

Identification Of Factors Affect People's Desire To Ride Bicycles In The City Of Banjarbaru

Retno Amelia, Puguh Budi Prakoso

Master Student, Transportation Engineering and Management Program, Master Program of Civil Engineering, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, Indonesia

Lecturer, Master Program of Civil Engineering, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, Indonesia.

ABSTRACT

Bicycles are a symbol of sustainable transportation. At this time cycling began to be used as a means of transportation, this study aims to determine the factors that influence people's desire to cycle in Banjarbaru City. Based on references from several previous studies, 7 independent variables (x) were obtained, namely humans (x1), environment (x2), security (x3), comfort (x4), accessibility (x5), facilities (x6), and distance. (x7), and the dependent variable (Y) is the desire to cycle (Y1) and infrastructure (Y2). To get the variables that affect the desire to cycle, multiple linear regression data analysis was performed using the IBM SPSS 25 software. After identification, the regression equation model was obtained for $Y1 = 1.378 + 0.554 X4_4 + 0.550 X6_3 + 0.537 X1_5 + 0.423 X4_2 + 0.234 X5_3 + (-0.268) X1_4 + (-0.314) X2_6$ with a value of (R2) 0.744. For the regression equation model $Y2 = 1.945 + 0.689 X6_3 + (-0.676) X6_4$ with a value of (R2) 0.256. Then, it was analyzed again using binary logistic regression using the orthogonal SPSS design scenario. So that the utility equation is obtained $U = 1.049 + 0.5165 X1 - 0.1451 X2 - 0.132 X3 - 0.569 X4 - 0.5832 X5 - 0.532 X6 - 0.208 X7 - 0.242 X8$.

Key words: Sustainable transportation, bicycles, cycling desire factors

Date of Submission: 12-06-2022

Date of acceptance: 27-06-2022

I. INTRODUCTION

At this time, cycling activities are very popular among the people of Banjarbaru City, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic. The use of bicycles itself has many positive impacts for its users. From an environmental perspective, cycling reduces air pollution, reduces congestion due to the use of motorized vehicles, and decreases demand for motor fuel (BBM). In terms of health, it helps control and reduce weight, burn calories and body fat, increase metabolism and immunity. Cycling itself is an element of sustainable transportation. The sustainable transportation model has been widely applied in developed countries, therefore it is hoped that in Indonesia, especially the city of Banjarbaru, it is also expected to be implemented. Based on the sample population taken at random, it is expected to know the factors that influence the desire to cycle Banjarbaru people, as well as evaluate the needs of bicycle users.

II. REFERENCE LITERATURE

According to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) 1994, sustainable transportation is transportation that does not have an impact that endangers public health or ecosystems and can meet mobility needs consistently by paying attention to renewable resources. Cycling is considered an element of sustainable transportation. Bicycles are non-motorized transport (NMT). This study took a random sample of the population, then sampled using a Likert scale 1-5 to measure attitudes and opinions as well as perceptions Sugiono, 2007.

There are 2 regression analyzes carried out in this study, namely multiple linear regression analysis with the retrieval method using a Likert scale and binomial logistic regression analysis, namely a scale of 1 = No, 2 = Yes.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Data Processing

In this research case study, a sample of 100 people was taken for multiple linear regression analysis and 113 samples for logistic regression analysis. Sampling was taken randomly, knowing some of the characteristics of the respondents including gender, education, occupation, vehicle ownership, bicycle ownership, and frequency of bicycle use.

Data Analysis

The data analysis process is as follows:

1. Data analysis was carried out using multiple regression and logistic analysis;
2. The sample population is the people of Banjarbaru City, to get an estimate of the number of samples it is necessary to use the slovin formula:

$$n = \frac{N}{N(d)^2 + 1}$$

n = Sample sizes

N = Population

d = Precision(0,1)

So, obtained for this research sample required 100 samples;

1. Identification of research variables and indicators is carried out. The data collection technique is simple random sampling;
2. After data collection, multiple regression analysis was performed. After obtaining the regression model, it was continued by making an orthogonal design of the existing variables;
3. Then, the analysis continued with data collection using an orthogonal design questionnaire. Then, the data obtained were analyzed using logistic regression;
4. From the results of the logistic regression, the utility value of the variable is obtained, then continued by testing the probability with the formula:

$$P = \frac{\exp(\text{Utility})}{1 + \exp(\text{Utility})}$$

5. The analysis is then continued with the sensitivity test of the model to determine the effect of one variable affecting other variables.

