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ABSTRACT

This study explores the concept of transport justice through the lens of perceived accessibility, highlighting the importance of individual experiences in transport planning and evaluation. It reveals that both gender- and age-based disparities exist in perceived accessibility and travel satisfaction, with women and the young experiencing lower accessibility and satisfaction due to a greater reliance on public transport. The study suggests that improving public transport quality and reducing car use attractiveness could address these inequalities. It also notes that increasing local activity hubs could enhance transport justice by reducing the need for frequent travel. The findings underscore the potential of perceived accessibility as a tool to unveil transport injustices and guide future research and policy-making toward a more equitable transport system.
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1. Introduction

In this study, we investigate transport justice from the perspective that all individuals should be able to live the life they want regardless of how they travel. For years, the general view on transport justice has focused on so called distributive justice, which in a simplified sense refers to the distribution of economic resources, or distribution of benefits and burdens in a system (Karner et al., 2023). Of late, several researchers have pointed out that to create a more just...
system, we need to include a broader perspective on justice where social justice and accessibility (Martens, 2006; Pereira et al., 2017), power imbalances, meaningfulness and individual experiences of quality of life (Karner et al., 2023; Vitrano & Lindkvist, 2022) and procedural and epistemic justice (Schwanen, 2021) stand in focus. In this broader perspective, the distributive dimension of transport justice refers to a focus on a more complete understanding of accessibility in terms of including individuals’ rights and focusing on prioritizing disadvantaged groups (Pereira et al., 2017), whereas the procedural dimension relates to inclusivity in decision-making processes (Karner et al., 2020), and the epistemic dimension of transport justice includes barriers and enablers in terms of experiences in skills, as well as inclusivity (of different groups or types of knowledge) in policy development (Schwanen, 2021). In sum, researchers point out that the extent to which transport justice, in terms of providing adequate transport and access for all, is successful needs to be understood in light of the ability of these systems to actually increase individual accessibility in terms of capabilities (Vecchio & Martens, 2021) and perceptions (Lättman, et al., 2016a). Sweden is no exception to these expanding perspectives on transport justice, in a recent anthology on transport justice (Joelsson et al., 2023), several contributors point out that just transport planning requires additional values, such as individual perceptions and specific, marginalized groups are made visible and incorporated into research and planning. In a recent editorial on transport justice, Karner et al. (2023) focus on difficulties in the practical evaluation of injustice in transport systems and lift a route forward towards more just transport systems by focusing on measuring accessibility to identify and understand which groups in our societies that are benefiting or being disadvantaged from the current transport planning. Following these broader perspectives on justice and equity, we propose perceived accessibility as a concept for reaching a better understanding of the experiences and perceptions of injustice or inequality within current transport systems.

