

Titre: Avoiding public transport? Assessing the relationship between accessibility, income and commuting mode in Recife, Brazil 40
Title:

Auteurs: Geneviève Boisjoly, Ahmed El-Geneidy, & Bernardo Serra
Authors:

Date: 2021

Type: Chapitre de livre / Book Section

Référence: Boisjoly, G., El-Geneidy, A., & Serra, B. (2021). Avoiding public transport? Assessing the relationship between accessibility, income and commuting mode in Recife, Brazil 40. In Mladenović, M. N., Toivonen, T., Willberg, E., & Geurs, K. T. (eds.), Transport in human scale cities (pp. 40-52).
Citation: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800370517.00013>

Document en libre accès dans PolyPublie

URL de PolyPublie: <https://publications.polymtl.ca/48802/>
PolyPublie URL:

Version: Version officielle de l'éditeur / Published version
Révisé par les pairs / Refereed

Conditions d'utilisation: CC BY-NC-ND
Terms of Use:

Document publié chez l'éditeur officiel

Titre du livre: Transport in human scale cities
Book Title:

Maison d'édition: Edward Elgar Publishing
Publisher:

URL officiel: <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781800370517.00013>
Official URL:

Mention légale: Open access : <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>
Legal notice:

4. Avoiding public transport? Assessing the relationship between accessibility, income and commuting mode in Recife, Brazil

Geneviève Boisjoly, Ahmed El-Geneidy and Bernardo Serra

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Accessibility, the ease of reaching destinations (Handy and Niemeier, 1997), plays a significant role in developing human scale cities. Planning for increased access to destinations, rather than higher travel speeds only, implies bringing origins and destinations closer to one another and supporting higher speeds and convenience for a variety of transport modes. In doing so, dense, mixed-use liveable neighbourhoods are prioritized, enabling all individuals to have access to a variety of destinations by active and public transport.

Accessibility is increasingly being used as a measure of land use and transport performance (Boisjoly and El-Geneidy, 2017; Handy, 2005; World Bank, 2016; van Wee and Geurs, 2016). From a travel behaviour perspective, previous research has shown a positive association between accessibility by public transport to jobs and commuting by public transport mode share in several cities in the Global North (Legrain et al., 2015; Moniruzzaman and Páez, 2012; Owen and Levinson, 2015), especially among low-income households who often rely on public transport (Lucas, 2012; Stanley and Lucas, 2008). In contrast, a low level of accessibility by public transport can result in forced car ownership, which is a major financial burden for low-income families (Curl et al., 2018; Mattioli, 2017).

While this reality is well documented in the Global North, cities in the Global South did not receive much attention with respect to the relationship between accessibility, travel behaviour and social equity. Looking specifically at Latin America, recent research has highlighted the socio-spatial segregation patterns that characterize many large metropolitan regions (Blanco et

al., 2018; Keeling, 2008). There exist significant mobility disparities across income groups, as low-income individuals often depend on public and active transport modes for their everyday mobility needs, although they are facing disadvantageous conditions in terms of access to destinations by public and active transport modes (Bocarejo and Oviedo, 2012; Delmelle and Casas, 2012; Hernandez, 2018; Hernandez and Rossel, 2015; Jaramillo et al., 2012). This can result in longer travel times, suppressed trips and/or limited access to opportunities (Falavigna and Hernandez, 2016; Martínez et al., 2018; Ureta, 2008; Vasconcellos, 2018).

Recent research has more specifically focused on accessibility and equity in Brazil. For example, using accessibility measures, researchers have demonstrated how various policies, namely school agglomeration policies in São Paulo and the development of transport infrastructure for mega-events in Rio de Janeiro, have contributed to exacerbating existing inequalities (Moreno-Monroy et al., 2018; Pereira, 2018). The relationship between accessibility to employment and informal employment in São Paulo has also been explored, demonstrating the importance of supporting accessibility by public transport for low-income individuals (Boisjoly et al., 2017). In a qualitative study in Recife, Maia et al. (2016) emphasized the importance of local land use mix and transport interventions for meeting the needs of low-income individuals.

The current chapter complements these studies by taking a travel behaviour perspective. Given the important social disparities and spatial segregation characterizing many of these cities, understanding this relationship across income groups is particularly important. The aim of this research, therefore, is to assess the relationship between accessibility by public transport, mode choice and income in Recife, Brazil. This study is amongst the first to combine accessibility data with individual-level origin–destination (OD) survey data to shed light on the relationship between income, accessibility and travel behaviour in the Global South. In doing so, the study provides quantitative evidence to support researchers, planners and policy-makers in developing equitable land use and transport systems, while highlighting the need for more context-specific research on accessibility and travel behaviour in the Global South.

