

Modeling Individuals' Willingness to Share Trips with Strangers in an Autonomous Vehicle Future

Patrícia S. Lavieri

The University of Melbourne

Department of Infrastructure Engineering

Grattan Street, Parkville, Victoria, 3010, Australia

Tel: +61-3-9035-3274; Email: patricia.lavieri@unimelb.edu.au

and

The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, USA

Chandra R. Bhat (corresponding author)

The University of Texas at Austin

Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering

301 E. Dean Keeton St. Stop C1761, Austin, TX 78712, USA

Tel: 512-471-4535; Email: bhat@mail.utexas.edu

and

The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hung Hom, Kowloon, Hong Kong

ABSTRACT

With the era of fully automated vehicles (AVs) quickly approaching, ridesharing services could have an important role in increasing vehicle occupancy, reducing vehicle miles traveled, and improving traffic conditions. However, the extent to which these potentials can be achieved depends on consumers' disposition to sharing rides. From a travel behavior perspective, two essential elements to the adoption of shared rides are individuals' acceptance of increased travel times associated with pick-up/drop-off of other passengers and their approval of strangers sharing the same vehicle. The current study develops the notion of willingness to share (WTS), which represents the money value attributed by an individual to traveling alone compared to riding with strangers, to investigate the adoption of shared rides. Using a multivariate integrated choice and latent variable approach, we examine current choices and future intentions regarding the use of shared rides and estimate individuals' WTS as well as their values of travel time for two distinct trip purposes. Results show that users are less sensitive to the presence of strangers when in a commute trip compared to a leisure-activity trip. We also observe that the travel time added to the trip to serve other passengers may be a greater barrier to the use of shared services compared to the presence of a stranger. However, the potential to use travel time productively may help overcome this barrier especially for high-income individuals.

Keywords: value of travel time, willingness-to-share, ride-hailing, dynamic ridesharing, automated vehicles

1. INTRODUCTION

For many decades, public agencies have been interested in promoting ridesharing to increase automobile occupancy, reduce congestion, and conserve resources (see Chan and Shaheen, 2012). Recently, such interest has regained momentum due to technological advancements that increase the convenience of ridesharing and broaden its scope (Shaheen and Cohen, 2018). Information and communication technologies (ICTs) have not only facilitated online platforms that allow real-time matching of drivers and riders (dynamic ridesharing), but also enabled the development of on-demand paid ride services, such as ride-hailing and pooled ride-hailing¹. However, despite the rapid growth of ICT-enabled ride services (Shaheen, 2018), the past decade has not seen any increase in vehicle occupancy rates in the U.S. According to the U.S. National Household Travel Survey, the mileage-weighted vehicle occupancy factor of light vehicles has remained at 1.67 between 2009 and 2017 and, when considering only cars, the factor has reduced from 1.55 to 1.54 (FHWA, 2018). Such stability, even after major technological advancements, suggests the continued unpopularity (in the U.S.) of ride sharing in all its different forms, and brings into central focus the issue of the willingness of people to embrace ridesharing (that is, pooling rides with others).

With the era of fully automated vehicles (AVs) quickly approaching, the consequences of ridesharing unpopularity may become more problematic, as the already low car occupancy rates may suffer further declines as vehicles gain the capability of traveling empty to self-park and to pick-up passengers. For instance, in one of the few AV simulation studies that account for congestion effects, Levin et al. (2017) observed that ridesharing is crucial for the introduction of AVs not to be accompanied by an increase of congestion and vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Their study compared the operations of three types of AV fleet schemes in central Austin (TX, U.S.): individually owned AVs, shared AVs (SAVs), and pooled SAVs (PSAVs)²; and showed that, during peak periods, only the PSAV fleet scheme was able to effectively contain empty vehicle travel and avoid surges in congestion. Similarly, using person-level trip data, other simulation studies have also evidenced the need for dynamic ridesharing and PSAVs if the move to AVs is not to be accompanied by increased traffic and overall VMT (see Liu et al., 2018 and Wang et al., 2018). All the above studies note that the performance of dynamic ridesharing/PSAV services in terms of matching users and reducing pick-up waiting times and detours is directly dependent on penetration rates (demand density), which points to the importance, on the demand side, of generating public interest in such services.

¹ Ride-hailing services, also referred to as transportation network companies (TNCs), use a smartphone or web application to pair passengers with drivers who offer paid rides in their non-commercial vehicles. The service is analogous to a taxi, but offers scheduling and pricing advantages. Pooled ride-hailing refers to a similar service that also offers users the possibility of sharing rides (and splitting costs) with strangers by dynamically matching passengers with overlapping routes. The largest and most well-known ride-hailing company in the U.S. is Uber, and its dynamic ridesharing service is known as UberPool.

² Shared Automated Vehicles (SAVs) are equivalent to a fleet of self-driving taxis that can be publicly or privately owned and that serve individual trips sequentially. Pooled Shared Autonomous Vehicles (PSAVs) are similar to SAVs but allow vehicles to serve multiple passengers with overlapping routes; that is, they provide ridesharing services.

Motivated by the important role that ridesharing may play in an AV future and the currently limited use of ridesharing in the U.S., this study seeks to provide a deeper understanding of the behavioral aspects associated with traveler's acceptance of pooling rides with others. Specifically, we focus on the development of a comprehensive model to closely examine personal and contextual conditions that may influence the decision to pool rides in an AV future.

1.1 Determinants of Ridesharing Adoption: from Carpooling to PSAVs

Understanding the motivations and barriers to carpooling has been a topic of interest since the U.S. fuel crisis in the late 1960's (Chan and Shaheen, 2012). Since then, the literature shows that most motivations and deterrents to pooling remain unchanged (Merat et al., 2017) even though traditional carpooling (with acquaintances and co-workers) has evolved into a variety of new schemes due to technological developments (see Shaheen and Cohen, 2018, for a full taxonomy of ridesharing schemes).

Interestingly, time is identified as the most relevant determinant of ridesharing adoption, but it can either be a facilitator or a deterrent of ridesharing adoption depending on contextual conditions. For instance, scheduling fixity and waiting times have admittedly been an important barrier to the acceptance of traditional carpooling, since trips had to be identified a priori and both drivers and passengers had relatively little flexibility to make last minute changes in travel plans (Chan and Shaheen, 2012). While this reduced flexibility of carpooling has been solved by real-time scheduling and ride-hailing features, users still need to accept the potentially longer (and less reliable) travel times of a shared ride due to pick-up/drop-off of additional passengers, which may still hinder the attractiveness of this mode compared to driving/riding alone. Nevertheless, time savings, together with monetary savings, is still identified as the main motivation for both drivers and passengers involved in all types of ridesharing schemes (see Merat et al., 2017 and Morales Sarriera et al., 2017). For example, the ability to use high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes without paying a toll fee (thus saving time and money) motivates drivers to offer morning commute rides to casual passengers waiting in specific pick-up locations in the San Francisco Bay Area (CA, U.S.), as described by Shaheen et al., (2016). In this case, most passengers opt for this scheme as an alternative to public transit, as they find it more time efficient and reliable. In the case of pooled ride-hailing services, drivers are being hired, but riders are still motivated by time savings relative to other modes such as public transit and walking, and monetary savings relative to private rides (Morales Sarriera et al., 2017; Schwieterman and Smith, 2018).

Despite monetary and time considerations, psychosocial aspects are also major determinants to individual's engagement in pooling (Amirkiaee and Evangelopoulos, 2018). In this sense, an important obstacle to ridesharing adoption is the user's willingness-to-share rides with strangers. Recent studies indicate that travelers are hesitant about being in an automobile environment with unfamiliar faces, due to a desire for personal space, an aversion to social situations, distrust, and concerns about security and privacy (see, for example, Tahmasseby et al., 2016, Morales Sarriera et al., 2017 and Amirkiaee and Evangelopoulos, 2018). Other aspects that have been identified to affect the likelihood of individuals engaging in trip ridesharing are socio-

demographic characteristics (especially income, but also ethnicity and gender, which reflect cultural aspects and social roles respectively; see Delhomme and Gheorghiu, 2016 and Shaheen, 2018) and the purpose of the trip (Merat et al., 2017).

While there is an extensive list of studies investigating behavioral aspects associated with people's participation in existing ridesharing schemes, very few studies have delved into the future adoption of PSAVs. Considering the similarities between future PSAVs and current pooled ride-hailing schemes, the overall motivations and barriers to the adoption of these two modes will be likely comparable, yet some factors influencing users' decision to rideshare may be intensified and others attenuated. For instance, the absence of drivers can decrease the operational costs of ride services (Bösch et al., 2018), reducing the relevance of monetary considerations. On the other hand, users may become more apprehensive about sharing the vehicle with strangers in the absence of an operator (Merat et al., 2017). It is also frequently argued that, because individuals may no longer need to drive and pay attention to traffic, they will have the ability to use their travel time productively and may reduce perceived disutilities associated with traveling (Cyganski et al. 2015, Malokin et al., 2017). This negative effect of time productivity on travel time disutility has been confirmed in the context of rail travel (Gripsrud and Hjorthol, 2012, Frei et al., 2015), and is likely to be relevant in the ride-hailing context and in the approaching AV future.

Only two studies have specifically surveyed travelers about their disposition to sharing rides in an AV future, though both of these do not investigate the trade-offs between travel times, travel costs, and the willingness to share rides with strangers within a comprehensive demographic and psychosocial context. Bansal et al. (2016) surveyed 347 individuals in the city of Austin (TX, U.S.) about their level of comfort in sharing PSAV rides. They found that only half of the sample would feel comfortable sharing a ride during the day with a stranger, while 90% would feel comfortable sharing it with regular friends and family members. Krueger et al. (2016) used a stated choice experiment to investigate people's willingness to adopt SAVs and PSAVs and examine the differences in value of travel time (VTT) associated to these two modes. Surprisingly, their results show higher VTT associated with the choice to use PSAVs compared to SAVs. In summary, research focusing on understanding user choices between using SAVs and PSAVs is still incipient and future efforts are still required.

1.2 The Current Study

This study develops an analytic framework with the objective of providing new insights into, and expanding the current knowledge on, users' preferences for solo and pooled rides in an AV future. Central to the proposed framework are the three motivations and barriers to ridesharing identified in the literature review: time, cost, and privacy concerns. Specifically, we examine psychosocial and financial trade-offs associated with preferences toward fare discounts, travel times, and presence of strangers in the vehicle, and identify segments of the population that are more (and less) prone to adopting PSAVs. To examine such trade-offs, the current study develops the notion of willingness to share (WTS), which represents the money value (willingness to pay or WTP) attributed by an individual to traveling alone (i.e., to not share) compared to riding with strangers.

Individuals' WTS is examined together with their VTTs, enabling a comparison between people's sensitivities to delays (associated with serving multiple passengers) and their concerns about being in a car with strangers. Additionally, our framework considers passengers' interest in productive use of travel time (which can be an important moderator to VTT and is also identified in the literature as a relevant factor in the AV future (see Cyganski et al. 2015)) and their current experience with ride-hailing and pooled ride-hailing services (which are the currently available services that are most similar to future SAVs and PSAVs). Further, since trip purpose is also identified as an important contextual variable to the choice of sharing rides (Merat et al., 2017), we include in our investigation both commute and leisure trip situations.

