

Analysis of Ownership and Travel Behavior of Women Who Drive Electric Vehicles: The case of Maryland

Paper presented at the 6th International Conference on Women's Issues in Transportation, Irvine, CA 2019

Amirreza Nickkar, Corresponding Author

Ph.D. Student

Transportation and Urban Infrastructure Studies, Morgan State University, 1700 E Cold Spring Lane, Baltimore, MD 21251

Email: amirreza.nickkar@morgan.edu

Hyeon-Shic Shin, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor

City and Regional Planning, Morgan State University, 1700 E. Cold Spring Lane, Baltimore, MD 21251

Tel: 443-885-1041; Fax: 443-885-8275

Email: hyeonshic.shin@morgan.edu

Z. Andrew Farkas, Ph.D.

Director

National Transportation Center, Morgan State University, 1700 E. Cold Spring Lane, Baltimore, MD 21251

Tel: 443-885-3761; Fax: 443-885-8275

Email: andrew.farkas@morgan.edu

Keywords: Electric vehicle, Commuting trip, Spatial analysis, Travel behavior, Purchasing behavior

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the Mid-Atlantic Transportation Sustainability University Transportation Center, led by the University of Virginia, and the U.S. Department of Transportation University Transportation Centers Program for their financial support of this research. The authors also thank the Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration for its cooperation with the survey of electric vehicle owners.

INTRODUCTION

Electric vehicles (EVs) can bring lots of benefits to the environment such as reduced energy consumption and emissions. Since the U.S. federal government has invested in policies that promote EVs in recent years, it is necessary to have clear insights into the travel behavior and ownership status of the EV owners. Currently in the U.S., men are more than twice as likely as women to own electric cars, although recent studies show that more women are making the switch to drive EVs [1]. Therefore, understanding possible influencing factors on purchasing EVs and travel behavior of EV owners would provide more practical and theoretical insights toward enhancing investment policies in the EV industry. The influence of demographic factors on EV purchasing behavior was extensive in most of the past studies. It has been proved that some socio-demographic characteristics like education [2-4], income [5, 6], gender [7, 8], age [9, 10], and household size [11, 12] may have a significant relationship with the EV preference and adoption. the reader is referred to the excellent review paper by Liao et al. [13] for a comprehensive literature review on this topic. Although many studies tried to address possible influencing factors on purchasing behavior of EV owners and their travel behavior, there is a very little knowledge is available about spatial travel and ownership behavior of EV owners especially in the angle of gender difference.

Several research questions arise from the state's policies to spur EV ownership through subsidizing purchase price and deploying public charging facilities at rail transit stations. Who drives EVs and what are female EV owners' socioeconomic characteristics? What are the primary reasons for females to purchase an EV and how are they related to owners' attitude toward and preferences for purchasing reasons such as environmental concerns, safety, gas prices, vehicle performance, and others? To answer the questions this study aims to investigate the contributing socio-demographic characteristics and factors among female EV owners as well as their travel behavior, commuting trip patterns, and purchasing/leasing ownerships. The objective of the study is to recommend public policies to decision makers to prompt gender equity for EV purchase and use by identifying socio-demographic attributes that influence EV travel patterns and behavior.

METHODOLOGY

This research surveyed registered Battery Electric Vehicle (BEV) owners in Maryland regarding attitudes toward EV purchasing and travel behavior, environmental considerations, and mode choice for work trips before and after purchase. The method of survey was online and respondents were asked about socioeconomic characteristics, vehicle features, current technology use, travel attributes, and preferences.

An online survey of EV owners of both sexes was conducted from May 28, 2015, to February 19, 2016. In total, 1,257 EV owners in Maryland completed usable surveys. A set of statistical analysis methods was employed to analyze the data [14, 15]. The sample was skewed toward the male population; 75% of the respondents were male, and 25% were female. Table 1 shows a summary of selected socioeconomic characteristics by gender.