4.2 METHODS

The Recife metropolitan region, in the Northeast Region of Brazil, comprises 14 municipalities, with a total population of around 3.7 million inhabitants in 2011 (Prefeitura da cidade do Recife, 2016). The public transport system consists of a metro and light rail system, complemented by a bus network.

The main data source used for this study is the Recife 2016 OD survey (Prefeitura da cidade do Recife, 2016). The survey contains 58 644 valid observations, at the individual level, and includes socio-demographic individual and household characteristics such as income, home and work location, and gender as well as questions related to work and study trips. Around 2.5 per cent of the population is surveyed through a sampling technique ensuring a representative spatial distribution of the sample. For the purpose of this study, only respondents that commuted to work, from home, were selected. For example, students, children and unemployed individuals were suppressed from the sample. After removing missing data, a total of 15 862 respondents were included in this study. Based on the home and work locations of the OD survey, two additional variables were calculated: distance from home to central business district (CBD) and commuting network distance. Note that commuting trips shorter than 100 m and longer than 50 km were excluded. The survey data was then combined with the 2010 census data and the neighbourhood average income was attributed based on the home location.

Three types of accessibility measures were included in this study: local accessibility to amenities (walking); accessibility to jobs, from home, by public transport; and accessibility to workers by public transport at place of work. The Walk Score measures, collected through the Walk Score application programming interface (API), were used to quantify local accessibility. Walk Score gives a score between 1 and 100 based on a variety of characteristics, namely street design and the number of amenities in the vicinity (Walk Score, 2016). Accessibility to jobs, by public transport, was calculated as the number of jobs or workers within a given travel time (that is, cumulative opportunities). Travel times were obtained from the Google Distance Matrix API for morning peak travel times (Google Maps, n.d.). Based on the OD survey, a travel time threshold of 45 minutes was selected, and departure time was set at 7 a.m.

Jobs and workers data were derived from the OD survey. To do so, we hypothesized that a respondent's commute trip destination corresponded to one job, while their home location represented one worker. Job locations were also obtained from the Ministry of Labour and gave consistent results in terms of accessibility to jobs. To be consistent with the measures of accessibility to workers, we decided to use the job locations from the OD in this study. The number of jobs and workers accessible were then divided by the total number of jobs and workers, respectively, to obtain a share of jobs and workers. The accessibility values thereby range from 0 to 1.

Since the aim of this study is to assess the determinants of mode choice across income groups, three multinomial logistic regressions were conducted, one for each income group specified in this study. The dependent variable was the mode used to commute to work. A series of independent variables were selected based on the literature and tested in a stepwise manner, including local

and regional accessibility variables, trip characteristics and socio-economic characteristics. The summary statistics of the variables included in the final model are presented in Table 4.1.

For ease of interpretation and presentation, all income groups above two times the minimum wage were grouped in the high-income group. Accessibility to workers, to jobs, Walk Score, distance from home to CBD and commute distance were integrated in the model in a stepwise manner. We decided not to include accessibility to jobs, by public transport, in the final model since it appeared to be positively and significantly associated with the likelihood of commuting by car in the medium-income model. This result is inconsistent with the literature and is probably due to the fact that the variable captures some socio-spatial patterns that are not controlled for in the model. It was accordingly removed from the model. It is important to mention that the three models remained stable when removing the variable. Given the large income variations within income groups, the neighbourhood average income was included in the models to further control for poverty levels. Number of children, having a mobile with Internet access, having a mobility impairment, gender and age group (as defined in the survey) were also included in the model. Finally, a variable indicating whether the individual commuted fewer than five days a week is included to capture part-time employment or requirement to go to the place of work. The correlation between the variables were tested and variation inflation factors below two were found in all three models.

4.3 RESULTS

4.3.1 Discrepancies in Mode Share and Accessibility Levels across Income Groups

The mode share across income groups is presented in Figure 4.1 (top). As expected, public transport use is generally higher across individuals from low- and medium-income households, while car use is predominant among high-income individuals. This is consistent with the literature that suggests the low-income individuals are more likely to rely on public transport for commuting. Walking and cycling mode share is relatively low in all three income groups, with the lowest proportion among high-income individuals.