Perceived accessibility can be defined as “how easy it is to live a satisfactory life with the help of the transport system” (Lättman, et al., 2016a, p.36), and refers to the individuals’ own experiences of accessibility in terms of whether ones needs and desires are met (Pot et al., 2024). Perceived accessibility is related to transport justice in that injustices arise when individuals perceive that they are not able to live their lives as they want to due to inaccessible transport systems (Lättman, Friman, et al., 2016b; Vecchio & Martens, 2021), thus both distributive and epistemic justice dimensions are represented within this concept. Previous research on perceived accessibility has shown that individual perceptions of accessibility differ from objective accessibility (also often referred to as measured or actual accessibility) both conceptually (e.g. Ryan & Pereira, 2021; Pot et al., 2021) and in practice (e.g. Lättman et al., 2018, Van der Vlugt et al., 2019). Research has shown that different individuals not only prefer different activities,
but they are also likely to experience unequal possibilities to go to the activities they prefer or need to participate in, even if they live in the same residential area with equal levels of distributive or spatial accessibility (Lättman et al., 2018; Lukina et al., 2021; Pot et al., 2023). These differences infer that other aspects than simplified distributive justice or accessibility aspects affect perceived accessibility, and add to the necessity of including measures of individual perceptions when evaluating transport justice. In the Netherlands, Pot et al. (2023) observed that the differences in perceived accessibility between rural and urban residents were not as distinct as a spatial accessibility evaluation suggested. Explanations for this could be found in the rural residents’ preferences for other aspects of accessibility than proximity to activities, whereas urban dwellers resided where their preferences for activities were fulfilled (i.e. residential self-selection). One important factor that may compensate for the lack of proximity to certain local activities is the private car, which also emphasizes the car dependency of rural areas. However, a study on (hypothetical) car restrictions in Sweden (Lättman et al., 2020) showed that urban individuals self-rated perceived accessibility significantly decreased when the car was no longer included as an option for daily travel. This decrease was significant both for regular car users and for the group with low car use, indicating that some activities and destinations individuals need to reach regularly still require access to a car, regardless of where one lives. Another study explored perceived accessibility with public transport among adolescents in two smaller cities in Finland and found that although public transport was free of charge in one of the cities, accessibility was not perceived as sufficient, likely due to the limited supply (Pesola et al., 2022). These findings indicate that maintaining high-quality accessibility and at the same time reducing the use of (fossil-fueled) cars to promote more sustainable transport systems will most likely be a tough challenge, in particular in rural areas. However, other studies have found that residents in urban areas who use the bike or walk as their main mode experience the highest levels of accessibility (compared to car and public transport users) (Lättman et al., 2018, 2020). In Pakistan, perceived accessibility was used to examine norms and social exclusion in relation to public transport. Results indicate that older people who perceived their accessibility as good are more likely to benefit from higher autonomy and mobility by using public transport for actively partaking in daily activities (Al Rashid et al., 2023). In China, where perceived accessibility was used as an indicator for public transport equity, similar conclusions could be drawn (Wang et al., 2022), whilst a Swedish study found that travel restrictions on public transport aimed at older people during Covid-19 resulted in a reduced quality of life, related to their inability to drive a car (Lättman et al., 2023). Other findings have concluded that schoolchildren in Canada, Japan, and Sweden who were given the opportunities to travel independently experienced higher levels of quality of life (Waygood et al., 2019). Findings like these suggest that transport systems designed to promote active and independent travel have the potential to be
beneficial for perceived accessibility and thus for transport justice. However, given that the private car is still the alternative that most individuals choose when having a choice, and that for some, the car may be the only realistic alternative (car dependency), transport injustice related to car use is likely to expand in the transformation toward sustainable transport systems unless we plan for inclusive societies by making sure that alternative modes for travel offer adequate transport justice for different groups of individuals.

Researchers studying perceived accessibility have also found differences in levels of perceived accessibility depending on gender. A study in Russia found that women perceive their accessibility as generally higher than men do (Lukina et al., 2021), similar trends have been observed in Sweden (Lättman et al., 2018). In Norway, a research team explored perceived accessibility before and after Covid-19 and found a significant decrease in the early days of Covid-19, followed by a small increase in the following months (Wolday & Böcker, 2023). They also discovered that the pandemic affected individuals unequally, as the perceived accessibility for women became significantly lower than for men when the pandemic struck, findings corroborated in recent analyses across several waves of the pandemic (Böcker et al., 2024). Other studies have observed no, or small differences between men and women (e.g. Lättman, Friman, et al., 2016b; Qiao & Yeh, 2023), which suggests that the context may be of importance. More studies are needed to establish when and how gender injustice can be observed.

Findings like these indicate that although we have come a long way in planning and building for accessibility, we have not adequately taken the heterogeneity of individuals, and their experiences, preferences, and needs into account when evaluating transport justice. This has to some extent resulted in an unequal and unjust transport system (Schwanen, 2021), putting some groups in society at risk of being socially excluded and experiencing a lower quality of life due to inequalities in accessibility (Lättman et al., 2016a; Pot et al., 2023).

For many individuals, the possibility to participate in activities outside their homes is essential for a meaningful and satisfactory life. However, this does not appear to apply to all individuals as some have a lesser need or desire to travel, so called “voluntary non-participation” in activities (Pot et al., 2024), which needs to be considered when evaluating aspects of transport justice. For instance, a study that focused on the perceived accessibility of older people (Lättman et al., 2019) found that although perceived accessibility was related to a higher quality of life and travel satisfaction, the results indicated a decrease in travel needs and an increased interest to partake in near to home activities when coming of age.