IV. ANALYSIS RESULTS

From the analysis of the model obtained from the SPSS program using the stepwise method and multiple linear regression, the regression equation model is $Y1 = 1,378 + 0,554 X4_4 + 0,550 X6_3 + 0,537 X1_5 + 0,423 X4_2 + 0,234 X5_3 + (-0,268) X1_4 + (-0,314) X2_6$ with a value of (R2) 0.744. For the regression equation model $Y2 = 1.945 + 0.689 X6_3 + (-0.676) X6_4$ with a value of (R2) 0.256. To see the effect of the independent variable on the dependent variable, several tests were carried out.

Table. 1 Multicollinearity Test

| Variable | Tolerance > 0,10 | VIF < 10 | Result |
|----------|------------------|----------|------------|
| Y1 - X | 0,177 | 7,902 | Correlated |
| Y2 - X | 0,180 | 7,827 | Correlated |

Table. 2 Autocorelation Test

| Variable | Durbin-Watson | dL | dU | 4-dU | Result |
|----------|---------------|-------|------|-------|----------|
| Y1 - X | 1,688 | 1,571 | 1,78 | 2,22 | Received |
| Y2 - X | 1,74 | 1,55 | ,803 | 2,197 | Received |

Table. 3 Heteroscedasticity Test for Y1

| Variable | Sig. > 0,05 | Result |
|----------|-------------|--------|
| X1 | ,226 | ✓ |
| X2 | ,410 | ✓ |
| X3 | ,887 | ✓ |
| X4 | ,824 | ✓ |
| X5 | ,953 | ✓ |
| X6 | ,943 | ✓ |
| X7 | ,963 | ✓ |

Table.4 Heteroscedasticity Test for Y2

| Variable | Sig. > 0,05 | Result |
|----------|-------------|--------|
| X1 | ,308 | ✓ |
| X2 | ,597 | ✓ |
| X3 | ,351 | ✓ |
| X4 | ,528 | ✓ |
| X5 | ,246 | ✓ |
| X6 | ,175 | ✓ |
| X7 | ,449 | ✓ |

Table. 5 T-test

The formula to find the value of t table:

$$T \text{ table} = (a/2 ; n-k-1)$$

$$=(0,50/2 ; 100-7-1)$$

$$=0,25 ; 92$$

T table = 1,989 (Based on the percentage point distribution $T_{df=1-100}$).

The results of the interpretation of the t-test output for Y1 and y2 using the SPSS IBM 25.

| Variable | T | Count > T | Table Hypothesis | Sig. < 0,05 | Hypothesis |
|----------|-------|-----------|------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Y1-X1 | 2,684 | 1,989 | Received | ,009 | 0,05 Received |
| Y1-X2 | 0,769 | 1,989 | Rejected | ,444 | 0,05 Rejected |
| Y1-X3 | 2,530 | 1,989 | Received | ,013 | 0,05 Received |
| Y1-X4 | 3,445 | 1,989 | Received | ,001 | 0,05 Received |
| Y1-X5 | 3,438 | 1,989 | Received | ,001 | 0,05 Received |
| Y1-X6 | 2,231 | 1,989 | Received | ,028 | 0,05 Received |
| Y1-X7 | 3,574 | 1,989 | Received | ,001 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X1 | 3,165 | 1,989 | Received | ,002 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X2 | 1,806 | 1,989 | Rejected | ,074 | 0,05 Rejected |
| Y2-X3 | 3,927 | 1,989 | Received | ,000 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X4 | 4,735 | 1,989 | Received | ,000 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X5 | 3,503 | 1,989 | Received | ,001 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X6 | 2,550 | 1,989 | Received | ,012 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X7 | 1,277 | 1,989 | Rejected | ,205 | 0,05 Rejected |