Figure 4.1 (bottom) presents the level of accessibility, by public transport, to jobs (from home) and to workers (from place of work) for the three income groups. Accessibility to workers within each income group exhibits lower variations compared to accessibility to jobs. This is likely due to the dispersion of workers across the territory, whereas jobs are more concentrated spatially, namely in the central areas of the metropolitan region. Accordingly, workers

Table 4.1 *Summary statistics of the variables included in the final model (15 862 observations)*

	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Accessibility to workers at workplace	0.30	0.12	0	0.45
Accessibility to jobs ^b	0.34	0.24	0	0.75
Walk Score	82.36	16.16	1	100
Distance to CBD	7.84	4.18	0.59	34.39
Commute distance	6.62	4.89	0.10	50.00
Neighbourhood median income	1 228 122	1 171 066	640	6 612 581
Number of children	0.65	0.98	0	8
Proportion of users (categorical variables)				
Mobility impairment		0.01		
Access to Internet on cellphone		0.89		
Commuting fewer than 5 days		0.17		
Gender (woman = 1)		0.51		
<i>Age category</i>				
16 to 24 years		0.08		
25 to 39 years		0.47		
40 to 59 years		0.41		
60 + years		0.04		
<i>Income</i>				
Below 1 MW ^a (low)		0.12		
1 to 2 MW ^a (medium)		0.33		
2 to 3 MW ^a (high)		0.15		
3 to 5 MW ^a (high)		0.13		
5 to 10 MW ^a (high)		0.15		
More than 10 MW ^a (high)		0.13		
<i>Commuting mode</i>				
Motorized modes (car and motorcycle)		0.52		
Public transport		0.42		
Walking and cycling		0.06		

Notes: ^a MW: minimum wage; ^b As noted in the methodology, this variable is not included in the final model.




Figure 4.1 Mode share and accessibility to jobs (from home) and to workers (from place of work) by public transport in Recife, Brazil for low-, medium- and high-income individuals

residing in peripheral areas have very low accessibility to jobs, and those residing in central areas have a much higher accessibility to jobs.

Comparing the levels of accessibility to jobs, it is typically higher for high-income individuals. Furthermore, the 25th percentile, the median and the 75th percentile are higher than for the other income groups, suggesting that a lower proportion of high-income individuals experience very low levels of accessibility. In contrast, several low- and medium-income individuals experience relatively low levels of accessibility to jobs. Note that low-income individuals are characterized by a higher accessibility to jobs than medium-income individuals, which potentially results from land use policies that were implemented in the 1980s to allow low-income individuals to remain in central locations (Maia, 1995). In terms of accessibility to workers at the place of work, the differences are less pronounced. The level of accessibility is comparable across income groups, suggesting lower discrepancies in workplace locations of different income groups, whereas residential segregation appears to be more pronounced.

In a nutshell, it is difficult to conclude that the higher public transport usage among low- and medium-income individuals is associated with a greater accessibility to jobs and to workers. In fact, although close to 50 per cent (47 per cent for accessibility to jobs and 51 per cent for accessibility to workers) of the low-income workers have accessibility levels below the regional median (33 per cent and 32 per cent, respectively), 79 per cent commute to work by public transport. For medium-income households, this proportion is 71 per cent.

4.3.2 Determinants of Mode Choice across Income Groups

Three multinomial regressions were conducted, one for each of the income groups specified in this study. The results are presented in Table 4.2. The reference category is public transport. The top part of the table presents the odds ratio for driving while the bottom part presents the odds ratio for walking or cycling. In other words, the top part refers to the likelihood of commuting by car as compared to public transport, and the bottom part refers to the likelihood of commuting by walking or cycling as compared to public transport.

We now concentrate on the results associated with the likelihood of commuting by car. Looking first at the low-income workers, we observe that the variables related to the characteristics of the land use and transport systems (accessibility to workers, Walk Score and distance to the CBD) are not significant. In contrast, variables that can be related to socio-economic conditions appear to be strong determinants of mode choice: higher neighbourhood average income and having a mobile phone with Internet access are strongly associated with a higher likelihood of commuting by car. Furthermore, gender is statistically significant and consistent with the literature: being a woman is strongly associated with a lower likelihood of commuting by car. Overall, the

Table 4.2 *Multinomial regression results for the commuting mode choice (bold coefficients are significant at the 95 per cent confidence level)*