Travel satisfaction has long been considered an important outcome of experiences of different transport systems and has been studied within an array of transport modes, transport settings, and between groups of individuals with different needs and preferences. In general, findings point to public transport
generally being the mode that induces the lowest levels of travel satisfaction, whereas active modes relate to higher travel satisfaction (Ettema et al., 2016). De Vos (2019) observed that individuals using their preferred mode of transportation report higher levels of travel satisfaction compared to those using less favored modes. Furthermore, travel satisfaction is associated with travel mode choice and thus do to some extent influence travel behavior (De Vos, 2019; De Vos et al., 2022). Travel satisfaction is important not only because it affects individuals’ overall quality of life, but since it also affects how people choose to travel. Dissatisfaction with a particular mode of transportation can deter individuals from using it, even when it is deemed accessible. This reluctance can narrow down the perceived travel options available to them.

Other researchers have also found links between perceived accessibility and travel satisfaction. In Taiwan, perceived accessibility was included in a survey evaluating a new MaaS project and a digital platform. It could be concluded that a wider supply, which includes an integration of several modes of travel, has the potential to increase both perceived accessibility and travel satisfaction among users (Chen & Chen, 2022). In Jakarta, Indonesia, the service quality of a relatively new subway system was explored, and a relationship between quality, perceived accessibility, and travel satisfaction could be established (Sukwadi et al., 2022). Although more research is needed to explore these relationships, studies like these lift the possibilities to use perceived accessibility in different contexts to evaluate the effect of innovations and interventions on transport justice, and in turn how transport justice is related to travel satisfaction.

While devastating in many ways, the Covid-19 pandemic also created opportunities for researchers to study the effects on mental health inequalities when travel opportunities, as well as public activities, were canceled or heavily restricted. A study in China (Liu et al., 2021) showed that mental health issues increased during the pandemic related to reduced perceived accessibility. This was found particularly among two already disadvantaged groups (low-income and senior citizens) and the relative accessibility deprivation that these groups experienced in turn exacerbated health inequalities. In Norway, general declines in both trip frequencies and mental health were observed, especially for the early stages of the pandemic, and especially so for women. Perceived accessibility was a strong predictor of mental health (Böcker et al., 2024).

In sum, these above examples show the possibilities of using perceived accessibility as a concept for identifying potential injustices within different travel settings, i.e. capturing different groups of individuals that perceive their possibilities to live the life they want as insufficient. Researchers are calling for complementary measures for capturing transport justice and injustice (e.g. Karner et al., 2023, Bills, 2024). The differences noted in various settings, between individuals as well as between objective and perceived measures, when evaluating perceived accessibility accentuate the importance of complementing
conventional evaluations of transport justice with approaches that capture individual perceptions - allowing for detecting inequalities between groups of individuals within different contexts.

In line with this, we argue that the experiences of individuals need to be put to the front of planning and evaluation to achieve a just and equitable transport system. In this paper, we focus on perceived accessibility as a concept for understanding and evaluating transport justice - in terms of how individuals perceive their opportunities and possibilities to participate in daily activities. A particularly relevant aspect is to look into how sustainable options stand against non-sustainable modes of transport, and their role for men and women and younger and older people concerning perceived accessibility. We also explore the links between transport justice and perceptions of travel satisfaction in daily travel, as level of travel satisfaction influences people’s evaluation of transportation choices, informs travel decisions, and significantly impacts people’s overall life satisfaction.

2. Material, method and participants

A web questionnaire was administered on two occasions to all households in a suburb (2,266 households) of Stockholm, the capital of Sweden, as part of a larger project on mobility and solutions for the future. The suburb is a relatively new area with rapid development of housing, and planning of infrastructure. The survey was administered on two occasions (summer 2022 and autumn 2023) by sending postcard invitations with a QR code to a web survey. The survey consisted of questions related to socio-demographic variables, daily travel, travel satisfaction, and perceived accessibility.