Table. 6 F-test

| Variable | F | Count > F | Table Hypothesis | Sig. < 0,05 | Hypothesis |
|----------|--------|-----------|------------------|-------------|---------------|
| Y1-X1 | 7,206 | 2,11 | Received | ,009 | 0,05 Received |
| Y1-X2 | ,592 | 2,11 | Rejected | ,444 | 0,05 Rejected |
| Y1-X3 | 6,399 | 2,11 | Received | ,013 | 0,05 Received |
| Y1-X4 | 11,865 | 2,11 | Received | ,001 | 0,05 Received |
| Y1-X5 | 11,817 | 2,11 | Received | ,001 | 0,05 Received |
| Y1-X6 | 4,976 | 2,11 | Received | ,028 | 0,05 Received |
| Y1-X7 | 12,772 | 2,11 | Received | ,001 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X1 | 10,015 | 2,11 | Received | ,002 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X2 | 3,261 | 2,11 | Received | ,047 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X3 | 15,419 | 2,11 | Received | ,000 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X4 | 22,420 | 2,11 | Received | ,000 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X5 | 12,273 | 2,11 | Received | ,001 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X6 | 6,504 | 2,11 | Received | ,012 | 0,05 Received |
| Y2-X7 | 1,630 | 2,11 | Rejected | ,205 | 0,05 Rejected |

Table.7 Analysis of determination (Rsquare)

| Variable | R Square | % Variable | R Square | % |
|----------|----------|------------|----------|------|
| Y1-X1 | .068 | 6,8 | .093 | 9,3 |
| Y1-X2 | .006 | 0,6 | .032 | 3,2 |
| Y1-X3 | .061 | 6,1 | .136 | 13,6 |
| Y1-X4 | .115 | 11,5 | .186 | 18,6 |
| Y1-X5 | .108 | 10,8 | .111 | 11,1 |
| Y1-X6 | .108 | 10,8 | .062 | 6,2 |
| Y1-X7 | .048 | 4,8 | .016 | 1,6 |

Table. 8 Multiple linear regression analysis

Meanwhile, the regression equation in this analysis is:

$$Y = a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 + \dots + b_nx_n$$

Interpretation of the results of regression analysis using the SPSS program for Variable Y1 against X.

Coefficients

| | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | | | |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------|--------|-------|
| Model | B | Std. Error | Beta | T | Sig. |
| X1_4 | -0,268 | 0,094 | -0,286 | -2,846 | 0,006 |
| X1_5 | 0,537 | 0,101 | 0,691 | 5,310 | 0,000 |
| X2_6 | -0,314 | 0,117 | -0,327 | -2,681 | 0,010 |
| X4_2 | 0,423 | 0,187 | 0,372 | 2,266 | 0,027 |
| X4_4 | 0,544 | 0,246 | 0,477 | 2,208 | 0,031 |
| X5_3 | 0,234 | 0,108 | 0,278 | 2,163 | 0,035 |
| X6_3 | 0,550 | 0,239 | 0,576 | 2,304 | 0,025 |

Interpretation of the results of regression analysis using the SPSS program for Variable Y2 against X.

Coefficients

| | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | | | |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------|--------|-------|
| Model | B | Std. Error | Beta | T | Sig. |
| X6_3 | 0,689 | 0,241 | 0,595 | 2,857 | 0,005 |
| X6_4 | -0,676 | 0,251 | -0,535 | -2,692 | 0,009 |

So, we get several independent variables that affect the dependent variable as follows:

| VARIABLE ITEMS | DESCRIPTION | KOEFISIEN |
|------------------|---|-----------|
| Y1 (Constant) | The desire to cycle for daily activities | 1,378 |
| X1_4 | There are not many places I want to go by bicycle | -0,268 |
| X1_5 | I want to ride a bicycle during the day | 0,537 |
| X2_6 | I want to cycle if the route/road is smooth (no potholes) | -0,314 |
| X4_2 | I want to ride a bicycle if the condition of the bicycle is comfortable to ride | 0,423 |
| X4_4 | I want to ride a bicycle if it is free from verbal distractions | 0,554 |
| X5_3 | Cycling saves travel time | 0,234 |
| X6_3 | Safe and comfortable public bathrooms are available | 0,550 |
| Y2 (Constant) | Influence of infrastructure on Cycling desire | 1,945 |
| X6_3 | Safe and comfortable public bathrooms are available | 0,689 |
| X6_4 | There are special bicycle signs/boards available | -0,676 |

