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## Method

**The idea**

Cyclists as ‘experts by daily experience’ assess their cycling environment (hometown)

**The tool:**

Questionnaire (online and paper version) with 27 questions in five categories.
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Overall evaluation index
Bicycle and Traffic Climate

In our city....

1. cycling is fun.
2. cyclists are accepted by all traffic participants.
3. everybody cycles – it doesn’t matter, if old or young.
4. cycling gets propagated.
5. media reports write positively about cyclists.

---

cycling is stress.
cyclists are dismissed.
Only certain groups cycle (e.g. kids, racing cyclists)
no advertising for cycling happens.
media reports write about accidents and misbehaviour of cyclists only.
Rules

- Every cyclist can participate
- Implemented everywhere at the same time (about 3 month period)
- Information distributed by activists, cities, media, shops ....
- Minimum requirements for publication of results: 50 to 100 participants depending on city size
- 6-point scale: mean of 1 (left side) and 6 (right side) is calculated
- Ranking of results in four city size classes
Survey participation

Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>approx. 105,000</td>
<td>approx. 120,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approx. 105,000

Participating municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approx. 80,000
What do we measure?

Objektivity

Assessment of the bicycle system through „daily experts“ (pragmatic expertise and life experience)

Perception of cycling

Subjektivity

Opinion

Wishes and expectations

Customer satisfaction with cycling
## One survey – triple effect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public relation tool</th>
<th>Partizipation tool</th>
<th>Benchmarking and evaluation tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brings high media attention, allows to highlight good (and bad) examples</td>
<td>Activates citizens for (low level) involvement in city planning and policy</td>
<td>Allows monitoring and benchmarking of the cycling level as well as identification of strong and weak points of local cycling policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rule of thumb:
1000 participants: ca. ±0,05 grades
50 participants: ca. ±0,2 grades
<50 participants: not acceptable
Mean rating for different groups is very similar

- Gender: female 3.80, male 3.82
- ADFC membership: yes 3.89, no 3.80
- Frequency of bicycle use:
  - (almost) daily: 3.83
  - weekly: 3.76
  - monthly: 3.70
  - more rarely: 3.75
  - (almost) never: 3.81
- Age:
  - below 18: 3.46
  - 18 to 29: 3.69
  - 30 to 49: 3.90
  - 50 to 69: 3.82
  - over 70 years: 3.60

Basis: all 78,941 interviews from 2012
Outcome

• Print press: 975 articles; Online press: 1210 articles; TV/Radio: more than 169 reports → 100 million media contacts on the first day after announcement of the results

• Participating communes represent more than half of the German population:

  all 76 cities > 100,000 inhabitants

  98 out of 107 towns with 50,000 – 100,000 inhabitants.  

  364 towns and villages < 50,000 inhabitants

  42 Mio. inhabitants
## Winner cities 2016

### Category „Champion“ (Best overall score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City 1</th>
<th>City 2</th>
<th>City 3</th>
<th>City 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Münster</td>
<td>Göttingen</td>
<td>Bocholt</td>
<td>Reken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Karlsruhe</td>
<td>Hamm</td>
<td>Nordhorn</td>
<td>Wettringen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freiburg/Breisgau</td>
<td>Erlangen</td>
<td>Wesel</td>
<td>Heek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Category „Climber“ (best development)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>City 1</th>
<th>City 2</th>
<th>City 3</th>
<th>City 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bochum</td>
<td>Pforzheim</td>
<td>Marburg</td>
<td>Baunatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wuppertal</td>
<td>Regensburg</td>
<td>Iserlohn</td>
<td>Zirndorf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Augsburg</td>
<td>Offenbach am Main</td>
<td>Hanau</td>
<td>Gevelsberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inhabitants:
- >200.000 inhabitants
- 100.000-200.000 inhabitants
- 50.000-100.000 inhabitants
- <50.000 inhabitants
Awards ceremony at the German Federal Ministry of Transport
map view: www.fahrradklima-test.de

Size of the municipality
- bis 50.000 Einwohner
- 50.000 - 100.000 Einwohner
- 100.000 - 200.000 Einwohner
- mehr als 200.000 Einwohner

Rating of the municipality
- 1,00 - 1,99
- 2,00 - 2,49
- 2,50 - 2,99
- 3,00 - 3,49
- 3,50 - 3,99
- 4,00 - 4,49
- 4,50 - 4,99
- 5,00 - 6,00
- nicht bewertet
Individual records for 539 municipalities

Overview of the city
(example: BOCHOLT)

- Anzahl Teilnehmer: 611
- Gesamtbewertung: 2,3
- Rangplatz Bund in Stadtgrößenklasse: 1 von 98
- Rangplatz Land in Stadtgrößenklasse: 1 von 37
- Vergleich zu 2014

Stadtgrößenklasse: 50.000-100.000 EW

Strengths and weaknesses...

Compared to other cities
Compared from question to question
Mean rating for German municipalities

→ Calculated through mean rating of all cities which have participated in all surveys since 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- <100,000 inhabitants (22 cities/municipalities)
- 100,000-200,000 inh. (15 cities)
- >200,000 inhabitants (26 cities)
Cut...
Comparison of objective and subjective methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking* ADFC-Bicycle Climate Test 2005</th>
<th>„subjektiv“</th>
<th>„objektiv“</th>
<th>Ranking* ADAC-Test „Cycling in Cities“ 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Source: ADFC</td>
<td>Source: PGV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 2</td>
<td>Münster</td>
<td>Münster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 3</td>
<td>Kiel</td>
<td>Kiel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 4</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td>Hannover</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5</td>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td>Bremen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karlsruhe</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nürnberg</td>
<td>Dortmund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erfurt</td>
<td>Frankfurt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dortmund</td>
<td>Karlsruhe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td>Dresden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>Erfurt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Only cities with participation in both of the surveys
## Comparison of objective and subjective methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Subjective</strong></th>
<th><strong>Objective</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by means of ADFC- Bicycle Climate Test 2005 (user evaluation)</td>
<td>by means of ADAC-Test „Cycling in Cities“ 2004 (municipal statistics, testing procedures with a maximum of objective criteria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- cost efficient, high number of participants</td>
<td>- Data collection costly / expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Result may be exposed to short-term media influences and manipulation</td>
<td>- Hardly manipulable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Exact the same survey methodology in all cities</td>
<td>- Partially large fluctuations in the availability of data and survey methodology (comparability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Covers all fields of bicycle planning and policy flexible and complete</td>
<td>- “Objective” data is not collectable in all fields of bicycle planning and policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Result depends on the level of ambition/expectation of participants</td>
<td>- Stable time series possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Direct measurement at the target object (biking population)</td>
<td>- Indirect measurement using indicators, which describe the conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>