The analysis is undertaken using revealed and stated choice data obtained through a web-based survey of commuters in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metropolitan Area (DFW), U.S. A multivariate approach is used to simultaneously model individual's current ride-hailing experience and their future intentions regarding the use of SAV and PSAV services for commute and leisure trip purposes. To accommodate individual variability in the valuation of privacy and time, we use stochastic latent constructs representing privacy-sensitivity, time-sensitivity, and interest in productive use of travel time (IPTT). These constructs are based on attitudinal statements and modeled as functions of socio-demographic characteristics in a single-step estimation procedure together with the main model outcomes. The framework hypothesizes that the three latent constructs have both a direct impact on the preference for sharing versus riding alone and a moderating effect on VTT and WTS. The modeling methodology is a special case of Bhat's (2015a) Generalized Heterogeneous Data Model, as detailed in Section 2.3.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The next section presents the research method, which includes the description of the conceptual framework, the data collection design, and the model methodology. In Section 3, we describe the characteristics of the sample and, in Section 4, we present the model results and goodness of fit measures. Then, we conduct a comparative analysis of VTT and WTS. An examination of the average treatment effect (ATE) of each variable is described in Section 6 and is followed by the paper conclusions.

2. METHOD

2.1 Conceptual Framework

The analysis framework comprises a joint model of current ride-hailing experience and future intentions regarding the use of driver-less SAV services for commute and leisure trip purposes. Figure 1 provides a schematic representation of the framework. Exogenous socio-demographic and transportation-related characteristics (left-side box in Figure 1), and three endogenous stochastic latent constructs representing privacy-sensitivity, time-sensitivity, and interest in productive use of travel time (IPTT) (middle box of Figure 1) are used as determinants of the three endogenous variables of interest (current ride-hailing experience, and the choices between solo and shared SAV rides for work and leisure trip purposes). Together with these three endogenous outcomes (shown under the label "Nominal/Binary" in the right box of Figure 2), seven attitudinal indicators (representing indicators of privacy-sensitivity, time-sensitivity, and IPTT) help to

characterize the three stochastic latent psycho-social constructs. The latent constructs create the dependency structure among all outcomes.

2.1.1 *Exogenous Variables*

We consider both socio-demographics and a set of three long and medium-term transportation-related variables as exogenous variables: residential location (characterized by urban versus non-urban living³), vehicle availability (whether the number of motorized vehicles in the household was less than, equal to, or greater than the number of workers), and commute mode choice (traveling to work by driving alone, non-solo car, or non-car modes). While it can be reasoned that these transportation-related variables are influenced by common unobserved factors affecting the main outcomes, we tested this issue in our model specifications by considering these three variables also as endogenous variables. These three transportation-related variables were not significantly impacted by the latent constructs (at any reasonable statistical level) and, therefore, are treated as exogenous. There are many possible reasons for this result, from lack of variability in the actual variable (for example, only 3.5% of the sample does not drive to work, as discussed in Section 3) to inadequacy in the ability of the latent variables to explain medium and long-term transportation-related choices (the indicators of the latent variables used in this study capture trip-related attitudes in the context of an uncertain future AV transportation landscape; long and medium-term choices, on the other hand, are usually associated with overall lifestyles, such as a green-lifestyle or a luxury-orientation, as observed by Bhat, 2015b and Lavieri et al., 2017).

2.1.2 *Psychosocial Latent Constructs*

As discussed in Section 1.2, the three psychosocial latent constructs used in the model are identified based on the literature and focus on capturing underlying unobserved behavioral aspects that may influence individual's valuation of shared ride attributes in an SAV future. The first latent construct, privacy-sensitivity (characterized by the three attitudinal indicators identified under ^{“**”} at the bottom of Figure 1), represents individuals' levels of discomfort and privacy concerns when sharing a vehicle with a stranger. This construct is hypothesized to have negative impacts on individuals' experience with (current) pooled ride-hailing and choice for shared rides in an SAV context. Additionally, we expect its negative effects to increase with the number of additional passengers (this is a case of the latent variable moderating the effect of an exogenous variable).

The second latent construct is time-sensitivity (see the corresponding indicators identified under ^{“***”} in Figure 1). Since the extent to which traveling is perceived as a disutility may vary among individuals and trip purposes depending on lifestyle and lifecycle factors and associated activity-scheduling constraints (Ory and Mokhtarian, 2005; Cirillo and Axhausen, 2006; Börjesson and Eliasson, 2018), the objective of this construct is to capture individual specific perceptions of time scarcity and desire in reducing travel time. This latent construct is introduced in the model both as a direct effect on the endogenous variables as well as a moderating effect of the influence

³ Urban living includes neighborhoods in central areas and downtowns, while non-urban living includes neighborhoods in suburban areas, small towns and rural areas.

of travel time, thereby engendering both observed and unobserved individual heterogeneity in the valuation of travel time (note that the latent constructs are also stochastic).

The final latent construct, interest in the productive use of travel time (IPTT) is identified by the indicators under “****” in Figure 1. As discussed earlier, this construct is motivated by the notion that the ability to use travel time productively may reduce perceived disutilities associated with traveling. This latent construct too is introduced in the model both as a direct effect on the endogenous variables as well as a moderator of travel time effects on the endogenous variables. All the latent construct indicators are measured on a five-point Likert scale and are modeled as ordinal variables.

2.1.3 Main Outcome Variables

The main outcomes in the model (labeled as “binary/nominal” outcomes in Figure 1) are derived from revealed and stated choice questions (see next section for a discussion of the data collection procedures). Current ride-hailing experience (revealed choice) is represented as a nominal dependent variable with three categories: (1) no experience with ride-hailing services, (2) experience only with private services (the individual traveled alone or with people s/he knew), and (3) experience with private and pooled services (the individual has, at least once, traveled with strangers for a cheaper fare). The future intention outcomes (stated choices) are represented as two binary outcomes corresponding to the choices between: (1) pooled-ride and solo-ride in an SAV for a commute trip, and (2) pooled-ride and solo-ride in an SAV for a leisure trip (both stated choice outcomes have three repeated choice occasions). The current level of ride-hailing experience is assumed to affect the future choices of riding solo or in pooled mode, which enables the evaluation of how current exposure to shared (or solo) rides may affect individuals’ future intentions. The joint approach allows for the underpinning of the true effect of the current experience since we are able to control for common unobserved factors underlying all choice dimensions (current behavior and future intentions) through the stochastic latent constructs. Additionally, the stochastic latent constructs are interacted with two attributes of the stated choice alternatives (time and number of additional passengers) to accommodate individual heterogeneity in VTT and WTS.

2.2 Data Collection

The data used for the analysis was obtained through a web-based survey developed and administered by the authors in the fall of 2017. The distribution was achieved through mailing lists held by multiple entities (local transportation planning organizations, universities, private transportation sector companies, non-profit organizations, and online social media) resulting in a convenience sample. The survey was confined to commuters (individuals who had their primary work place outside their homes) living in the Dallas-Fort Worth-Arlington (DFW) Metropolitan

Area^{4,5}. Following the conceptual framework described earlier, the survey collected data on the individual's socio-demographics, travel behavior characteristics, attitudinal statements (based on a five-point Likert-scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”), current (revealed) ride-hailing experience, and stated choices regarding the preference for a solo or pooled ride in an SAV.

Because some respondents may not be familiar with the term *ride-hailing*, the survey provided the definitions of both ride-hailing (“Ride-hailing services use websites and mobile apps to pair passengers with drivers who provide passengers with transportation in the driver's non-commercial vehicle; Examples are Uber and Lyft.”), and pooled ride-hailing services (“In the carpooling option of ride-hailing, additional passengers with similar routes get picked and dropped off in the middle of the customer's ride; Customers receive discounted rates when they choose this option”). Respondents were then asked if they had ever used these services. Similarly, before the stated choice experiments, respondents were presented with the definition of autonomous vehicles, as “Self-driving vehicles, also sometimes referred to as *autonomous cars* or *driverless cars*, are capable of responding to the environment and navigating without a human driver in the vehicle controlling the vehicle. In the following questions, whenever you read the term *self-driving vehicle*, imagine a car with no steering wheel that operates like a personal chauffeur”. Respondents also were provided the option to watch a 90-second educational animation video about how AV-technology works and how the user experience might be⁶.

2.2.1 Stated Choice Experiment

Considering the uncertainties associated with the AV future, the stated choice experiment design focused on simple scenarios that would allow the simultaneous investigation of VTT and WTS without imposing too many assumptions about changes in urban mobility. Respondents were presented with situations with only binary alternatives, and both alternatives involving the use of an SAV (corresponding to traveling in an SAV alone or with strangers). Five trip attributes characterized each scenario: (1) travel time (which was associated with a specific distance for fare calculation purposes), (2) fare structure, (3) cost amount reduction resulting from pooling, (4)

⁴ More than twenty thousand email requests were sent using the mailing lists. While approximately three thousand respondents opened the survey, about thousand respondents were not eligible for the survey because of not living in the DFW area or because of not being a commuter (that is, these individuals were not allowed to continue the survey after a negative answer to either of these two front-end questions). Another 390 respondents did not complete the survey. The final sample used in the current paper includes information on 1,607 respondents.

⁵ The decision to focus on individuals with commute travel was guided by the fact that one of the stated choice experiments in the survey refers to a commute trip. Also note that the survey contained other stated choice experiments relative to commute trips that are not associated to the topic of the current paper. The authors acknowledge that understanding the preferences of non-commuters toward the use of SAVs though solo and pooled rides is also important from a transportation policy standpoint, and we encourage future studies in this direction.

⁶ Considering the highly uncertain future, the authors decided that providing additional details on the AV definition would cause more cognitive burden than it would generate significant empirical insights. Also note that: (1) the fact that the two alternatives in the stated choice experiment are based on the same type of vehicle makes the baseline homogeneous for each individual; (2) the model accommodates for multiple sources of taste heterogeneity (each individual has the values of psychological constructs, VTT and WTS dependent on socio-demographic characteristics); so, even though we are not able to disentangle the influence of the “imagined vehicle” from the other unobserved heterogeneity sources, the model accommodates variations across individuals.

additional travel time associated with pooling, and (5) the number of additional passengers. All the attributes and their respective levels are presented at the top of Figure 2 (each column of Figure 2 represents an attribute, and each row represents an attribute level (or a package of attribute levels that determine fare in the case of the fare structure attribute)).

The levels for the travel time attributes (the first and the fourth attributes above) were defined with the objective of keeping the scenarios realistic, while also providing an instrument to engender adequate time variability in the attribute values across scenarios. For the second attribute, fare structure, a three-level scheme was used. The first level assumed that there would be no change in the non-pooled fare structure compared to today (this fare structure was based on Uber's non-pooled distance-based and time-based fare structure at the survey time; see UberEstimator, 2017). The other two levels (reflecting an autonomous vehicle future) assumed that service fees would no longer be necessary (because of the absence of human drivers) and that there would be a certain percentage reduction in the distance-based fare (relative to the current Uber fare structure). For the third attribute, corresponding to the reduced cost due to sharing, no specific source of information about current TNC procedures was readily available, but the anecdotal experience of several students at the University of Texas suggested significant variability. Hence, three levels corresponding to 20%, 40%, and 60% reduction (relative to the solo-SAV rate) were used in the stated choice experiments. The number of additional passengers was defined considering that standard autonomous cars would accommodate comfortably up to four passengers (similar to today's passenger vehicles, leading to three levels for this attribute, corresponding to one, two, and three additional passengers).