Then, the equation model is made as follows:

| Variable | Equation | R Square | Sig. |
|------------------------|--|----------|-------|
| Y1 (Desire) | $= 1,378 + 0,554(X4 - 4) + 0,550(X6 - 3) + 0,537(X1 - 5) + 0,423(X4 - 2) + 0,234(X5 - 3) + (-0,268)(X1 - 4) + (-0,314)(X2 - 6) = 74,4\%$ | 0,7440 | 0,000 |
| Y2 (Infrastructure) | $= 1,945 + 0,689(X6 - 3) + (-0,676)(X6 - 4)$ | 0,256 | 0,009 |
| | | =25,6% | |

From the Equation above, it can be seen that the variables that affect the desire to cycle are:

1. Verbal disturbance (Cat Calling)
2. Public bathroom facilities
3. The purpose of cycling
4. Bike trails
5. Rest area
6. Cycling distance
7. Bicycle storage
8. Cycling time

Table. 9 Orthogonal Design

| No. | Card Plans | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Time (X1) | Distance (X2) | Destination (X3) | Bike Lane (X4) | Storage facilities/ Bicycle parking (X5) | Rest Area Facilities (X6) | Bathroom Amenities (X7) | Verbal disturbance (X8) |
| 1 | Night | >5km | Sports/Recreation | Isn't | Is | Isn't | Isn't | Isn't |
| 2 | Night | >5km | All Activities | Is | Isn't | Isn't | Is | Isn't |
| 3 | Night | <5km | Sports/Recreation | Is | Isn't | Is | Is | Isn't |
| 4 | Day | >5km | Sports/Recreation | Is | Is | Is | Is | Is |
| 5 | Day | <5km | Sports/Recreation | Is | Isn't | Isn't | Isn't | Is |
| 6 | Night | <5km | All Activities | Is | Is | Isn't | Isn't | Is |
| 7 | Day | >5km | All Activities | Isn't | Isn't | Isn't | Is | Is |
| 8 | Night | >5km | Sports/Recreation | Isn't | Isn't | Is | Isn't | Is |
| 9 | Night | <5km | All Activities | Isn't | Is | Is | Is | Is |
| 10 | Day | <5km | All Activities | Isn't | Isn't | Is | Isn't | Isn't |
| 11 | Day | >5km | All Activities | Is | Is | Is | Isn't | Isn't |
| 12 | Day | <5km | Sports/Recreation | Isn't | Is | Isn't | Is | Isn't |

The orthogonal design table is created using the SPSS tool by using existing variables. The orthogonal design is a special experimental design which is a factorial design. Orthogonal means the effect of each factor is mathematically estimated independently of the effects of other factors. In this study, the data taken is data on the desire for cycling of the Banjarbaru community, which if given such a scenario, the respondent chooses yes or no. Because there are 2 choices, namely yes and no, the analysis used is binomial/binary logistic regression. The following is the output of the orthogonal SPSS design:

Table. 10The results of respondents answers for orthogonal designs

| No. | X1 | X2 | X3 | X4 | X5 | X6 | X7 | X8 | Y1 | Y2 | Total |
|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|------------|
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 26 | 87 | 113 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 41 | 72 | 113 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 67 | 46 | 113 |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 73 | 40 | 113 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 57 | 56 | 113 |
| 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 41 | 72 | 113 |
| 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 57 | 56 | 113 |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 32 | 81 | 113 |
| 9 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 35 | 78 | 113 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 68 | 44 | 113 |
| 11 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 43 | 70 | 113 |
| 12 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 20 | 93 | 113 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | 5607951355 |

Table. 11Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

| Step | Chi Square | df | Sig. |
|------|------------|----|-------|
| 1 | .000 | 7 | 1.000 |

Table. 12Omnibus test

| Step | Chi-Square | df | Sig. |
|--------|------------|----|-------|
| Step 1 | | | |
| Step | 16.301 | 8 | 0.038 |
| Block | 16.301 | 8 | 0.038 |
| Model | 16.301 | 8 | 0.038 |