Table 1. EV owners' demographic characteristics by gender

Attribute		Count		Percentage	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
Age	30 years old and younger	17	3	85	15
	30 to 49 years old	236	80	75	25
	50 to 59 years old	215	66	77	23
	60 years old and older	149	50	75	25
People in Household	One	49	14	78	22
	Two	228	103	69	31
	Three or more	339	82	81	19
Vehicles in Household	One	49	19	72	28
	Two	278	90	76	24
	Three or more	290	90	76	24
Education	College degree, high school diploma, and under	95	17	85	15
	Bachelor's degree	177	45	80	20
	Master's degree	172	69	71	29
	Doctoral or professional degree	172	66	72	28
Income	Less than \$100,000	67	34	66	34
	\$100,000 – \$200,000	221	83	73	27
	More than \$200,000	247	56	82	18
Marital status	Single	79	27	75	25
	Married or in domestic partnership	534	170	76	24
Race/Ethnicity	White (non-Hispanic)	473	160	75	25
	Other	94	31	75	25
Political affiliation	Democrat	287	128	69	31
	Republican	96	21	82	18
	Independent	153	28	85	15
	Not interested in politics	70	20	78	22

According to the US Census Bureau, geographic areas are classified into urban and rural areas. Urban areas in this classification include cities and towns, where 81% of the US population lives, and the rest (19%) are living in rural areas. However, this classification may not be adequate for analyzing travel behavior and commuting patterns of travelers. In order to conduct a spatial analysis of commuting trips of EV owners, the geographic areas in Maryland were categorized into three levels of “city,” “suburban” and “rural” areas. This classification clarifies travel patterns of EV owners. Figure 1 shows geographical distribution of female EV owners in Maryland.




Figure 1. Geographical distribution of female EV owners in Maryland

A set of correlation test, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and multinomial logit model (MNL) were constructed to examine the associations between EV owner characteristics and their EV purchasing/leasing and spatial commuting trip behavior. The EV owners in Maryland were asked to select three top reasons that encouraged them to buy or lease an EV.

FINDINGS

It is hypothesized that there is a relationship between female EV owners' commuting trip distance and their sociodemographic characteristics; therefore, in this section, a set of one-way analyses of variance was conducted to examine possible relationships between socio-demographic characteristics of EV owners and their driving distance by EV. Values of F and their significance levels in ANOVA are summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2 ANOVA on driving distance mileage among socio-demographic variables

Variable	F	Sig.
Age	0.998	0.53
People in Household	1.313	0.205
Vehicles in Household	1.318	0.201
Education	1.004	0.523
Income	0.885	0.68
Marital status	1.747	0.044*
Race/Ethnicity	2.212	0.009*
Political affiliation	1.028	0.493

* $p \leq .05$

Table 3 shows the main reasons of participants for purchasing EV.

Table 3. Summary of female participants' reasons for purchasing/leasing an EV

Trip status / main reason for purchasing EV		Environmental Issues	Price and Authority Issues	Efficiency and Performance	Total
Suburban to Suburban	Count	41	15	8	64
	% of Total	20.70%	7.60%	4.00%	32.30%
Suburban to City	Count	32	15	1	48
	% of Total	16.20%	7.60%	0.50%	24.20%
Suburban to Rural	Count	3	0	0	3
	% of Total	1.50%	0.00%	0.00%	1.50%
City to City	Count	21	9	3	33
	% of Total	10.60%	4.50%	1.50%	16.70%
City to Suburban	Count	21	3	1	25
	% of Total	10.60%	1.50%	0.50%	12.60%
City to Rural	Count	2	0	0	2
	% of Total	1.00%	0.00%	0.00%	1.00%
Rural to City	Count	4	2	1	7
	% of Total	2.00%	1.00%	0.50%	3.50%
Rural to Suburban	Count	5	5	1	11
	% of Total	2.50%	2.50%	0.50%	5.60%
Rural to Rural	Count	3	0	2	5
	% of Total	1.50%	0.00%	1.00%	2.50%
Total	Count	132	49	17	198
	% of Total	66.70%	24.70%	8.60%	100.00%

Table 4 presents Chi-square and statistical significance of variables derived from likelihood ratio tests.

Table 4. Results of Likelihood Ratio Tests for EV purchasing reasons logit model

Likelihood Ratio Tests			
Effect	Model Fitting Criteria	Likelihood Ratio Tests	
	-2 Log Likelihood of Reduced Model	Chi-Square	Sig.
Intercept	134.444 ^a	0.000	
Age*Education	175.957	41.513	0.000*
Age*Vehicle	155.355	20.911	0.022*
Political affiliation	161.614 ^b	27.170	0.000*
Education	153.908	12.982	0.043*
The chi-square statistic is the difference in -2 log-likelihoods between the final model and a reduced model. The reduced model is formed by omitting an effect from the final model. The null hypothesis is that all parameters of that effect are 0.			
a. This reduced model is equivalent to the final model because omitting the effect does not increase the degrees of freedom.			
b. Unexpected singularities in the Hessian matrix are encountered. This indicates that either some predictor variables should be excluded or some categories should be merged.			