In all, there were 243 (five attributes corresponding to the five columns in Figure 2 and three levels corresponding to the three rows of Figure 2, for a total of $3^5 = 243$) possible combinations between the attribute levels. From these combinations, 27 different scenarios were chosen with the focus on isolating main effects and keeping orthogonality. As illustrated at the bottom of Figure 2, the respondent was presented with two alternatives and the information available for each alternative was the total travel time, cost, and, in the case of shared rides, the additional number of passengers. In other words, the discount rates and additional travel times due to pooling were not explicitly shown, but incorporated in the travel time and cost of the shared alternative. Each individual was randomly assigned to respond to six scenarios, evenly split between commute and leisure trip purposes.

2.3 Modeling Approach

The model employed in our analysis is a special case of Bhat's (2015a) Generalized Heterogeneous Data Model (GHDM) in which ordinal, nominal, and binary endogenous variables are considered simultaneously. As explained earlier, unobserved stochastic psycho-social constructs serve as latent factors that provide a structure to the dependence among the many endogenous variables, while the latent constructs themselves are explained by exogenous variables and may be correlated with one another in a structural relationship. In particular, there are two components to the GHDM model: (1) the latent variable structural equation model (SEM), and (2) the latent variable

measurement equation model (MEM). As illustrated in Figure 1, the SEM component defines stochastic latent variables as functions of exogeneous variables and unobserved error components. In the MEM component, the endogeneous variables are described as functions of both the stochastic latent variables and exogeneous variables. The error terms of the structural equations (which define the latent variables) permeate into the measurement equations (which describe the outcome variables), creating a parsimonious dependence structure among all endogenous variables. These error terms are assumed to be drawn from multivariate normal distributions (with the dimension equivalent to the number of latent variables). The measurement equations have different characteristics depending on the type of dependent variable, following the usual ordered response formulation with standard normal error terms for the ordinal indicator variables, and the typical random utility-maximization model with a probit kernel for the nominal/binary outcomes of primary interest (see Bhat and Dubey, 2014, and Bhat, 2015a, for details of the formulation and estimation). The latent constructs are created at the individual level (as a stochastic function of individual demographics and transportation-related variables). These stochastic latent constructs influence the current ride-hailing experience endogenous variable in a cross-sectional setting (one revealed observation per individual from each of the 1607 respondents) as well as each of the stated choice outcomes (one for commute travel and another for leisure travel) associated with the use of future SAV services in each of the three repeated choice occasions. Doing so immediately and parsimoniously captures not only unobserved factors impacting the indicator and endogenous outcomes of interest (as discussed earlier), but also accommodates covariations among the three choice occasions of the same individual. Additionally, the stochastic latent factors serve as a parsimonious approach to incorporating observed and unobserved individual heterogeneity in variables of interest, which is done by interacting the latent factors with exogenous variables (see Section 2.4 for additional details).

The resulting GHDM model is estimated using Bhat's (2011) MACML approach. To conserve on space, we do not provide the details of the estimation methodology, which is available in Bhat (2015a).

2.4 Value of Travel Time and Willingness to Share

Within the scope of discrete-choice models, WTP for travel attributes, including time (VTT), corresponds to the ratio of the estimated attribute and cost coefficients. Considering that WTP varies across the population, observed individual heterogeneity is addressed by interaction terms between attributes/cost and socio-demographic characteristics. Unobserved heterogeneity, on the other hand, is usually accommodated by specifying mixing distributions on the attribute coefficients and/or the cost coefficient, or by specifying mixing distributions on the actual WTP ratio coefficient (see Train and Weeks, 2005). A challenge associated with such approaches is that they are profligate in the number of parameters to be estimated. The current study deviates from the traditional WTP and VTT literature by adopting an alternative method to introduce individual heterogeneity in VTT and WTS. Instead of a mixing approach, we use stochastic latent variables as moderators of attributes in the choice utilities, thus capturing both observed and unobserved

individual heterogeneity. As already indicated, in our application, we interact the privacy-sensitivity latent variable with the number of additional passengers (strangers) in the shared ride alternatives, and both time-related latent variables with the travel time attribute. In addition to a parsimonious structure, this method has the behavioral appeal of partitioning individual heterogeneity in VTT and WTS into specific psycho-social construct effects.

For each individual q , the computations of the expected values of VTT and WTS, and the corresponding variances, occur as follows:

$$E(VTT_q) = \frac{\beta_{TT_1} E(z_{TS_q}^*) + \beta_{TT_2} E(z_{IPTT_q}^*) + \beta_{TT_3}}{\beta_{COST}}, \quad Var(VTT_q) = \frac{1}{\beta_{COST}^2} (\beta_{TT_1}^2 + \beta_{TT_2}^2) \quad (1)$$

$$E(WTS_q) = \frac{\beta_{AP_1} E(z_{PS_q}^*) + \beta_{AP_2}}{\beta_{COST}}, \quad Var(WTS_q) = \frac{\beta_{AP_1}^2}{\beta_{COST}^2} \quad (2)$$

where β_{TT_1} is the coefficient on the interaction of the time-sensitivity latent construct ($z_{TS_q}^*$) and travel time, β_{TT_2} is the coefficient on the interaction of the interest in the productive use of travel time (IPTT) latent construct ($z_{IPTT_q}^*$) and travel time, β_{TT_3} is the coefficient on travel time, β_{AP_1} is the coefficient on the interaction of the privacy-sensitivity ($z_{PS_q}^*$) latent construct and the additional number of passengers (ADD) variable, β_{AP_2} is the coefficient on the ADD variable, and β_{COST} is the coefficient on trip cost. The expected values of the stochastic latent constructs are computed based on the SEM model results.⁷

It is well documented in the literature that stated choice data should be anchored to actual revealed choice values to reduce hypothetical bias and increase the external validity of WTP values (Hensher, 2010). The situation investigated in this study did not have a plausible revealed choice analogous, so WTP is not ‘calibrated’ by observed choices. Instead, to avoid drawing conclusions directly about actual VTT and WTS values, we direct our analysis toward relative comparisons between these two values for different segments of the population.

3. SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

The final sample used in the current paper includes information on 1,607 commuters. Table 1 presents descriptive statistics of the socio-demographic characteristics of these respondents. While the appropriate baseline population would be the set of all commuters in the DFW area (those with a primary workplace outside their homes), we have no information available on this baseline population. The closest population we have information on is the employed population of DFW (including those who may be employed and working at home). A comparison of our sample with this employed population of DFW (as characterized by the U.S. Census Bureau, 2018) indicates that the sample has an overrepresentation of men (58.4% in the survey compared to 54.0% from

⁷ The variance formulas arise as given because the latent construct variances are normalized to one for identification in the estimation. Also, to keep the presentation simple, we do not consider the sampling variance of the estimated coefficients in the variance computation.

the Census data), individuals between 45 and 64 years of age (53.2% compared to 35.8%), Non-Hispanic Whites (75.0% compared to 51.0%), and individuals with bachelor's or post-graduate degrees (75.6% compared to 33.7%). We also observe that the majority of the sample corresponds to full time-employees (81.6%). Finally, among the socio-demographic characteristics, we are unable to compare the statistics from our survey with the Census data for the household income and household composition variables, because the Census data provides income and household composition data only for all households (while our survey is focused on households with at least one worker with a primary workplace outside home). However, the sample statistics do suggest a skew toward individuals from higher income households and multi-worker households.

Overall, there are many possible reasons for the socio-demographic differences between our sample and the Census data (besides the fact that the Census includes all employed individuals, while our sample is confined to commuters). For example, the main topic of the survey was self-driving vehicles, which may be of more interest to highly educated men. In addition, the survey was conducted strictly through an online platform and the largest mailing list used in the distribution was of toll-road users, who are likely to be individuals with higher values of time that then correlates with the specific characteristics of our sample. Because the sample is not representative of the population of employed individuals in DFW and is skewed toward high-income individuals, the general descriptive statistics of the dependent variables of interest cannot be generalized to the DFW population, and estimated VTT and WTS values may be inflated. However, the individual level models developed in this paper should still provide important insights on the fundamental relationship between travel behavior in an autonomous vehicle future (that does not currently exist at all) and socio-demographic/lifestyle characteristics.

The descriptive statistics of the three transportation-related variables are provided toward the bottom of Table 1, and reveal a sample with more than three-fourths of the respondents living in non-urban areas, more than 50% owning motorized vehicles equal to the number of workers in the respondent's household, and a predominance of the drive alone mode to commute to work. Figure 3 presents the distribution of the attitudinal indicators among the survey respondents. We observe a general tendency toward being privacy-sensitive, time-sensitive, and interested in the productive use of travel time.

In terms of ride-hailing experience, about 56.4% of the sample (n=906) reported using ride-hailing services at least once in their lifetimes, although only about 10.0% of the sample (n=157) reported experience with the pooled version of the service. Accordingly, ride-hailing experience is represented in the three nominal categories of *no experience* (43.6%; n=701), *experience with private rides only* (46.6%; n=906-157=749), and *experience with pooled rides* (9.8%; n=157; note that this group may have had experience with private rides too). Finally, in terms of stated choices for SAV services (n=4821=1607 individuals × 3 choice occasions per individual), we observe that different trip purposes may be associated with different preferences toward sharing. In 48.3% of the choice occasions associated with work trip scenarios, respondents chose to ride alone, while this fraction is higher for leisure trip scenarios, reaching 54.0%.

4. MODEL ESTIMATION RESULTS

The final model specification was obtained based on a systematic process of testing alternative combinations of explanatory variables and eliminating statistically insignificant ones. Also, for continuous variables such as respondent age and respondent's household income, a number of functional forms were tested in the sub-models for each endogenous outcome variable, including a linear form, a dummy variable categorization, as well as piecewise spline forms. But the dummy variable specification turned up to provide the best data fit in all cases, and is the one adopted in the final model specification. Also, in the final model specification, some variables that were not statistically significant at a 95% confidence level were retained due to their intuitive interpretations and important empirical implications. In this regard, the methodology used involves the estimation of a large number of parameters, so the statistical insignificance of some coefficients may simply be a result of having only 1,607 respondents. Also, the effects from this analysis, even if not highly statistically significant, can inform specifications in future ride-hailing investigations with larger sample sizes.

In the next section, we discuss the results of the SEM model component of the GHDM, as well as the latent constructs' loadings on the attitudinal indicators (which are one part of the MEM). In subsequent sections, we discuss the MEM relationships corresponding to the effects of socio-demographic and transportation-related characteristics, and the latent constructs, on the three main outcomes of interest.

4.1 Attitudinal Latent Constructs

The structural relationships between socio-demographic variables representing lifecycle stages and the latent constructs are presented in Table 2. Gender shows no significant effect on the individual's level of privacy-sensitivity and interest in the productive use of travel time (IPTT). Yet, women display higher levels of time sensitivity, which is expected considering that working women are more likely to experience time scarcity relative to men, attributable to lingering gender disparities in household-related activities, including childcare and chauffeuring activities (Fan, 2017, Motte-Baumvol et al., 2017). Younger adults (18-34 years of age), relative to their older counterparts, display greater levels of privacy-sensitivity and IPTT. The latter effect is probably associated with higher levels of tech-savviness and ICT usage among younger adults, which facilitates the productive use of travel time (Astroza et al., 2017, Malokin et al., 2017). The first effect, on the other hand, seems less obvious and requires further investigation; however, it may also be related to higher levels of technology use, especially smartphones, by younger generations. There is growing evidence that the use of smartphones is creating a "portable-private bubble" phenomenon, which makes individuals more estranged from their surroundings and less interested in potential social interactions in public spaces (Hatuka and Toch, 2016). Along the same lines, higher smartphone usage also seems to be associated with higher social anxiety and lower social capital building (Bian and Leung, 2015, Kuss et al., 2018). We also observe that individuals between 35 and 44 years of age are more time-sensitive than their younger and older peers. This

age range is associated with the beginning of the career peak cycle, and also increased responsibilities associated with raising children and looking after family elders (Neal and Hammer, 2017).