Table. 13Parcialtest

| | | 95% C.I. for EXP(B) | | | | |
|--------|----------|---------------------|---------|---------|--------|--------------------|
| | B | S.E. | Wald | df | Sig. | Exp(B) Lower Upper |
| Step 1 | Constant | 1.049 | 0,494 | 4,5128 | 10,038 | 2,8565 |
| | X1 | 0,5165 | 0,1151 | 20,1175 | 10,038 | 1,67611,3375 2,100 |
| | X2 | 0,1451 | 0,115 | 1,59047 | 10,038 | 1,15610,92271,4486 |
| | X3 | -0,132 | 0,1159 | 1,2982 | 10,038 | 0,8760,69821,0997 |
| | X4 | -0,569 | 0,11579 | 24,1505 | 10,038 | 0,5660,45110,7102 |
| | X5 | 0,5832 | 0,1158 | 25,365 | 10,038 | 1,7921,42792,2482 |
| | X6 | -0,5318 | 0,11587 | 21,0658 | 10,038 | 0,58750,46810,7373 |
| | X7 | -0,2084 | 0,11516 | 3,2764 | 10,038 | 0,81180,64781,0174 |
| | X8 | -0,2424 | 0,1157 | 4,3869 | 10,038 | 0,78460,62530,9845 |

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: X1, X2, X3, X4, X5, X6, X7, X8.

Logistics Regression Modeling

Regression modeling was carried out with the help of IBM SPSS 25 software. In order to obtain the following regression equation.

$$U = (a + bx_1 + bx_2 + bx_3 + \dots + bx_n)$$

Wherever,

U =Utility

a =Constanta

b =Coeffisien

x = Variable independent

$$U = 1,049 + 0,5165X_1 + 0,1451X_2 - 0,132X_3 - 0,569X_4 + 0,5832X_5 - 0,532X_6 - 0,208X_7 - 0,242X_8$$

Based on the respondents' assessment, the following results were obtained:

| Percentage | | | | |
|------------|-------------|-----|----|-------|
| NO. | Scenario | Yes | No | Total |
| 1 | Scenario 1 | 87 | 26 | 113 |
| 2 | Scenario 2 | 72 | 41 | 113 |
| 3 | Scenario 3 | 46 | 67 | 113 |
| 4 | Scenario 4 | 40 | 73 | 113 |
| 5 | Scenario 5 | 56 | 57 | 113 |
| 6 | Scenario 6 | 72 | 41 | 113 |
| 7 | Scenario 7 | 56 | 57 | 113 |
| 8 | Scenario 8 | 81 | 32 | 113 |
| 9 | Scenario 9 | 78 | 35 | 113 |
| 10 | Scenario 10 | 44 | 68 | 113 |
| 11 | Scenario 11 | 70 | 43 | 113 |
| 12 | Scenario 12 | 93 | 20 | 113 |

So, the calculation of utility with Equation is obtained:

$$U = 1,049 + 0,5165X_1 + 0,1451X_2 - 0,132X_3 - 0,569X_4 + 0,5832X_5 - 0,532X_6 - 0,208X_7 - 0,242X_8$$

List of utility values for each Scenario, as follows:

| Intercept | 1,049599 | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|---------|---------|
| Coefficient | 0,5165 | 0,1451 | 0,1320 | -0,569 | 0,5832 | 0,531 | -0,208 | -0,2424 | |
| No. | X1 | X2 | X3 | X4 | X5 | X6 | X7 | X8 | UI |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1,8553 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0,3626 |
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | -0,1822 |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | -0,2128 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | -0,2009 |
| 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0,7667 |
| 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0,1726 |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0,4979 |
| 9 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0,5954 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | -0,0532 |
| 11 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0,1059 |
| 12 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0,9853 |