Socio-demographic variables were reported by gender (woman, man, non-binary), age (18-30, 31-50, above 50), high education (university: no, yes), children (no, yes), and cohabiting (no, yes) as categorical variables, and monthly income (low (1) to high (6)) as a continuous variable.

Daily travel was reported by how frequently each of four modes (car, bike, walk, public transport) was used in general on 6-point scales ranging from less to more: never, once a month or more seldom, 2-3 times/month, 1-2 days/week, 3-5 days/week, practically daily. Both parametric tests (t-tests and Anova) and non-parametric tests (Mann Whitney U test and Kruskal Wallis tests) were conducted with the same results, supporting our choice to treat the four frequencies of mode use as continuous variables in our analyses (Williams, 2020) to be able to assess potential mediation effects in the hierarchical regression analyses.

Travel satisfaction was measured using a single item phrased as “How satisfied are you with your current transport solution for your everyday travel?”, reported on a 5-point scale ranging from very dissatisfied (1) to very satisfied (5), and treated as a continuous variable.
Perceived accessibility was measured using the perceived accessibility scale (PAC; Lättman et al., 2016a, 2018). The respondents were asked about their perceived accessibility of daily travel through rating four statements, on a five-point scale (ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). The four statements were: (1) Considering how I travel today, it’s easy to do (daily) activities; (2) Considering how I travel today, I’m able to live my life as I want to; (3) Considering how I travel today, I’m able to do all the activities I prefer to do; (4) Considering how I travel today, access to my preferred activities is satisfying. The four items measuring perceived accessibility showed good internal consistency (Cronbach’s Alpha = .90). A PAC-index was calculated by taking the mean of the items (ranging between 1 and 5), and treated as a continuous variable.

Questions were also asked about perceptions and experiences of alternative mobility solutions and services, results that are out of the scope of the present study and will be reported elsewhere.

184 respondents replied to the first wave and another 38 in the second wave, providing a response rate slightly below 10%. The low response rate of the survey may partly be attributed to the QR code on the distribution form which was concluded to be less effective. Furthermore, postcards may not always prompt immediate action from the recipients. Some people may have kept the postcard to respond later but ended up forgetting to do so.

Among the 218 respondents, 122 were women, and 94 were men (two did not report gender, an none reported non-binary). 57% had children and 22% were single households (36% among these had children). For age, the distribution was slightly skewed, where 14% were in the age of 18-30, 60% between 31-50, and 26% above 50. As regards household income, 41% had an average monthly income below SEK60,000 (equivalent to 5,500€). A majority had attended university (66%), a proportion slightly overrepresented to the population of the area (53%). Although the respondents do not represent Sweden as whole, the sample is fairly representative for the population of the area. The present study provide an example of how injustices can be evaluated within a specific case.

3. Results
In the following analyses, we first present descriptive findings of daily travel accompanied by some group comparisons. This is followed by hierarchical regression analyses for perceived accessibility and travel satisfaction. Hierarchical regression was chosen as a means to assess and control for effects of socio-demographic variables, mode use and perceived accessibility separately. The regressions were accompanied with Sobel tests to assess potential mediation effects.
3.1. Daily travel

Daily travel was reported by how frequently car, public transportation, bike and walk was used as their mode of transport. As shown in Table 1, some differences can be observed between men and women and between age-groups. Women use public transport significantly more frequently than men do (t (214) = 3.58, \( p < .001 \)), and use the car significantly less (t (214) = -2.37, \( p = .019 \)). No significant differences were observed for cycling and walking. Checking potential age differences, a significant difference was once again only observed for public transport use (\( F(2,215) = 12.77, \( p < .001 \)), where those aged 18-30 report being regular public transport users to a higher extent, than those in the age between 31-50, followed by those in the age of above 50. For car use, a marginally significant difference was observed (\( F(2,215) = 3.00, \( p = .052 \), although with a small effect size (\( \text{Eta}^2 = .027 \)). The frequency of cycling and walking did not differ significantly across age-groups.