Non-Hispanic White individuals tend to be more privacy-sensitive relative to other ethnicities, a result that aligns with the higher levels of drive-alone travel and vehicle ownership by this ethnic group (Giuliano, 2003, Klein et al., 2018). As expected, individuals who are more highly educated show greater interest in the productive use of travel time. Higher levels of education are associated with higher tech-savviness and ICT usage (Astroza et al., 2017), as well as greater opportunity to work outside the traditional work place (Singh et al., 2013), which can contribute to the ability to work and be productive while traveling. Being a part-time employee or self-employed is associated with lower time sensitivity, presumably because these employment arrangements provide greater time flexibility than full-time employment. Finally, individuals from households with very high incomes (above US\$200,000 per year) show greater privacy and time-sensitivity, and are also more interested in using their travel time productively. The higher privacy-sensitivity among the wealthiest segment of individuals can be a direct result of having more access to private property and/or a need to signal exclusivity through separation and differentiation from others (Chevalier and Gutsatz, 2012, Bhat, 2015b). These individuals may also focus on privacy due to concerns associated with safety and preservation of material assets. High-income individuals also have stronger feelings of time pressure (DeVoe and Pfeffer, 2011, Chen et al., 2015), which are dictated by perceived opportunity costs, among other factors, such as increased occupation responsibilities. Such characteristics explain the positive impacts of income in the two time-related latent constructs.

All three correlations corresponding to the three pairs of latent variables are statistically significant (see Table 2), even if only medium-to-low in magnitude. Privacy-sensitivity is positively associated with time-sensitivity, and negatively related to IPTT. Time-sensitivity is also negatively associated with IPTT. The implication of these correlation results is that, when dealing with individuals who are intrinsically privacy and time-sensitive (due to unobserved personality characteristics), an environment that is conducive to the productive use of travel time will have little to no effect on increasing their tolerance to increased travel times and/or additional passengers.

The SEM estimation is made possible through the observations of the endogenous variables (far right block of Figure 1), which include the latent variable indicators and the three endogenous outcomes of interest. The loadings of the latent variables on their indicators are represented at the bottom of Table 2 and have the expected signs. Thresholds and constants associated with the ordinal response equations characterizing the indicators were also estimated but are omitted to conserve on space.

4.2 Current Ride-Hailing Experience

The results of the ride-hailing experience model are presented in the first column of Table 3. The coefficients represent the effects of variables on the utilities of private only ride-hailing and shared (or pooled) ride-hailing, with the base alternative being the case of no ride-hailing experience.

The latent variable effects have the expected directionality of effects, with privacy-sensitive individuals less likely to have experience with pooled ride-hailing service and IPTT increasing the probability of both types of ride-hailing experience. This latter result suggests that interest in using travel time more productively is an important factor currently guiding ride-hailing adoption.

In addition to the indirect socio-demographic influences through the latent variable effects just discussed, there are direct socio-demographic effects on ride-hailing experience. Table 3 indicates that age has a direct negative effect on ride-hailing experience, with younger individuals more likely than their older counterparts to have used ride-hailing both in the private as well as pooled arrangements, which is consistent with earlier studies (Smith, 2016, Kooti et al., 2017)⁸.

The results also show that Non-Hispanic Whites are less likely to have used pooled services, even after accounting for the indirect negative effect (through the privacy-sensitivity construct) of being Non-Hispanic White (relative to individuals of other race/ethnicity categories) and after controlling for income effects. The reason behind this race/ethnicity effect is not clear in the literature and calls for more qualitative studies investigating cultural influences on the willingness to share rides. However, on a related note, there is evidence that non-white immigrants are more likely to carpool, especially if living in immigrant neighborhoods (Blumenberg and Smart, 2010). Similar to what was observed by Dias et al. (2017), part-time employees are less likely to have experienced private ride-hailing services relative to full-time employees and self-employed individuals.

In terms of household level variables, a higher household income increases experience with both private and pooled ride-hailing, beyond the positive effect of household income through IPTT (and while individuals with a household income over \$200,000 have a higher privacy sensitivity, and privacy sensitivity negatively impacts pooled ride-hailing experience, this indirect negative effect gets swamped by the magnitude of the positive direct effect in Table 3; this may be observed by doing a similar computation as for the age effects discussed earlier). Considering that attitudinal and lifestyle factors are being controlled for, the direct positive income effect is probably an

⁸ Note that this direct negative age effect more than compensates for the average indirect positive age effects on experience with both private and pooled services through the privacy-sensitivity latent construct. Thus, for example, the average indirect age effect indicates that an individual 18-34 years of age (relative to a person 65 years of age or older) has a lower pooled ride-hailing utility valuation of the order of 0.168 (the coefficient on the “18 to 34 years” of age variable corresponding to privacy sensitivity in Table 2) times the average expected value of the privacy-sensitivity latent variable (0.246) multiplied by -0.131 (the magnitude of the coefficient on the privacy-sensitivity construct on pooled ride-hailing experience in Table 3) yielding an average indirect age effect between the “18 to 34 years” age group and the “≥65 years age group” of -0.005 (=0.168*0.246*(-0.131)). The corresponding direct age effect is 0.843, which swamps the indirect age effect, resulting in younger adults distinctly more likely to adopt the pooled form of ride-hailing compared to their older peers. Of course, the direct negative age effect reinforces the indirect negative age effect through the IPTT latent construct.

indicator of higher consumption power, though there is still a distinct preference for private ride-hailing over pooled ride-hailing in the higher income groups. As we will see later in Section 5.2, the magnitude of the coefficients on the household income variables on the private only and pooled ride-hailing utilities imply that an increase in household income tends to lead to a higher probability of private only ride-hailing experience, at the expense of drawing away from both the pooled ride-hailing and no ride-hailing experience categories. Individuals living alone are more likely to have used private ride-hailing service relative to individuals in other household types, while those in single-worker multi-person households are the least likely to have used both private and pooled services. Individuals living in more urbanized locations are more likely than their counterparts in less urbanized locations to have used both private and pooled ride-hailing. A similar result holds for individuals in households with more than one vehicle per worker. This latter result suggests that, in an area such as DFW where almost all households own at least one vehicle, ride-hailing serves as more of a convenience feature for those one-off trips rather than being an accessibility facilitator for routine trips. Still, individuals who commute by non-car modes are more likely to have experience with both private and pooled ride-hailing.

4.3 Private versus Pooled Rides for Work and Leisure Travel

The second and third columns of Table 3 present the estimated coefficients based on the stated choice between a solo ride and a pooled ride for commuting scenarios and leisure trip-purpose scenarios, respectively. There is very limited literature in the context of SAVs to which we can compare our model results. This is because, although there have been multiple studies investigating individual intentions to adopt SAVs (see for example, Zmud et al., 2016, Haboucha et al., 2017, Lavieri et al., 2017), there is little research modeling the choice between riding solo in a SAV use and pooling a ride in an SAV. The few studies on this topic have an exclusive focus on the investigation of VTT (see for example, Krueger et al., 2016). To our knowledge, there is no current study that models WTS.

As expected, privacy-sensitivity significantly reduces the likelihood of choosing to pool a ride in an SAV. The other two latent variables do not show significant direct effects after accounting for their interaction with travel time attributes (as discussed later in this section). Women and young adults exhibit a lower tendency to pool rides in a commuting context, but gender and age do not show effects on the decision to pool trips with others for leisure purposes. Women are usually responsible for most household chauffeuring and shopping activities, which are usually chained with into work commutes (Buddelmeyer et al., 2018; Fan, 2017; Motte-Baumvol et al., 2017). This may explain the lower tendency of women to choose the pooled SAV (PSAV) mode for the work trip. The negative inclination to use the PSAV commute mode among younger adults (relative to older adults) is intriguing, especially given that younger adults are distinctly more likely to use the pooled form of ride-hailing today (as discussed earlier). It is possible that, in today's ride-hailing setting with a human driver, millennials (individuals between 18 and 34 years old) feel somewhat more comfortable traveling with strangers because they view the human driver as a professional "guardian" during their pooled commute trips, while these same

individuals (relative to their older peers) are much more wary of traveling with strangers in SAVs without a “guardian” human driver. There are no statistically significant direct race/ethnicity effects in the stated choice models; yet, we observe indirect race/ethnicity effects (through privacy-sensitivity and ride-hailing experience) which indicate that Non-Hispanic Whites are less likely to opt for the PSAV mode. Individuals with graduate degrees have lower interest in pooling rides with strangers to reach leisure activities, while self-employment, compared to part-time and full-time employment, reduces the interest in the PSAV mode for commute trips.

In terms of household level variables, a higher household income decreases the propensity to choose the PSAV mode for both activity purposes, even after accounting for indirect effects through current ride-hailing experience and beyond the indirect effects through privacy-sensitivity. This result may be an indication of the higher consumption power and a desire for personalized SAV services among higher income individuals. Finally, in the set of demographic variables, individuals living in multi-worker households (compared to living alone or in a single-worker household) are more likely to use the PSAV mode for both activity purposes.

The transportation-related variables also reveal intriguing effects on the stated choices of SAV services. While living in urban areas (compared to living in the suburbs or rural areas) has a significant positive association with pooled ride-hailing experience, the opposite is observed in the SAV stated choice model. This result certainly needs further investigation in the future, though it may reflect the same perception of enhanced security (as for young individuals) with a human driver present (as opposed to not having an additional individual in the form of the human driver) when traveling with strangers in and around urban areas. Household vehicle availability seems to reduce the inclination toward pooling rides for commute purposes, while not affecting leisure trip-purposes. This effect corroborates the findings of Lavieri and Bhat (2018) in the context of current pooled ride-hailing behavior in the DFW area. Next, the model shows that commuting with other individuals today reduces the interest in sharing SAV commute trips, but increases it for leisure trips. Indeed, pooling rides with strangers when already escorting family members or acquaintances may be perceived as a challenge. However, it is interesting to note that individuals who do not drive alone to work seem more open to pooling rides in situations that they would potentially be alone, such as trips to leisure activities.

Finally, the endogenous variable representing ride-hailing experience also shows very interesting effects on the stated choice outcomes. Current experience with “private ride-hailing only” (relative to having no experience with ride-hailing at all or having pooled ride-hailing experience) has a negative effect on choosing to share AVs for both activity purposes. In other words, it appears that people who have used “private ride-hailing only” appreciate the convenience and flexibility of the private arrangement based on the actual experience, and are loath to sharing the travel experience with strangers (either with current pooled ride-hailing or with PSAVs in the future). Particularly intriguing here is the implication that it may be easier to “convert” individuals who have never used ride-hailing into future PSAV users than to attempt to convince current “private ride-hailing only” users to become future PSAV users. From this standpoint, part-time employees appear to be a promising demographic group to court for future PSAV travel, given,

based on our ride-hailing model results of the previous section, that they are one of the most likely groups to have never experienced ride-hailing. The fraction of part-time employees is also quite significant in today's workforce, and this fraction is only projected to increase over time (Trading Economics, 2018). Perhaps understanding their needs better (such as other household responsibilities they may shoulder) can lead to the provision of pooled ride-hailing services today as well as future PSAV services that can assuage their concerns about these services meeting up to their needs. On the other hand, current pooled ride-hailing users appear to be the prime segment for promoting PSAV use, especially for trips for leisure purposes.