After obtaining the utility value, then we can count the probability value. With Equation as follows:

$$P = \frac{\exp(Utility)}{1 + \exp(Utility)}$$

Table. 14 Probability for P1 and P2

| Intercept | 1,0496 | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| Coefficient | 0,5165 | 0,145 | -0,13 | -0,57 | 0,58 | 0,53 | -0,21 | -0,24 | | | |
| No. | X1 | X2 | X3 | X4 | X5 | X6 | X7 | X8 | UI | P1 | P2 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1,8554 | 0,865 | 0,135 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0,3626 | 0,59 | 0,41 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--------|-------|-------|
| 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | -0,182 | 0,455 | 0,545 |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | -0,213 | 0,447 | 0,553 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | -0,201 | 0,45 | 0,55 |
| 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0,7667 | 0,683 | 0,317 |
| 7 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0,1727 | 0,543 | 0,457 |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0,4979 | 0,622 | 0,378 |
| 9 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0,5955 | 0,645 | 0,355 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | -0,053 | 0,487 | 0,513 |
| 11 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0,106 | 0,526 | 0,474 |
| 12 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0,9853 | 0,728 | 0,272 |

In column P1 there is a probability of choosing yes. In scenario 1, a probability of 0.865 is obtained, meaning that scenario 1 has a chance to occur with a percentage of 86.5% which also applies to the next scenario.

Table. 15 Model Sensitivity

a. Sensitivity of probability of wanting to cycle with utility included Trip time (Day with short distance < 5km)

| No. | X1 | X2 | X3 | X4 | X5 | X6 | X7 | X8 | U | P1 | P2 |
|-----|-----|-------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|-------|-------|
| 1 | Day | Near (<5km) | Sports/ Recreation | Is | Isn't | Isn't | Isn't | Is | -0.20094 | 45.0% | 55.0% |
| 2 | Day | Near (<5km) | Sports/ Recreation | Isn't | Is | Isn't | Is | Isn't | 0.985321 | 72.8% | 27.2% |
| 3 | Day | Near (<5km) | All Activities | Isn't | Isn't | Is | Isn't | Isn't | -0.05328 | 48.7% | 51.3% |

By attention to the time of day trips (X1) with a travel distance of Near > 5km (X2) in the desire to use a bicycle, it can be explained that the probability of respondents wanting to use a bicycle on a day with a short distance for Sports/Recreation is 72.8%.

b. Sensitivity of probability of wanting to cycle with utility including Travel time (Day with distance Far > 5km)

| No. | X1 | X2 | X3 | X4 | X5 | X6 | X7 | X8 | U | P1 | P2 |
|-----|-----|------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------------|-------|-------|
| 1 | Day | Far (>5km) | All Activities | Is | Is | Is | Isn't | Isn't | 0.105989 | 52.6% | 47.4% |
| 2 | Day | Far (>5km) | Sports/ Recreation | Is | Is | Is | Is | Is | -0.2128944 | 74.7% | 55.3% |
| 3 | Day | Far (>5km) | All Activities | Isn't | Isn't | Isn't | Is | Is | 0.1727 | 54.3% | 45.7% |

By paying attention to the travel time at night (X1) with a travel distance of Far >5km (X2) in the desire to use a bicycle, it can be explained that the probability of respondents wanting to use a bicycle at night with a distance of >5km for sports/recreation is 86.5%.

c. Sensitivity of the probability of wanting to cycle with the utility including Travel time (Night with distance Far > 5km)

| No. | X1 | X2 | X3 | X4 | X5 | X6 | X7 | X8 | U | P1 | P2 |
|-----|-------|------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|-------|
| 1 | Night | Far (>5km) | Sports/ Recreation | Isn't | Is | Isn't | Isn't | Isn't | 1.8553 | 86.5% | 13.5% |
| 2 | Night | Far (>5km) | All Activities | Is | Isn't | Isn't | Is | Isn't | 0.3626 | 59.0% | 41.0% |
| 3 | Night | Far (>5km) | Sports/ Recreation | Isn't | Isn't | Is | Isn't | Is | 0.4979 | 62.2% | 37.8% |

By attention to the Night travel time (X1) with a travel distance of Far >5km (X2) in the desire to use a bicycle, it can be explained that the probability of respondents wanting to use a bicycle at night with a distance of >5km for sports/recreation is 86.5%

d. Sensitivity of probability of wanting to cycle with utility including Travel time (Night with Near distance < 5km)

| No. | X1 | X2 | X3 | X4 | X5 | X6 | X7 | X8 | U | P1 | P2 |
|-----|-------|-------------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|
| 1 | Night | Near (<5km) | AllActivities | Isn't | Is | Is | Is | Is | 0.5954 | 64.5% | 35.5% |
| 2 | Night | Near (<5km) | Sports/ Recreation | Is | Isn't | Is | Is | Isn't | -0.1822 | 45.5% | 54.5% |
| 3 | Night | Near (<5km) | AllActivities | Is | Is | Isn't | Isn't | Is | 0.7667 | 68.3% | 31.7% |

