 destrians can pass Lane 3 smoothly by adopting the subsequent gap 156 rather than the current gap in Lane 3. The existing gap acceptance 157 model cannot explain appropriately these complicated crossing behaviors at multi-lane crosswalks. 159

In this paper, the concept of lane-based gap (LGAP), which means 160 the gaps are quantified over each lane, instead of over road cross sec- 161 tion, has been proposed. Furthermore, for a multi-lane mid-block cross- 162 walk, pedestrians will face a series of dynamic gaps, and they usually 163 observe the gaps of each lane, then choose the appropriate LGAPs to 164 cross the street (see Fig. 2). It is a multistep decision process rather 165 than a one-kick decision. This paper analyzes pedestrian crossing be- 166 haviors and sets up a dynamic gap acceptance model based on LGAP 167 to depict realistic pedestrian crossing behaviors in developing countries. 168

Please cite this article as: Zhang, C., et al., Pedestrian crossing behaviors at uncontrolled multi-lane mid-block crosswalks in developing world, *Journal of Safety Research* (2017), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsr.2017.12.018

Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/6973652

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/6973652

Daneshyari.com