In terms of trip attribute effects and interaction effects of trip attributes and latent constructs (see toward the bottom of Table 3), all the coefficients have the expected signs. In the specific context of the interaction effects, time-sensitive individuals place a higher premium on travel time for both the work and leisure purposes, individuals with high interest in the productive use of travel time have a lower sensitivity to travel time (particularly for the work purpose), and privacy-sensitive individuals have an increasing reluctance for PSAV travel as the number of passengers in the pooled arrangement increases (this last effect is particularly so for leisure travel). However, it is also important to note that these interaction effects generally pale in comparison to the main effects. Thus, for example, the utility difference per minute between the individual in the sample with the highest expected value of the time sensitivity latent construct and the lowest expected value of the time sensitivity construct is 1.066 (this is computed based on the SEM model predictions; the range of the expected value of the time sensitivity construct is from -0.263 to 0.803), which translates to an expected travel time sensitivity difference between these two individuals of $0.007 \times 1.006 = 0.0075$. This difference is less than 6% of the main travel time effect of 0.141 for the work purpose and less than 8% of the main travel time effect of 0.102 for the leisure purpose. Similar computations reveal that (a) the travel time sensitivity difference between the two individuals with the minimum and maximum expected IPTT values is 22% of the main travel time effect for the work purpose, but less than 3% of the main travel time effect for the leisure purpose, and (b) the negative additional passenger utility effect on sharing between the two individuals with the minimum and maximum expected privacy sensitivity values is about 9% of the negative valuation of the main additional passenger utility effect for the work purpose and 24% of the main additional passenger utility effect for the leisure purpose. Overall, the strongest interaction effects correspond to travel time variations due to IPTT for the work purpose, and the (dis-)utility attributable to additional passengers based on the level of privacy sensitivity for the leisure purpose.

We also tested the interaction between privacy-sensitivity and PSAV travel time to examine if the presence of strangers increases the disutility of time traveling, but this effect was not statistically significant. Similarly, we also tested the interaction effect of additional passengers with travel time, but again this interaction effect was not statistically significant. That is, individuals seem to have a fixed dis-utility to having a stranger travel with them, which is independent of travel time.

4.4 Model Fit Evaluation

In this section, we present the data fit results of an independent heterogeneous data model (IHDM) model that excludes the latent psychological constructs and compare this IHDM model to the proposed GHDM model. The IHDM model essentially is a set of independent models (one for each outcome, including attitudinal indicators) and ignores the jointness in the outcomes (that is, the covariances engendered by the stochastic latent constructs are ignored). The IHDM model includes the exogenous determinants of the latent constructs directly as explanatory variables as well as considers all statistically significant demographic and transportation-related variables impacting the outcome variables in the GHDM model. The GHDM and the IHDM models are not nested, but they may be compared using the composite likelihood information criterion (CLIC)⁹. The model that provides a higher value of CLIC is preferred. Another way to examine the performance of the two models is to compute the equivalent GHDM predictive likelihood value for the three main outcomes (that is, for the current revealed preference ride-hailing experience nominal variable and the repeated stated binary choice observations of SAV use (or not) for the commute purpose and the leisure purpose). The corresponding IHDM predictive log-likelihood value may also be computed. Then, one can compute the adjusted likelihood ratio index of each model with respect to the log-likelihood with only the constants.

We also evaluate the data fit of the two models intuitively and informally at both the disaggregate and aggregate levels. To do so, we focus on the predictions for the 12 different combinations of ride-hailing experience (three alternatives), work purpose SAV use (two alternatives), and leisure purpose SAV use (two alternatives). We then compute multivariate predictions for these 12 (=3×2×2) combinations. At the disaggregate level, for the GHDM model, we estimate the probability of the observed multivariate outcome for each individual and compute an average (across individuals) probability of correct prediction at this three-variate level. Similar disaggregate measures are computed for the IHDM model. At the aggregate level, we design a heuristic diagnostic check of model fit by computing the predicted aggregate share of individuals in each of the 12 combination categories. The predicted shares from the GHDM and the IHDM models are compared to the actual shares, and the absolute percentage error (APE) statistic is computed.

The composite marginal likelihoods of the GHDM and IHDM models came out to be $-52,4983.3$ and $-52,9193.4$, respectively. Other disaggregate measures of fit are provided in Table 4a. The GHDM shows a better goodness-of-fit on the basis of the CLIC statistic, the predictive log-likelihood values and the predictive adjusted likelihood ratio indices. The average probability of correct prediction is 0.1740 for the GHDM model, and 0.1545 for the IHDM model. At the aggregate level (see Table 4b), the shares predicted by the GHDM model are either superior to the IHDM model or about the same as the IHDM model for each of the 12 multivariate combinations. Across all the 12 combinations, the average APE is 10.69 for the GHDM model compared to 30.00

⁹ The CLIC, introduced by Varin and Vidoni (2005), takes the following form (after replacing the composite marginal likelihood (CML) with the maximum approximate CML (MACML)): $\log L_{MACML}^*(\hat{\theta}) = \log L_{MACML}(\hat{\theta}) - tr \left[\hat{J}(\hat{\theta}) \hat{H}(\hat{\theta})^{-1} \right]$.

for the IHDM. These aggregate fit measures in Table 4b reinforce the disaggregate level results in Table 4a. In summary, the results show that the GHDM model proposed here outperforms the IHDM model in data fit, providing support for our modeling of the revealed preference current ride-hailing experience choice and the stated choices of future SAV use as a joint package.

5. VTT AND WTS ANALYSIS

The expected values of VTT and WTS values are computed for each individual as discussed in Section 3.4. These expected values may be averaged across any demographic sub-sample or across the entire sample to obtain corresponding mean values and standard deviations. Overall, the VTT sample average estimate is \$26.5 for work travel and \$23.2 for leisure travel, which are rather high but may be attributed to the sample being skewed toward high-income households¹⁰. The higher sample average VTT for work travel compared to leisure travel is consistent with findings from previous studies (for example, Axhausen et al., 2008; Börjesson and Eliasson, 2014). Interestingly, we find a lower variation in the leisure VTT relative to the work travel VTT. In terms of the WTS estimates, the results indicate that individuals are willing to pay, on average, about 50 cents (48.71 cents is the actual point value) not to have an additional passenger for commute travel, and this willingness to pay not to have an additional passenger rises to 90 cents (89.71 cents in the actual point value) on average, for leisure travel. This is, of course, consistent with the estimation results that individuals are more sensitive to additional passengers for leisure travel relative to commute travel. As already discussed, this willingness to pay to avoid traveling with strangers represents a fixed cost, and appears to be independent of travel time. That is, the notion that individuals may be more willing to share rides for short travel times in an AV, but not long travel times, is not supported by our analysis. Another perspective on these results is that individuals are willing to pay 14% $(((26.5-23.2)/23.2) \times 100)$ more to reduce a minute in a commute trip compared to a leisure trip, while they are willing to pay 84% more to avoid an additional passenger in a leisure trip compared to a commute trip. The implications of these results for transportation planning and policy are that, from a shared economy perspective, it may be easier to promote PSAV use for commute trips than for leisure trips. Given that commute trips are the ones that overload the system during the peak period, there may be an opportunity to alleviate some of this peak period congestion. At the same time, there does not seem to be any difference in sensitivity to pooling with others in an SAV based on travel time, which suggests that promoting PSAV use for short-distance trips will be likely as difficult as promoting PSAV use for long-distance trips, both for commute and leisure travel. Still, since the value of time is somewhat higher for commute trips, efforts need to be focused on minimizing delays caused by serving multiple passengers during the peak period.

¹⁰ The average household income in the sample is \$125,000 and the majority of the individuals live in multi-worker households. Using the estimate of 1.7 workers per household from our sample and an average work duration of about 37 hours/week in the sample, and considering that each respondent works 52 weeks per year, a worker would earn, on average, \$38.2 per hour, which means that the work-trip VTT is equivalent to 69% of the hourly wage and the leisure travel VTT is about 60% of the hourly wage rate.

A further examination of the ratios between WTS and VTT for each trip purpose provides additional insights. In particular, for commute travel, reducing one passenger in a commute trip has the same monetary value as reducing the travel time by 1.10 minutes. For a leisure trip, the equivalent value is 2.33 minutes. Once again, this is a fixed time cost of an additional passenger, regardless of travel time. Overall, these values are low when compared to actual delays caused by an additional passenger in a ride. Thus, our results suggest that delays are a greater barrier to PSAV adoption than the actual presence of strangers¹¹. This result reinforces the idea that privacy concerns may not be a barrier too difficult to overcome and dynamic ridesharing may have a large market penetration potential, especially for commute trips, as long as operated efficiently with minimal detour and pick-up/drop-off delays. Of course, it is possible that the perceptions associated with the experience of pooling a ride with strangers is abstract to a large group of respondents in the sample, because of the small share of the sample that has experienced pooled ride-hailing. Thus, it may be a fruitful avenue of further research to design experiments that mimic the travel experience in a more realistic manner (using pictures or even virtual reality). Nonetheless, our results provide important insights into SAV use in the future.

6. TREATMENT EFFECTS

To examine differences in preferences for sharing among different population segments, we compute average treatment effects (ATEs) of the socio-demographic variables on ride-hailing experience and on sharing intentions in the SAV scenarios, as well as VTT and WTS. The ATE measure for the choice outcomes provides the expected difference in ride-hailing experience or SAV-service choice for a random individual if s/he were in a specific category i of the determinant variable as opposed to another configuration $k \neq i$. The ATE is estimated as follows for each determinant variable:

$$\hat{ATE}_{ikj} = \frac{1}{Q} \sum_{q=1}^Q \left(\left[P(y_q = j | a_{qi} = 1) - P(y_q = j | a_{qk} = 1) \right] \right) \quad (3)$$

where a_{qi} is the dummy variable for the category i of the determinant variable for the individual q , y_q stands for the choice variable, and j represents a specific choice alternative. Thus, \hat{ATE}_{ikj} above represents the estimate of the expected value change in the nominal category j of the choice outcome because of a change from category k of the determinant variable to category i of the determinant variable. In computing this effect, we first assign the value of the base category for each individual in the sample (that is, we assign the value of $a_{qk} = 1$ to the determinant variable of each individual to compute $P(y_q = j | a_{qk} = 1)$) and then change the value of the variable to $a_{qi} = 1$ to compute $P(y_q = j | a_{qi} = 1)$.

In our analysis, we compute the ATE measures for only two categories of the determinant variables. The base category for each determinant variable is used as the category to change from

¹¹ Note that from an experimental design perspective, the range of additional time per individual varied from 1.66 to 10 minutes. Our results regarding the equivalent time value of an additional passenger is at the bottom of this range.