	Low income		Medium income		High income	
	OR	P>z	OR	P>z	OR	P>z
<u>Driving (ref: public transport)</u>						
Access. to workers at workplace	0.43	0.208	0.19	0.000	0.86	0.567
Walk Score	1.01	0.296	1.00	0.323	1.00	0.801
Distance to CBD	1.02	0.422	0.99	0.396	0.99	0.276
Commute distance	0.96	0.042	0.98	0.059	0.98	0.007
Neighbourhood median income	1.63	0.000	1.51	0.000	1.61	0.000
Mobility impairment	1.81	0.263	0.86	0.617	0.75	0.294
Access to Internet on cellphone	2.40	0.001	1.90	0.000	2.75	0.000
Number of children	0.94	0.524	1.14	0.000	1.26	0.000
Commuting fewer than 5 days	1.32	0.129	1.56	0.000	1.76	0.000
Gender	0.49	0.000	0.34	0.000	0.98	0.742
<i>Age (ref: 25 to 39 years)</i>						
16 to 24 years	0.75	0.154	0.79	0.058	0.46	0.000
40 to 59 years	0.90	0.597	0.64	0.000	0.75	0.000
60 + years	0.47	0.344	0.86	0.531	0.86	0.342
<i>Income (ref: 2 to 3 MW)</i>						
3 to 5 MW					3.23	0.000
5 to 10 MW					8.28	0.000
More than 10 MW					24.39	0.000
Constant	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000	0.00	0.000
<u>Walking or cycling (ref: public transport)</u>						
Access to workers at workplace	0.00	0.000	0.01	0.000	0.09	0.004
Walk Score	1.00	0.804	1.02	0.000	1.01	0.093
Distance to CBD	0.84	0.000	1.01	0.681	0.92	0.030
Commute distance	0.70	0.000	0.57	0.000	0.40	0.000
Neighbourhood median income	1.04	0.638	1.06	0.497	1.39	0.001
Mobility impairment	1.05	0.935	0.44	0.279	0.33	0.158
Access to Internet on cellphone	0.74	0.143	1.02	0.898	0.89	0.646

	Low income		Medium income		High income	
	OR	P>z	OR	P>z	OR	P>z
Number of children	1.23	0.013	1.29	0.000	1.20	0.009
Commuting fewer than 5 days	0.39	0.001	0.75	0.167	1.15	0.537
Gender	0.76	0.112	0.33	0.000	0.49	0.000
<i>Age (ref: 25 to 39 years)</i>						
16 to 24 years	1.14	0.559	1.16	0.452	0.33	0.008
40 to 59 years	1.22	0.334	0.84	0.232	0.76	0.056
60 + years	1.13	0.920	0.94	0.875	0.44	0.019
<i>Income (ref: 2 to 3 MW)</i>						
3 to 5 MW					1.41	0.050
5 to 10 MW					2.33	0.000
More than 10 MW					4.09	0.000
Constant	9.02	0.109	0.53	0.575	0.05	0.022
Log-likelihood	-1043		-3319		-3973	
Number of observations	1875		5181		8806	

results demonstrate that for low-income individuals, characteristics associated with poverty and gender are the major determinants of mode choice.

In contrast, for the medium-income individuals, we find that higher accessibility by public transport at place of work is highly significant and associated with a lower likelihood of commuting by car compared to public transport. This suggests that having a workplace which is well connected by public transport potentially influences medium-income individuals' commute decisions. Poverty-related variables (neighbourhood average income and access to Internet on mobile) and gender are strongly significant, as is the case for the low-income individuals. In addition, the number of children is positively associated with the likelihood of commuting by car, which is consistent with the literature. Part-time commuting is also positive and significant. Note that these two variables were not significant in the low-income model.

Finally, the magnitude and significance of the variables in the high-income model are similar overall to the ones in the medium-income model. There are, however, two notable differences. First, accessibility to workers is not significant (this was also the case in the low-income model). Second, the gender variable is not significant. Finally, it is important to highlight that a higher income is strongly associated with a higher likelihood of commuting by car, confirming that the economic situation plays an important role in mode choice.

Other results are worth mentioning for the three models. The commuting distance is significant (although marginally in some models), with a higher distance reducing the likelihood of commuting by car. Since it is probable that this variable captures socio-spatial patterns, rather than an actual explanatory factor of decision-making, these results suggest that further data (namely, more detailed income and transport and land use data) should be collected to gain a better understanding of this relationship.