By paying attention to the pIs Night travel time (X1) with a travel distance of Near <5km (X2) in the desire to use a bicycle, it can be explained that the probability of respondents wanting to use a bicycle at night with a distance of <5km for All activities is 68.3%.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the research conducted, the following conclusions are obtained:

1. Characteristics that affect the desire to cycle if there are not many places to go, it is obtained from the results of regression analysis with a coefficient value of 0.268. Ispun the factors that have a big influence on the desire to ride a bicycle. Variables are comfort, facilities, people, and accessibility. The comfort factor is a factor that influences the desire to cycle with the largest coefficient value of 0.554.
2. Based on the research, the condition of the city of Banjarbaru is quite suitable for bicycle users, it can be seen from the number of bicycle users and the number of bicycle ownership of the respondents.
3. The handling solution is further improved both in terms of facilities, such as better roads/routes, available green open spaces, rest areas, bathrooms. In terms of security, it may be further improved, such as installing CCTV in vulnerable areas, dividing the bicycle lane and the main road, handling cat calling, and so on.

VI. SUGGESTION

In connection with these conclusions, the suggestions that can be put forward in this study are as follows:

1. In terms of security, to increase the desire for cycling, it is better to install CCTV at vulnerable points so that bicycle users feel safe. In terms of facilities, such as bicycle lanes, there must be improvement, as well as the need to integrate the use of bicycles with public facilities.
2. The need for a policy on the use of bicycles.
3. For further research, it is recommended to take questionnaire data directly or interview so that the data obtained is more reliable/reliable.
4. This research can be the basis for further research.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Ebtarizqi, Aldinosa.2019. Analysis of the Interest Factors of Drivers and Passengers on the Use of Type A Peat Barakat Passenger Terminal. Faculty of Engineering. LambungMangkurat University.
- [2]. Ekamarta, Rimamunanda.2018. Analysis of Factors Influencing the Selection of Transportation Modes for Students at the University of Lampung. Faculty of Engineering. Lampung University. Lampung city.
- [3]. Federal Highway Administration, (FHWA). 1992. Cycling and walking are not widely used as modes of travel.
- [4]. Hadi, Sutrisno. 2004. Regression Analysis. Yogyakarta: CV Andi Offset.
- [5]. Hair, JF. Et al.1998. Multivariate Anaysis Fifth Edition, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International.
- [6]. Indrawan Isa, et al. 2020. Factors of Student Reluctance to Cycling in Yogyakarta.
- [7]. Sumabrata Jachrizal. 2019. Analysis of Student Perception on Infrastructure and willingness to cycle at Universitas Indonesia Campus. Depok.
- [8]. Jurike Ireynne, Toar. 2015. Analysis of the Choice of Transportation Modes for Manado City - Gorontalo City Using the Binomial Model - Difference Logistics.
- [9]. Made Yuliana, I. 2016. Multiple Linear Regression. Faculty of Math and Science. Udayana University. Bali
- [10]. Nazir, 2003. Research Methods Edition 5, Jakarta. Publisher : Ghahlia Jakarta
- [11]. Nirmala Arum Janie, Dyah. 2012. Descriptive Statistics & Multiple Linear Regression with SPSS. Semarang University. Semarang
- [12]. Sumabrata, Jachrizal. 2015. Analysis of Student Perception On Infrastructure and Willingness to Cycle a University of Indonesia Campus, Depok. Jakarta
- [13]. Tyas, Iswara. 2013. Identification of Factors Affecting Cycling and Priority of Cycling Facilities as Considerations for the Proposed Strategy for Development of Cycling Facilities in the City of Surakarta. Surakarta
- [14]. Winters, et al. 2011. Supporting and Inhibiting Factors for Cycling as seen from the Comparison of the Effects of PIs on Driving Decisions