(as denoted by index k in Equation (3)) and a single non-base category of the determinant variable is selected as the category to change to (as denoted by index i in Equation (3)). For example, in the case of age, the base category is the “ ≥ 65 years” age group, while the changed category corresponds to the “18-34 years” age group. Similarly, for race/ethnicity, the base category is the “other” race/ethnicity (including individuals of Hispanic and non-White races) and the changed category is the “Non-Hispanic White” race/ethnicity. We follow the same process of comparing a base and a non-base category of the determinant variables to evaluate percentage changes in VTT and WTS for the two trip purposes investigated. The results are presented in Table 5. Using employment type as an example, the ATE effect of -0.08 on private ride-hailing experience is interpreted as follows: if 100 random individuals moved jobs from full-time employment to part-time employment, there would be 8 fewer individuals with private ride-hailing experience.

The results in Table 5 indicate that high-income individuals, millennials, and individuals who live alone are the segments most likely to adopt private ride-hailing, while lower income millennials, individuals living in multi-worker households and individuals who are not Non-Hispanic Whites are the most likely to have experience with pooled ride-hailing. Overall, age and income are the strongest predictors of ride-hailing experience and pooling intentions. As discussed earlier, millennials are more likely than those 65+ years of age to adopt pooled ride-hailing today, but are also more reluctant to indicate intent to use PSAVs in the future. Millennials also have a higher WTS value relative to those 65+ years of age, indicating an aversion to sharing rides in SAVs. Why these results are so is an important avenue for further research, especially because millennials just became the majority of the labor force in the U.S. (Pew Research Center, 2018) and the success of pooling policies are critically dependent on this segment’s adoption.

Although individuals living in high-income households are the most likely to use private ride-hailing services, they demonstrate high pooled ride aversion in all dimensions. An interesting and worrisome result is that the interest in the productive use of travel time for work travel reduces travel time disutility for this group, which then tempers the higher time-sensitivity of this group. The net result is that there is no statistically significant difference in VTT between the low and high income categories for work travel (and the difference in VTT is rather marginal even for leisure travel), as may be observed in the VTT percentage change columns for the income row in Table 5. With reduced VTT, high pooling aversion and high economic power, these individuals may have significant increase in “ride-alone VMT” when AVs become available. Encouraging high-income individuals to pool rides will be challenging, but could be encouraged by upscale services offering additional comfort features for a higher price.

Transferring individuals from rural and suburban environments and encouraging commute by non-car modes instead of drive alone shows a positive impact on both private and pooled ride-hailing experience. In fact, together with age, both living in an urban area and commuting by a non-car mode are the strongest positive predictors of pooled ride-hailing. Yet, similar to millennials, despite the experience with pooled ride-hailing, urban residents seem less interested in the PSAV mode choice for both work and leisure purposes. From an operational perspective, urban (dense) areas are the most suitable environment to the efficient operation of dynamic pooled

ridesharing (because the demand is concentrated and thus matching becomes easier), thus further investigation of this negative effect observed herein is necessary.

7. CONCLUSIONS

There is growing evidence that pooling with others in the same vehicle will be a key element to prevent increases in VMT and congestion in an AV future. In this context, the current paper proposed and applied a multivariate modeling framework to investigate the extent to which individuals are willing to share rides with strangers in an SAV future. A joint model of current ride-hailing experience and stated intentions regarding the use of pooled rides for trips to work and to leisure activities was estimated and VTT and WTS (money value of traveling alone compared to riding with strangers) were computed for each individual in the sample. The model relied on three stochastic psychosocial latent constructs representing privacy-sensitivity, time-sensitivity and interest in productive use of travel time to create dependency among the three nominal outcomes and to moderate the effects of trip attributes (time and number of additional passengers) for each individual.

The use of psychosocial latent constructs as a key component in our model provides important insights regarding transportation planning and policy. First, we identified that privacy concerns are currently discouraging individuals (mostly Non-Hispanic Whites) from using pooled ride-hailing services, and such concerns also create a significant aversion to future PSAV services. Privacy-sensitivity may also be worsened by security concerns in an SAV context where individuals see themselves alone with a stranger in the vehicle (since there is not a driver to serve as a “professional guardian” during the trip). Although we did not investigate security concerns directly, we did observe that current pooled ride-hailing users may be reticent to pooling with strangers in an SAV, which could be preliminary evidence of this issue. In that sense, it becomes incumbent that AV design pay attention to security features, such as having an emergency “911-like” button accessible to each passenger. Also, our results suggest that AV security features be advertised particularly to young individuals, high income individuals, and urban area residents to allay their anxiety toward PSAV travel. Social-network-based ridesharing schemes can also be an interesting solution to privacy and security concerns in shared rides. This type of scheme has been recently proposed and simulated from a supply standpoint but is still to be implemented (see Richardson et al., 2016, and Wang et al., 2017). Thus, future travel behavior research efforts should help investigate consumer’s interest and potential demand to this new type of service. In any case, our results call for a deeper investigation into attitudes and perceptions associated with having a human driver versus not having one in the context of pooled ride-hailing travel. Similarly, a better understanding of why Non-Hispanic Whites, in particular, shy away from pooled ride-hailing travel today can be beneficial to bringing them to the “pooled-ride” fold and potentially increasing the number of individuals who may use PSAVs in the future.

Second, the latent variable representing “interest in productive use of travel time” provided evidence that this is an important factor currently guiding ride-hailing adoption. Considering the current interest by transportation researchers in understanding the impacts of automation on VTT,

the evidence obtained in the current study is very important. Ride-hailing services can be an important proxy for future SAV services and can provide valuable data to measure potential changes in individual's VTT due to productive use of travel time (even as a tool for naturalistic experiments). We also observed that providing an environment that is conducive to productive use of travel time may increase high-income individual's tolerance to increased travel times. High-income individuals are currently the main users of private ride-hailing and demonstrate high pooling aversion in all dimensions. Thus, if their VTT decreases due to productive use of travel time, they may have a disproportional increase in "ride-alone VMT". Encouraging high-income individuals to pool rides will be challenging and calls for future research. Yet, this group could be encouraged to share if upscale services are offered.

Third, we observed that when dealing with individuals who are intrinsically privacy and time-sensitive, an environment that is conducive to the productive use of travel time will have little to no effect on increasing their tolerance to increased travel times and/or additional passengers. This indicates that despite the potential of automation in reducing VTT, there are population segments that are unlikely to become less time-sensitive, such as full-time employed women between the ages of 35 and 44 years old.

In terms of actual measures of VTT and WTS, our results point to the importance of distinguishing trip purposes. For instance, individuals seem to be less sensitive to the presence of strangers in a commute trip than in a leisure trip, but the sensitivity to time is the opposite. The implications of these results for transportation planning and policy are that, from a shared economy perspective, it may be easier to promote PSAV use for commute trips than for leisure trips. Given that commute trips are the ones that overload the system during the peak period, there may be an opportunity to alleviate some of this peak period congestion. At the same time, there does not seem to be any difference in sensitivity to riding with others in an AV based on travel time, which suggests that promoting PSAV use for short-distance trips will be likely as difficult as promoting PSAV use for long-distance trips, both for commute and leisure travel. Still, since value of time is somewhat higher for commute trips, efforts need to be focused on minimizing delays caused by serving multiple passengers during the peak period. A further examination of the ratios between WTS and VTT reinforced the idea that privacy concerns may not be a barrier too difficult to overcome and dynamic ridesharing may have a large market penetration potential, especially for commute trips, as long as operated efficiently with minimal detour and pick-up/drop-off delays. This result points to a potential bright future for PSAV systems even in car-dominated environments such as DFW.

Further, any efforts to provide additional opportunities for, and promote the use of, pooled ride-hailing today appears will have positive pay-offs for the future use of PSAVs. That is, there may be merit to, for example, considering the provision of deep discounts for pooled ride-hailing today (or at least for a small window of time just before the large-scale advent of AVs) as a means to attract individuals to the use of pooled ride-hailing, even if these deep discounts may not be justifiable from an economic standpoint in the short-term.

The current study is just a first step to an important travel behavior topic. The novelty of the topic and the hypothetical nature of the experiment (considering that we surveyed individuals about SAVs and PSAV that are currently non-existent services) calls for future research to confirm the results obtained herein. Further, our study presented many sampling limitations that should be addressed by new studies. For instance, new studies should seek to investigate individuals representing broader population segments instead of only commuters and should aim at representative samples to generate more accurate VTT and WTS values. Additionally, it is likely that populations of different cities and countries have very different dispositions to pooling rides with strangers (for example, in cities where public transit is popular, people may be less averse to pooling rides), thus broader geographies should be considered in the future. In terms of methods, a similar framework to the one proposed herein can be enhanced by the inclusion of a fourth latent variable representing individuals' sensitivities to travel monetary costs. As largely discussed in the VTT and WTP literature, accommodating variability in the cost coefficient is important to avoid erroneously attributing variation to WTP. Additionally, a new experimental design that captures individuals current VTT would allow the identification of biases in the values estimated in this study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was partially supported by Cintra and the U.S. Department of Transportation through the Data-Supported Transportation Operations and Planning (D-STOP) (Grant No. DTRT13GUTC58) Tier 1 University Transportation Center. The first author acknowledges funding support from CAPES and the Brazilian Government. The authors are grateful to Lisa Macias for her help in formatting this document and for the comments provided by anonymous reviewers.


REFERENCES

- Amirkiaee, S.Y. and Evangelopoulos, N., 2018. Why do people rideshare? An experimental study. *Transportation Research Part F*, 55, 9-24.
- Astroza, S., Garikapati, V.M., Bhat, C.R., Pendyala, R.M., Lavieri, P.S. and Dias, F.F., 2017. Analysis of the impact of technology use on multimodality and activity travel characteristics. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2666, 19-28.
- Axhausen, K.W., Hess, S., König, A., Abay, G., Bates, J.J. and Bierlaire, M., 2008. Income and distance elasticities of values of travel time savings: New Swiss results. *Transport Policy*, 15(3), 173-185.
- Bansal, P., Kockelman, K.M. and Singh, A., 2016. Assessing public opinions of and interest in new vehicle technologies: An Austin perspective. *Transportation Research Part C*, 67, 1-14.
- Bhat, C.R., 2011. The maximum approximate composite marginal likelihood (MACML) estimation of multinomial probit-based unordered response choice models. *Transportation Research Part B*, 45(7), 923-939.
- Bhat, C.R., 2015a. A new generalized heterogeneous data model (GHDM) to jointly model mixed types of dependent variables. *Transportation Research Part B*, 79, 50-77.
- Bhat, C.R., 2015b. A comprehensive dwelling unit choice model accommodating psychological constructs within a search strategy for consideration set formation. *Transportation Research Part B*, 79, 161-188.
- Bhat, C.R. and Dubey, S.K., 2014. A new estimation approach to integrate latent psychological constructs in choice modeling. *Transportation Research Part B*, 67, 68-85.
- Bian, M. and Leung, L., 2015. Linking loneliness, shyness, smartphone addiction symptoms, and patterns of smartphone use to social capital. *Social Science Computer Review*, 33(1), 61-79.
- Blumenberg, E. and Smart, M., 2010. Getting by with a little help from my friends... and family: immigrants and carpooling. *Transportation*, 37(3), 429-446.
- Börjesson, M. and Eliasson, J., 2014. Experiences from the Swedish value of time study. *Transportation Research Part A*, 59, 144-158.
- Börjesson, M. and Eliasson, J., 2018. Should values of time be differentiated?. *Transport Reviews*, forthcoming.
- Bösch, P.M., Becker, F., Becker, H. and Axhausen, K.W., 2018. Cost-based analysis of autonomous mobility services. *Transport Policy*, 64, 76-91.
- Buddelmeyer, H., Hamermesh, D.S. and Wooden, M., 2018. The stress cost of children on moms and dads. *European Economic Review*, 109, 148-161.
- Chan, N.D. and Shaheen, S.A., 2012. Ridesharing in North America: Past, present, and future. *Transport Reviews*, 32(1), 93-112.
- Chen, C., Xu, H. and Zheng, J., 2015. The relationship between economic value of time and feelings of time pressure. *Social Behavior and Personality: An international journal*, 43(8), 1395-1407.
- Chevalier, M., Gutsatz, M., 2012. *Luxury Retail Management: How the World's Top Brands Provide Quality Product and Service Support*. John Wiley & Sons, Singapore.
- Cirillo, C. and Axhausen, K.W., 2006. Evidence on the distribution of values of travel time savings from a six-week diary. *Transportation Research Part A*, 40(5), 444-457.
- Cyganski, R., Fraedrich, E. and Lenz, B., 2015. Travel-time valuation for automated driving: A use-case-driven study. Presented at the 94th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., January, Paper No. 15-4259.