We now turn to the walking and cycling results of the three regression models. For low-income individuals, the likelihood of commuting by walking or cycling is largely explained by variables reflecting local commutes, namely lower commute distances and lower accessibility to workers at the place of work (which is likely to reflect a place of work that is not centrally located). The number of children is also associated with a higher likelihood of walking or cycling, which might be associated with additional constraints that refrain workers from commuting outside the neighbourhood. In contrast, Walk Score does not appear to be statistically significant, while a higher distance from CBD decreases the likelihood of cycling or walking. This is also the case in the high-income model. Again, it is unclear whether distance from CBD accounts for socio-spatial patterns that are not currently considered in the models.

With respect to the medium- and high-income individuals, the likelihood to walk or cycle is also explained by variables that can be associated with local commutes (accessibility to workers, commute distance and number of children). Gender is also a significant determinant: women are less likely to walk and cycle (as compared to using public transport) than men. The Walk Score is also a significant determinant of mode choice for the medium-income model, with a higher Walk Score being associated with a higher likelihood of walking or cycling. Interestingly, for high-income individuals, a higher household income is associated with a higher likelihood of walking or cycling, while a higher neighbourhood average income is associated with a decreased likelihood. It is important, however, to note the low number of walking and cycling trips among high-income individuals, which may affect the results obtained here.

4.4 CONCLUSION

Combining OD survey data with local and regional accessibility measures, this chapter has investigated the relationship between accessibility, mode choice and income in Recife, Brazil. The results highlight that commuting mode choice is not closely tied to accessibility, contrary to what is observed in several cities in the Global North. While high-income groups tend to have higher accessibility by public transport at their place of home, they largely commute by car. Conversely, low- and medium-income individuals mainly

commute by public transport, although their level of accessibility is not significantly higher.

The multinomial regression models demonstrate that income and poverty-related variables are amongst the main determinants of mode choice, as found in previous studies. Yet, contrary to the literature, land use and transport variables – namely accessibility to workers by public transport and Walk Score – are found to be non-significant for both the low-income and high-income individuals. On the one hand, the results suggest that low-income individuals depend on public transport, regardless of their accessibility conditions. On the other hand, it appears that high-income individuals decide not to use public transport, for reasons other than the lack of accessibility. A recent study conducted in Recife demonstrated that public safety is the main motivation behind car use (dos Santos, 2017). It is also important to mention that gender is an important predictor of mode choice, women being generally more likely to use public transport. This is an important equity concern that should be considered in future research.

These findings have several implications. From a modal shift perspective, providing higher accessibility at place of work for medium-income individuals has the potential to support higher public transport use. Conversely, providing higher accessibility to high-income individuals does not appear to be an effective approach to support higher public transport usage. Other factors, namely safety and comfort, should be explored, as pointed out in previous studies (dos Santos, 2017; Jaramillo et al., 2012). This is also true for other income groups. From an equity perspective, while improvements in accessibility are not likely to yield changes in travel behaviour for low-income individuals, improving accessibility by public transport is likely to improve the quality of the commute and offer new opportunities in terms of accessible jobs.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge Leila Hawa for collecting the Walk Score data used in this study, and Guillaume Barreau for collecting the public transport travel times used to generate the accessibility measures. Thanks also to the Canadian Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council for providing funding for this research.

REFERENCES

- Blanco, J., Lucas, K., Schafran, A., Verlinghieri, E., and Apaolaza, R. (2018). Contested mobilities in the Latin American context. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 67, 73–75.

