Safety perceptions and behavior related to cycling in mixed traffic: A comparison between Brisbane and Copenhagen

This study explores the differences in safety perceptions and reported behavior of cyclists in mixed traffic between an emerging cycling city (Brisbane, Australia) and an established cycling city (Copenhagen, Denmark). Perceptions and reported behavior were retrieved from a custom-designed web-based survey administered among cyclists in the two cities. Elicited items concerned perceived risk of infrastructure layouts, fear of traffic, cycling while distracted, use of safety gear, cycling avoidance due to feeling unsafe, and avoidance to cycle in mixed traffic conditions. The data were analyzed with structural equation models. Results show that, in comparison with cyclists in Copenhagen, cyclists in Brisbane perceive mixed traffic infrastructure layouts as less safe, feel more fear of traffic, and are more likely to adopt cycling avoidance as a coping strategy. Results also show that cyclists in Copenhagen tend to use less helmets and to cycle more while being distracted.
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