- Delhomme, P. and Gheorghiu, A., 2016. Comparing French carpoolers and non-carpoolers: Which factors contribute the most to carpooling?. *Transportation Research Part D*, 42, 1-15.
- DeVoe, S.E. and Pfeffer, J., 2011. Time is tight: How higher economic value of time increases feelings of time pressure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(4), 665-676.
- Dias, F.F., Lavieri, P.S., Garikapati, V.M., Astroza, S., Pendyala, R.M. and Bhat, C.R., 2017. A behavioral choice model of the use of car-sharing and ride-sourcing services. *Transportation*, 44(6), 1307-1323
- Fan, Y., 2017. Household structure and gender differences in travel time: Spouse/partner presence, parenthood, and breadwinner status. *Transportation*, 44(2), 271-291.
- Federal Highway Administration, 2018. Summary of Travel Trends: 2017 National Household Travel Survey (Publication Number FHWA-PL-18-019). Available at: https://nhts.ornl.gov/assets/2017_nhts_summary_travel_trends.pdf [Accessed: 11/23/2018]
- Frei, C., Mahmassani, H.S. and Frei, A., 2015. Making time count: Traveler activity engagement on urban transit. *Transportation Research Part A*, 76, 58-70.
- Gripsrud, M. and Hjorthol, R., 2012. Working on the train: from 'dead time' to productive and vital time. *Transportation*, 39(5), 941-956.
- Giuliano, G., 2003. Travel, location and race/ethnicity. *Transportation Research Part A* 37(4), 351-372.
- Haboucha, C.J., Ishaq, R. and Shiftan, Y., 2017. User preferences regarding autonomous vehicles. *Transportation Research Part C*, 78, 37-49.
- Hatuka, T. and Toch, E., 2016. The emergence of portable private-personal territory: Smartphones, social conduct and public spaces. *Urban Studies*, 53(10), 2192-2208.
- Hensher, D.A., 2010. Hypothetical bias, choice experiments and willingness to pay. *Transportation Research Part B*, 44(6), 735-752.
- Klein, N.J., Guerra, E., Smart, M.J., 2018. The Philadelphia story: Age, race, gender and changing travel trends. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 69, 19-25.
- Kooti, F., Grbovic, M., Aiello, L.M., Djuric, N., Radosavljevic, V., Lerman, K., 2017. Analyzing Uber's ride-sharing economy. *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web Companion*, pp. 574-582. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- Krueger, R., Rashidi, T.H. and Rose, J.M., 2016. Preferences for shared autonomous vehicles. *Transportation Research Part C*, 69, 343-355.
- Kuss, D.J., Kanjo, E., Crook-Rumsey, M., Kibowski, F., Wang, G.Y. and Sumich, A., 2018. Problematic mobile phone use and addiction across generations: The roles of psychopathological symptoms and smartphone use. *Journal of Technology in Behavioral Science*, 3(3), 141-149.
- Lavieri, P.S., and Bhat, C.R., 2018. MaaS in car-dominated cities: Modeling the adoption, frequency, and characteristics of ride-hailing trips in Dallas, TX. Technical paper, Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering, The University of Texas at Austin.
- Lavieri, P.S., Garikapati, V.M., Bhat, C.R., Pendyala, R.M., Astroza, S. and Dias, F.F., 2017. Modeling individual preferences for ownership and sharing of autonomous vehicle technologies. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2665, 1-10.
- Levin, M.W., Kockelman, K.M., Boyles, S.D. and Li, T., 2017. A general framework for modeling shared autonomous vehicles with dynamic network-loading and dynamic ride-sharing application. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 64, 373-383.

- Liu, Z., Miwa, T., Zeng, W. and Morikawa, T., 2018. An agent-based simulation model for shared autonomous taxi system. *Asian Transport Studies*, 5(1), 1-13.
- Malokin, A., Circella, G. and Mokhtarian, P.L., 2017. Do multitasking millennials value travel time differently? A revealed preference study of northern California commuters. Presented at the 96th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., January, Paper No. 17-00891.
- Merat, N., Madigan, R. and Nordhoff, S., 2017. Human factors, user requirements, and user acceptance of ride-sharing in automated vehicles. Discussion Paper No. 2017-10, International Transport Forum.
- Morales Sarriera, J., Escovar Álvarez, G., Blynn, K., Alesbury, A., Scully, T. and Zhao, J., 2017. To share or not to share: Investigating the social aspects of dynamic ridesharing. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2605, 109-117.
- Motte-Baumvol, B., Bonin, O. and Belton-Chevallier, L., 2017. Who escort children: Mum or dad? Exploring gender differences in escorting mobility among Parisian dual-earner couples. *Transportation*, 44(1), 139-157.
- Neal, M.B. and Hammer, L.B., 2017. *Working Couples Caring for Children and Aging Parents: Effects on work and well-being*. Psychology Press.
- Ory, D.T. and Mokhtarian, P.L., 2005. When is getting there half the fun? Modeling the liking for travel. *Transportation Research Part A*, 39(2-3), 97-123.
- Pew Research Center, 2018. Millennials are the largest generation in the U.S. labor force, 2018. <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/04/11/millennials-largest-generation-us-labor-force/>. [Accessed: 01/23/2019].
- Richardson, M., Petrescu, A. and Finch, M., 2016. Event-based ridesharing. United States Patent Application 20160026936. <http://appft1.uspto.gov/netacgi/nph-Parser?Sect1=PTO1&Sect2=HITOFF&d=PG01&p=1&u=/netahtml/PTO/srchnum.html&r=1&f=G&l=50&s1=20160026936.PG&NR>. [Accessed: 06/30/2018]
- Schwieterman, J. and Smith, C.S., 2018. Sharing the ride: A paired-trip analysis of UberPool and Chicago Transit Authority services in Chicago, Illinois. *Research in Transportation Economics*, 71, 9-16.
- Shaheen, S., 2018. Shared Mobility: The Potential of Ridehailing and Pooling. In *Three Revolutions* (pp. 55-76). Island Press, Washington, DC.
- Shaheen, S.A., Chan, N.D. and Gaynor, T., 2016. Casual carpooling in the San Francisco Bay Area: Understanding user characteristics, behaviors, and motivations. *Transport Policy*, 51, 165-173.
- Shaheen, S. and Cohen, A., 2018. Shared ride services in North America: definitions, impacts, and the future of pooling. *Transport Reviews*, forthcoming.
- Singh, P., Paleti, R., Jenkins, S. and Bhat, C.R., 2013. On modeling telecommuting behavior: option, choice, and frequency. *Transportation*, 40(2), 373-396.
- Smith, A., 2016. Shared, collaborative and on demand: The new digital economy. Pew Research Center, Washington, D.C. Available at: <http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/05/19/the-new-digital-economy/> [Accessed: 02/06/2018].
- Tahmasseby, S., Kattan, L. and Barbour, B., 2016. Propensity to participate in a peer-to-peer social-network-based carpooling system. *Journal of Advanced Transportation*, 50(2), 240-254.

- Trading Economics, 2018. United States Part Time Employment <https://tradingeconomics.com/united-states/part-time-employment> [Accessed: 08/01/2018].
- Train, K. and Weeks, M., 2005. Discrete choice models in preference space and willingness-to-pay space. *Applications of Simulation Methods in Environmental and Resource Economics*, R. Scarpa and A. Alberini (eds), The Economics of Non-Market Goods and Resources, Vol 6. Springer, Dordrecht.
- UberEstimator, 2017. Uber Estimator: Uber in Dallas-Fort Worth. Available at: <https://uberestimator.com/cities/dallas> [Accessed: 08/13/2017].
- U.S. Census Bureau, 2018. Employment Status, Table S2301. 2012-2016 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available at: https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_16_5YR_S2301&prodType=table [Accessed: 03/23/2018].
- Varin, C., Vidoni, P., 2005. A note on composite likelihood inference and model selection. *Biometrika*, 92(3), 519-528.
- Wang, Y., Winter, S. and Ronald, N., 2017. How much is trust: The cost and benefit of ridesharing with friends. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 65, 103-112.
- Wang, Y., Zheng, B. and Lim, E.P., 2018. Understanding the effects of taxi ride-sharing—A case study of Singapore. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 69, 124-132.
- Zmud, J., Sener, I.N. and Wagner, J., 2016. Self-driving vehicles: Determinants of adoption and conditions of usage. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2565, 57-64.



- “*”11: I don’t mind sharing a ride with strangers if it reduces my costs.
 12: Having privacy is important to me when I make a trip.
 13: I feel uncomfortable sitting close to strangers.
- “**”14: Even if I can use my travel time productively, I still expect to reach my destination as fast as possible.
 15: With my schedule, minimizing time traveling is very important to me.
- “***”16: Self-driving vehicles are appealing because they will allow me to use my travel time more effectively.
 17: I would not mind having a longer commute if I could use my commute time productively.