- Bocarejo, J., and Oviedo, D. (2012). Transport accessibility and social inequities: a tool for identification of mobility needs and evaluation of transport investments. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 24, 142–154.
- Boisjoly, G., and El-Geneidy, A. (2017). How to get there? A critical assessment of accessibility objectives and indicators in metropolitan transportation plans. *Transport Policy*, 55, 38–50.
- Boisjoly, G., Moreno-Monroy, A., and El-Geneidy, A. (2017). Informality and accessibility to jobs by transit: evidence from the Sao Paulo metropolitan region. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 64, 89–96.
- Curl, A., Clark, J., and Kearns, A. (2018). Household car adoption and financial distress in deprived urban communities: a case of forced car ownership? *Journal of Transport Policy*, 65, 61–71.
- Delmelle, E., and Casas, I. (2012). Evaluating the spatial equity of bus rapid transit-based accessibility patterns in a developing country: the case of Cali, Colombia. *Transport Policy*, 20, 36–46.
- dos Santos, P.R.G. (2017). Análise da influência da segurança pública na escolha do uso do carro como modo de transporte pela população da Região Metropolitana do Recife. (Programa de pós-graduação em transportes e gestão das infraestruturas), Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Recife, Brazil.
- Falavigna, C., and Hernandez, D. (2016). Assessing inequalities on public transport affordability in two Latin American cities: Montevideo (Uruguay) and Córdoba (Argentina). *Transport Policy*, 45, 145–155.
- Google Maps (n.d.). <https://developers.google.com/maps/documentation/distance-matrix/intro> (accessed February 2018).
- Handy, S. (2005). Planning for accessibility: in theory and in practice. In D. Levinson and K. Krizek (eds), *Access to Destinations* (pp. 131–147). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Handy, S., and Niemeier, D. (1997). Measuring accessibility: an exploration of issues and alternatives. *Environment and Planning A*, 29, 1175–1194.
- Hernandez, D. (2018). Uneven mobilities, uneven opportunities: social distribution of public transport accessibility to jobs and education in Montevideo. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 67, 119–125.
- Hernandez, D., and Rossel, C. (2015). Inequality and access to social services in Latin America: space–time constraints of child health checkups and prenatal care in Montevideo. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 44, 24–32.
- Jaramillo, C., Lizarraga, C., and Luis Grindlay, A. (2012). Spatial disparity in transport social needs and public transport provision in Santiago de Cali (Colombia). *Journal of Transport Geography*, 24, 340–357.
- Keeling, D. (2008). Latin America's transportation conundrum. *Journal of Latin American Geography*, 7(2), 133–154.
- Legrain, A., Buliung, R., and El-Geneidy, A. (2015). Who, what, when and where: revisiting the influences of transit mode share. *Transportation Research Record*, 2537, 42–51.
- Lucas, K. (2012). Transport and social exclusion: where are we now? *Transport Policy*, 20, 107–115.
- Maia, M. (1995). Land use regulations and rights to the city: squatter settlements in Recife, Brazil. *Journal of Land Use Policy*, 12(2), 177–180.
- Maia, M., Lucas, K., Marinho, G., Santos, E., and de Lima, J. (2016). Access to the Brazilian City – from the perspectives of low-income residents in Recife. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 55, 132–141.

- Martínez, C., Hodgson, F., Mullen, C., and Timms, P. (2018). Creating inequality in accessibility: the relationships between public transport and social housing policy in deprived areas of Santiago de Chile. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 67, 102–109.
- Mattioli, G. (2017). ‘Forced car ownership’ in the UK and Germany: socio-spatial patterns and potential economic stress impacts. *Social Inclusion*, 5(4), 147–160.
- Moniruzzaman, M., and Páez, A. (2012). Accessibility to transit, by transit, and mode share: Application of a logistic model with spatial filters. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 24, 198–205.
- Moreno-Monroy, A., Lovelace, R., and Ramos, F. (2018). Public transport and school location impacts on educational inequalities: Insights from São Paulo. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 67, 110–118.
- Owen, A., and Levinson, D. (2015). Modeling the commute mode share of transit using continuous accessibility to jobs. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 74, 110–122.
- Pereira, R. (2018). Transport legacy of mega-events and the redistribution of accessibility to urban destinations. *Cities*, 81, 45–60.
- Prefeitura da cidade do Recife (2016). *Pesquisa Origem-Destino do Recife*. Recife, Brazil. <http://www2.recife.pe.gov.br/etiquetas/pesquisa-origem-destino-2016>.
- Stanley, J., and Lucas, K. (2008). Social exclusion: What can public transport offer? *Research in Transportation Economics*, 22(1), 36–40.
- Ureta, S. (2008). Mobilising poverty?: Mobile phone use and everyday spatial mobility among low-income families in Santiago, Chile. *Information Society*, 24(2), 83–92.
- van Wee, B., and Geurs, K. (2016). The role of accessibility in urban and transport planning. In: M. Bliemer, C. Mulley and C. Moutou (eds), *Handbook on Transport and Urban Planning in the Developed World* (pp. 53–66). Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Vasconcellos, E. (2018). Urban transport policies in Brazil: the creation of a discriminatory mobility system. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 67, 85–91.
- Walk Score (2016). Opportunity Score. <https://labs.redfin.com/opportunity-score>.
- World Bank (2016). Transport and Accessibility. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/transport/brief/transport-and-social-responsibility>.