3.2. Perceived accessibility and travel satisfaction

In Table 2, scores on the PAC-index and the single item of travel satisfaction are displayed across age-groups and gender.

Two hierarchical regression analyses were performed to assess the importance of socio-demographic variables (model 1) and mode use (added to model 2), for perceived accessibility and travel satisfaction, respectively. For travel satisfaction, perceived accessibility was furthermore added in a third step (model 3).

### Table 1. Self-reported mode use across age and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Age 18-30</th>
<th>Age 31-50</th>
<th>Age 50&lt;</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once a month or more seldom</th>
<th>2-3 times/month</th>
<th>1-2 days/week</th>
<th>3-5 days/week</th>
<th>Practically daily</th>
<th>In total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In each cell the number of respondents is reported.
For perceived accessibility, both models were statically significant (model 1: $F(7,199) = 3.94, p < .001$; model 2: $F(11,195) = 8.66, p < .001$), where Model 1 with socio-demographic variables explain about 9%, and Model 2, including mode use, contributing with 20% additional explanatory value. As can be seen in Table 3, being a woman is negative for perceived accessibility, an effect that seems to be mediated by public transport use when this is added to the equation (model 2). A follow-up Sobel test confirmed that this mediation is significant ($z = 3.32, p < .001$). Age was furthermore observed as related to perceived accessibility, an increase in age was positively related to perceived accessibility. Model 2 indicates that this age effect is mediated by public transport use, which was confirmed by Sobel tests (Age: High vs Others, $z = 1.99, p < .05$; Age: Medium vs Low, $z = 3.11, p < .01$). Car use is moderately positive, and public transport use is significantly negative for perceived accessibility. The mediated effect on gender and age can primarily be explained by the fact that women and the younger use public transport to a higher extent, a travel mode that is related to lower perceived accessibility.

To the right in Table 3, the second hierarchical regression analysis is presented, with travel satisfaction as the target variable, and with an additional third model including perceived accessibility. All three models are statically significant (model 1: $F(7,199) = 2.13, p < .042$; model 2: $F(11,195) = 3.88, p < .001$; model 3: $F(12,194) = 11.18, p < .001$), where model 1 with socio-demographic variables explains about 4%, and model 2, including mode use, contributes with 9% additional explanatory value, and model 3 including PAC an additional 24%. Again, a gender effect can be observed where being a woman is negatively related to travel satisfaction, an effect still significant after controlling for mode use. Mediation occurs when entering perceived accessibility to model 3 of the equation (Gender: $z = 3.10, p < .05$). For age, the youngest age group is less satisfied; an effect mediated in model 2 by public transport use ($z = 2.82, p < .05$). Looking at model 3, it is evident that perceived accessibility is substantially more important than any other variable. Interestingly, more frequent travel is negative for satisfaction in general, and specifically so for car, walking and public transport use. It can be noted that in contrast to walking and car use, the

| Table 2. Means and standard deviations of perceived accessibility and travel satisfaction across age-groups and gender. |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                | Mean           | Sd             |
| Perceived accessibility (PAC) |                |                |
| Age 18-30      | 3.02           | 1.09           |
| Age 31-50      | 3.79           | 1.04           |
| Age 50<        | 3.91           | 0.91           |
| Women          | 3.52           | 1.16           |
| Men            | 3.97           | 0.83           |
| Travel satisfaction |                |                |
| Age 18-30      | 2.97           | 0.93           |
| Age 31-50      | 3.60           | 1.14           |
| Age 50<        | 3.55           | 1.74           |
| Women          | 3.30           | 1.18           |
| Men            | 3.77           | 1.03           |
negative effect of frequent public transport is fully mediated by perceived accessibility ($z = 6.82$, $p < .05$).