Figure 1. Model Structure

Experimental Design Attributes and Levels				
<i>Solo option</i>		<i>Shared option</i>		
Travel time	Fare structure	Discount	Additional travel time	Additional passengers
10 minutes	Base fare: \$1 Cost per minute: \$0.1 Cost per mile: \$0.91 Service fee: \$2.45	20%	4 minutes	1
15 minutes	Base fare: \$1 Cost per minute: \$0.1 Cost per mile: \$0.70 Service fee: \$-	40%	8 minutes	2
20 minutes	Base fare: \$1 Cost per minute: \$0.1 Cost per mile: \$0.40 Service fee: \$-	60%	10 minutes	3
Scenario Example				
Imagine that ride-sourcing services (similar to Uber and Lyft) use self-driving vehicles for all of their clients. Imagine also that you plan to go out on a leisure activity and you will use one of these ride-sourcing services. In the scenario described below, which option would you choose?				
<i>Option 1</i>		<i>Option 2</i>		
Call a private self-driving cab service (similar to Uber/Lyft)		Call a shared self-driving cab service (similar to UberPool/LyftLine)		
Travel time: 15 min Cost: \$16.5 No additional passenger		Travel time: 23 min Cost: \$10.0 Additional passengers: 1		

Figure 2. Stated Choice Experiment Design Components and Scenario Example




Figure 3. Sample Distribution of Attitudinal and Behavioral Indicators (n = 1607)

Table 1. Sample Distribution of Exogenous Variables: Socio-Demographic and Transportation Related Characteristics

Variable	Count	%
Gender		
Female	668	41.57
Male	939	58.43
Age		
18 to 34	261	16.24
35 to 44	360	22.4
45 to 54	432	26.88
55 to 64	423	26.32
65 or more	131	8.16
Race		
Non-Hispanic White	1205	74.98
Non-Hispanic Black	102	6.35
Hispanic	109	6.78
Asian/Pacific Islander	101	6.29
Other	90	5.60
Education		
Completed high-school	238	14.82
Completed technical school/associates degree	154	9.58
Completed undergraduate degree	724	45.05
Completed graduate degree	491	30.55
Employment type		
Full-time employee	1312	81.64
Part-time employee	138	8.59
Self-employed	157	9.77
Household income		
Under \$49,999	184	11.45
\$50,000-\$99,999	443	27.57
\$100,000-\$149,999	496	30.86
\$150,000-\$199,999	269	16.74
\$200,000 or more	215	13.38
Household composition		
Single person household	191	11.89
Single worker multi-person household	265	16.49
Multi-worker household	1151	71.62
Residential location		
Non-urban living: suburban, rural or small town	1232	76.67
Urban living: downtown or central area	375	23.33
Vehicle availability		
< 1 per worker	236	14.69
= 1 per worker	817	50.84
> 1 per worker	554	34.47
Commute mode		
Non-car	56	3.48
Car non-solo	146	9.09
Drive alone	1405	87.43

Table 2. Determinants of Latent Variables and Loadings on Indicators

Variables (base category)	Structural Equations Model Component Results					
	Privacy-sensitivity		Time-sensitivity		IPTT	
	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat
Gender (male)						
Female	--	--	0.183	4.27	--	--
Age (≥55 years)						
18 to 34	0.168	1.84	--	--	0.326	4.87
35 to 44	0.137	4.09	0.265	5.26	0.256	4.54
45 to 54	--	--	--	--	--	--
Race (other races)						
Non-Hispanic White	0.131	3.76	--	--	--	--
Education (≤ undergraduate degree)						
Graduate degree	--	--	--	--	0.133	4.32
Employment (full-time)						
Part-time employee	--	--	-0.382	-4.71	--	--
Self-employed	--	--	-0.119	-1.97	--	--
Household income (< \$150,000)						
\$150,000-\$199,999	--	--	--	--	0.092	2.84
\$200,000 or more	0.350	5.16	0.298	4.26	0.092	2.84
Correlations between latent variables						
Privacy-sensitivity	1.000	n/a				
Time-sensitivity	0.241	7.59	1.000	n/a		
IPTT	-0.115	-2.67	-0.071	-2.71	1.000	n/a
Attitudinal Indicators	Loadings of Latent Variables on Indicators (MEM component)					
I don't mind sharing a ride with strangers if it reduces my costs (inverse scale)	0.847	13.98				
Having privacy is important to me when I make a trip	0.477	17.49				
I feel uncomfortable sitting close to strangers	0.347	3.16				
Even if I can use my travel time productively, I still expect to reach my destination as fast as possible			0.755	40.40		
With my schedule, minimizing time traveling is very important to me			1.329	57.60		
Self-driving vehicles are appealing because they will allow me to use my travel time more effectively					1.183	7.26
I would not mind having a longer commute if I could use my commute time productively					0.751	4.49

"--" = not statistically significantly different from zero at the 90% level of confidence and removed from the specification.

"n/a" = not applicable

Table 3. Results of the Ride-Hailing Experience and SAV Choice Model Components

Variables (base category)	Ride-hailing experience (base: none)				SAV: work purpose (base: solo)		SAV: leisure purpose (base: solo)	
	Private only		Pooled		Pooled		Pooled	
	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat	Coeff.	t-stat
<i>Latent variables</i>								
Privacy-sensitivity	--	--	-0.131	-1.90	-1.348	-5.11	-1.251	-7.87
Time-sensitivity	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
IPTT	0.151	2.55	0.151	2.55	--	--	--	--
<i>Socio-demographic variables</i>								
Gender (male)								
Female	--	--	--	--	-0.174	-5.23	--	--
Age (≥65 years)								
18 to 34	0.978	9.19	0.843	11.61	-0.311	-1.84	--	--
35 to 44	0.699	7.10	0.564	8.83	-0.257	-3.15	--	--
45 to 54	0.321	4.09	0.336	5.46	--	--	--	--
55 to 64	0.158	2.38	--	--	--	--	--	--
Race (other races)								
Non-Hispanic White	--	--	-0.205	-5.69	--	--	--	--
Education (≤ undergraduate degree)								
Graduate degree	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.086	-3.67
Employment (full-time)								
Part-time employee	-0.277	-10.12	--	--	--	--	--	--
Self-employed	0.114	4.40	--	--	-0.232	-5.07	--	--
Household income (< \$50,000)								
\$50,000-\$99,999	--	--	--	--	--	--	-0.132	-3.85
\$100,000-\$149,999	0.353	14.92	--	--	-0.396	-10.00	-0.692	-11.74
\$150,000-\$199,999	0.605	13.53	0.203	6.90	-0.396	-10.00	-0.692	-11.74
\$200,000 or more	0.986	16.80	0.485	10.29	-0.396	-10.00	-0.692	-11.74
Household composition (multi-worker)								
Single person	0.362	14.50	--	--	-0.193	-4.55	--	--
Single worker multi-person	-0.171	-6.26	-0.241	-7.93	-0.435	-8.71	-0.279	-8.49
<i>Transportation-related variables</i>								
Residential location (rural/ suburban)								
Urban	0.363	21.64	0.413	16.35	-0.092	-2.86	-0.086	-3.43
Vehicle availability (< 1 per worker)								
= 1 per worker	--	--	--	--	-0.339	-7.58	--	--
> 1 per worker	0.059	3.79	0.144	4.06	-0.151	-3.53	--	--
Commute mode (drive alone)								
Car not-alone	-0.042	-2.00	0.053	2.04	-0.092	-2.22	0.086	2.69
Non-car	0.242	7.34	0.395	10.02	--	--	--	--
Ride-hailing experience (no)								
Private only	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.173	-5.42	-0.420	-11.51
Pooled	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.049	0.81	0.193	2.98
<i>Trip attributes</i>								
Cost [US\$]	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.294	-13.31	-0.263	-14.59
Travel time [minutes]	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.141	-13.60	-0.102	-13.81
Additional passengers	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.139	-8.68	-0.218	-10.03
Travel time*Time-sensitivity	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.007	-2.08	-0.007	2.87
Travel time*IPTT	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0.066	9.69	0.006	2.11
Additional passengers*Privacy-sensitivity	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.017	-1.33	-0.073	-2.48
Constant	-0.884	-9.31	-1.214	-13.03	1.130	11.011	0.903	9.60

“--” = not statistically significantly different from zero at the 90% level of confidence and removed. “n/a” = not applicable

Table 4a. Disaggregate Measures of Goodness-of-Fit

Summary Statistics	Model	
	GHDM	IHDM
Composite Marginal log-likelihood value at convergence	-524,196.0	-528,710.0
Composite Likelihood Information Criterion (CLIC)	-524,983.3	-529,193.4
Predictive log-likelihood at convergence	-9,847.68	-10,133.67
Constants only predictive log-likelihood at convergence	-11,220.60	
Number of parameters	120	87
Predictive adjusted likelihood ratio index	0.113	0.090
Average probability of correct prediction	0.174	0.154

Table 4b. Aggregate Measures of Goodness-of-Fit

Multivariate Combination	Sample		GHDM		IHDM	
	Count	Share (%)	Predicted Share (%)	APE (%)	Predicted Share (%)	APE (%)
Ride-hailing experience, Leisure Purpose, Work Purpose						
No, Solo, Solo	675	14.00	14.69	4.93	8.60	38.55
No, Solo, Shared	343	7.11	7.22	1.50	9.92	39.46
No, Shared, Solo	294	6.10	6.59	8.06	9.86	61.69
No, Shared, Shared	791	16.41	16.01	2.40	14.69	10.49
Private, Solo, Solo	854	17.71	17.02	3.94	12.44	29.76
Private, Solo, Shared	528	10.95	11.04	0.80	12.21	11.52
Private, Shared, Solo	291	6.04	4.43	26.65	9.87	63.59
Private, Shared, Shared	574	11.91	14.43	21.21	11.91	0.01
Pooled, Solo, Solo	128	2.66	2.63	1.12	1.92	27.55
Pooled, Solo, Shared	78	1.62	1.17	27.95	2.16	33.35
Pooled, Shared, Solo	88	1.83	1.46	20.18	2.52	38.10
Pooled, Shared, Shared	177	3.67	3.32	9.59	3.89	5.89
Average APE				10.69		30.00
Average Probability of Correct Prediction				0.1740		0.1545

Table 5. Treatment Effect of Socio-Demographic Variables on Main Outcomes, VTT and WTS Based on Model 3

Variable	Categories Compared (base versus changed)	Change in Probability								Percentage Change							
		Ride-hailing experience				Work purpose		Leisure purpose		Work purpose				Leisure purpose			
		Private only		Pooled		Pooled		Pooled		VTT (%)		WTS (%)		VTT (%)		WTS (%)	
Est.	St. err.	Est.	St. err.	Est.	St. err.	Est.	St. err.	Est.	St. err.	Est.	St. err.	Est.	St. err.	Est.	St. err.	Est.	St. err.
Gender	Male vs. female	--	--	--	--	-0.032	0.006	-0.006	0.003	1.029	0.217	--	--	1.255	0.264	--	--
Age	65+ vs. 18 to 34	0.316	0.026	0.049	0.006	-0.021	0.008	-0.102	0.015	-16.221	3.436	2.069	1.373	-1.891	0.398	5.487	3.634
Race	Other vs. Non-Hispanic White	0.021	0.004	-0.040	0.007	-0.028	0.006	-0.040	0.008	--	--	1.616	0.410	--	--	4.291	1.070
Education	< bachelor's vs. graduate	0.007	0.003	-0.002	0.001	0.028	0.007	-0.015	0.006	-6.614	1.663	--	--	-0.764	0.191	--	--
Employment	Full-time vs. part-time	-0.080	0.009	0.021	0.003	0.011	0.004	0.020	0.006	-2.177	0.445	--	--	-2.652	0.539	--	--
Income	< \$50,000 vs. \$200,000+	0.337	0.019	-0.023	0.006	-0.269	0.029	-0.133	0.015	--	--	4.288	0.765	1.565	0.554	11.266	1.947
Households composition	Multi-worker vs. single-worker	0.137	0.011	-0.032	0.003	-0.034	0.007	-0.013	0.002	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Residential location	Rural/suburban vs. urban	0.098	0.007	0.042	0.004	-0.027	0.005	-0.017	0.004	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Vehicle availability	< 1 per worker vs. > 1 per worker	0.008	0.005	0.021	0.006	-0.025	0.007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Commute mode	Drive alone vs. Non-car	0.049	0.008	0.051	0.007	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Ride-hailing experience	No vs. Pooled	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-0.008	0.008	0.039	0.009	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

"--" = not statistically significantly different from zero at the 90% level of confidence.