* $p \leq .05$

CONCLUSIONS

The results of this study showed that first, socio-demographic factors, including education and income, played a significant role in preferences attributes of participants for purchasing/leasing an EV and in the commuting travel behavior and pattern and of EV drivers. Second, environmental issues are the main reason for purchasing/leasing EVs, but the EV owners who had longer commutes were more concerned about the price and status of the EV owner and efficiency and performance than were those with shorter commutes. The results of logit models showed that females with higher age, income, and education levels were more concerned about the environmental issues than younger ones. There is a big gender gap in EV ownership in Maryland. Several reasons for male dominance could be speculated. It is possible that most households registered their EVs under male householders, and males were likely to be primary EV drivers.

REFERENCES

1. Tal, G., M.A. Nicholas, J. Woodjack and D. Scrivano, *Who is buying electric cars in California? Exploring household and vehicle fleet characteristics of new plug-in vehicle owners*. 2013.
2. Bjerkan, K.Y., T.E. Nørbech and M.E. Nordtømme. (2016). Incentives for promoting battery electric vehicle (BEV) adoption in Norway. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 43, 169-180.

3. Hidrue, M.K., G.R. Parsons, W. Kempton and M.P. Gardner. (2011). Willingness to pay for electric vehicles and their attributes. *Resource and energy economics*, 33(3), 686-705.
4. Kim, J., S. Rasouli and H. Timmermans. (2014). Expanding scope of hybrid choice models allowing for mixture of social influences and latent attitudes: Application to intended purchase of electric cars. *Transportation research part A: policy and practice*, 69, 71-85.
5. Rasouli, S. and H. Timmermans. (2016). Influence of social networks on latent choice of electric cars: a mixed logit specification using experimental design data. *Networks and Spatial Economics*, 16(1), 99-130.
6. Sang, Y.-N. and H.A. Bekhet. (2015). Modelling electric vehicle usage intentions: an empirical study in Malaysia. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 92, 75-83.
7. Jensen, A.F., E. Cherchi and S.L. Mabit. (2013). On the stability of preferences and attitudes before and after experiencing an electric vehicle. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 25, 24-32.
8. Qian, L. and D. Soopramanien. (2011). Heterogeneous consumer preferences for alternative fuel cars in China. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 16(8), 607-613.
9. Carley, S., R.M. Krause, B.W. Lane and J.D. Graham. (2013). Intent to purchase a plug-in electric vehicle: A survey of early impressions in large US cities. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 18, 39-45. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2012.09.007>
10. Musti, S. and K.M. Kockelman. (2011). Evolution of the household vehicle fleet: Anticipating fleet composition, PHEV adoption and GHG emissions in Austin, Texas. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 45(8), 707-720.
11. Peters, A. and E. Dütschke. (2014). How do Consumers Perceive Electric Vehicles? A Comparison of German Consumer Groups. *Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning*, 16(3), 359-377. doi:10.1080/1523908X.2013.879037
12. Plötz, P., U. Schneider, J. Globisch and E. Dütschke. (2014). Who will buy electric vehicles? Identifying early adopters in Germany. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 67, 96-109.
13. Liao, F., E. Molin and B. van Wee. (2017). Consumer preferences for electric vehicles: a literature review. *Transport Reviews*, 37(3), 252-275. doi:10.1080/01441647.2016.1230794
14. Farkas, A., H.-S. Shin and A. Nickkar, *Environmental Attributes of Electric Vehicles Ownership and Commuting Behavior in Maryland: Public Policy and Equity Considerations*. 2018, Morgan State University: Mid-Atlantic Transportation Sustainability University Transportation Center.
15. Shin, H.-S., A. Farkas and A. Nickkar. (Year). *An Analysis of Attributes of Electric Vehicle Owners' Travel and Purchasing Behavior: The Case of Maryland*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Transportation and Development 2019, Alexandria, VA., doi:10.1061/9780784482582.008