### 4. Discussion

In this paper, we argue that to achieve a just and equitable transport system, the experiences of individuals should be given priority in planning and evaluation. To better understand and assess transport justice, we focus on perceived accessibility as a potential way forward. Perceived accessibility refers to how people perceive their opportunities and possibilities to participate in preferred daily activities and relates to the distributive and epistemic dimensions of transport justice.
In our empirical case, both men and women report in average being satisfied with their daily travel and perceived accessibility. Women are though less satisfied which can be attributed to choices of travel mode, and specifically their greater use of public transport, which affects their perceived opportunities and possibilities to participate in daily activities as well as travel satisfaction more than men. Similar results are observed as regards the youngest age group. Hence, important inequalities are identified, highlighting the potential of using perceived accessibility as one means to observe e.g. gender- or age-based injustice within a specific context and from the perspective of the individuals themselves.

This research doesn’t provide answers as to why women choose to use public transport, even though it can make it harder for them to achieve their goals in life. From a sustainability perspective, the solution is not to discourage women from using public transport. In opposite, from a social sustainability perspective, it is important to understand the limitations and difficulties that decrease the perceived accessibility of public transport, leading to transport injustices for its users. With such knowledge, it is possible to develop supportive policies and specific interventions to increase women’s use of public transport. As highlighted in the introduction, safety and comfort while traveling on public transport are critical areas of importance. A government policy on public transportation safety could be complemented with measures focusing on providing training for staff on handling safety incidents. Additionally, such measures can encourage more men to use public transport, leading to a more equal and diverse public transportation system. Ultimately, increasing the number of people who travel by public transport can improve its status and importance in society.

We can conclude that the current transportation system in the area is inadequate, as it doesn’t provide everyone with the means to live the life they want. If one chooses (or has no choice but) to travel by public transport, one will be disadvantaged compared to driving a car, a finding especially evident in our case for women and the young. Since we still think that public transport has a role to play, especially considering climate change, we simply have to improve travel with public transport - and other sustainable modes - or worsen the situation for car users. The latter may be challenging as transport planning has prioritized, and succeeded in, making cars the most accessible mode.

What attributes contribute to the injustice when comparing public transport and cars? As other research has shown, it is the car’s flexibility, ability to get close to the activity, comfort, and ease of use that are factors that make it attractive (e.g. Jakobsson et al., 2011). These are qualities that are not easily replicated in public transport. One possible solution is to focus on improving the quality of public transport while simultaneously implementing measures that reduce the quality of car use. Quality-enhancing measures for public transport could include increased departures, simplified payment systems, better departure
and arrival information, and easy connection options for the first-last mile. Quality-reducing measures for cars could involve parking fees, lower speeds, increased fuel costs, and reduced accessibility in traffic. All measures can be effectively included in a national policy as overarching guidelines for transitioning to a more sustainable transport system. When looking at walking and cycling we did not find significant differences between mode use by gender or age, but rather it seems that active modes are those options for travel that people in the area choose most rarely. This could be due to the area not providing sufficient paths for walking or cycling, but it could also be due to negative norms and attitudes towards walking or cycling (van der Vlugt et al., 2022) which are both aspects we did not study here but should be included when further exploring matters of transport injustice.

The study reveals that when people travel more their travel satisfaction decreases, regardless of mode. One way to increase transport justice is to enable people to take part in activities close to their homes, within walking or biking distance. Living in the suburbs often entails frequent trips to participate in activities centered in the main city. A broader sustainability and urban development policy can include the development and establishment of hubs for work, study, and other activities in suburban areas, which can have a positive impact. These hubs decrease the necessity for frequent travel, ultimately benefitting overall accessibility and travel satisfaction.

In summary, this study shows how using perceived accessibility as an instrument can unveil inequalities in transport justice. The outcome of a perceived accessibility analysis can be used to develop local and overarching policies to counteract injustices in the transportation system. In this section, based on our results we have provided examples of policies for a sustainable transportation system or urban development.

In future studies, there are great opportunities to include more variables for an increased degree of explanation as to why injustice occurs, and who is benefitting and who is not with regards to existing policies and planning. The PAC instrument can be used not only to identify inequities between groups, such as minorities or individuals with different travel needs and capabilities but also to compare different neighborhoods or to examine the impact of different measures implemented to improve and develop just transport systems. If a fair and equitable system is the target, where people have similar possibilities to do preferred activities and live the life they want with the help of available transportation options, capturing perceptions of accessibility may be one way forward.
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