

Auckland Transport

Tertiary Student Travel Survey 2018

Report Prepared by: Gravitass Research and Strategy Ltd

For: Auckland Transport

March/April 2018

gravitas

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
2.	INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES	8
3.	METHODOLOGY	9
4.	TRAVEL MODE USE.....	13
4.1.	Common Means of Travel To/From Campus	13
4.2.	Main Means of Travel To/From Campus.....	16
4.4.	Use Of Public Transport.....	19
4.5.	Use of PT For Any Trip	20
4.6.	Type of PT User – By Campus.....	21
4.8.	Days and Times of Travel.....	23
4.9.	Travel to Campus During Peak Times – by Campus and days of the week.....	24
5.	PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT.....	26
5.1.	Ease of Taking Public Transport to the Campus.....	26
5.3.	Ease of Taking Public Transport – By Main Mode Used.....	30
5.4.	Ease of Taking Public Transport – By Campus Over Time	32
5.5.	Recommend Public Transport to Other Students	33
5.8.	Suggestions for Improvements to Public Transport.....	37
5.9.	Suggestions for Improvements to Public Transport – By Current PT Use.....	39
5.10.	Perceptions of Public Transport in General – Motivations and Barriers.....	40
6.	TERTIARY STUDENT CONCESSION	45
6.1.	Ease of Getting Tertiary Student Discounts for Public Transport	45
6.3.	Recommending the HOP Card to Students	48
6.4.	Possession of an AT HOP Card.....	51
6.6.	Possession of AT HOP Card – by Main Mode	54
6.7.	Student Discount/Concession Application	55
6.8.	Applied for Tertiary Discount – by Main Mode.....	57
6.9.	Suggestions for AT HOP Card	59
6.10.	Source of Transport Information.....	61

7.	CARPARKING/CAR POOLING.....	63
7.1.	Easy to Find Parking Near Campus.....	63
7.3.	Parking Charges around Campus.....	66
7.5.	Making Carpooling Easier and more Convenient.....	70
7.6.	Awareness and use of carpooling apps and websites.....	72
7.7.	Use of carpooling apps and websites.....	73
7.8.	Smart Travel website awareness and use.....	74
7.9.	Likelihood of using Smart Travel in future.....	75
8.	WALKING AND CYCLING	76
8.1.	Distance Reasonable to Walk or Cycle.....	76
8.2.	Distance Reasonable to Walk or Cycle – by main mode used.....	77
8.3.	Ease of Walking To/From Campus.....	78
8.4.	Suggestions to Improve Ease of Walking.....	80
8.5.	Ease of Cycling To/From Campus.....	82
8.6.	Suggestions to Improve Ease of Cycling.....	83
9.	Moving Closer or Further Away from Campus.....	84
9.1	Moving address since starting study at this campus.....	84
9.2	Moved closer or further away.....	85
9.3	Reasons for moving.....	86
9.4	Did cost impact the decision to move.....	87
9.5	How cost impacted the decision to move.....	88
 APPENDIX		
	Appendix One: Student Travel Questionnaire	1
	Appendix Two: Time Series Data (2016 v 2018)	19

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Key findings:

Travel Modes Used:

- Half (50%) of all respondents surveyed mentioned that they commonly use the **bus** for some of their trips (or for at least part of their travel) to or from their place of study. Other forms of public transport are not used as commonly, with 20% of all students surveyed mentioning the **train** and only 1% mentioning the ferry.
- Use of public transport differs by campus, with significantly higher mentions of public transport modes among those surveyed at the CBD sites of University of Auckland City, AUT City and MAINZ, as well as city fringe sites such as University of Auckland Grafton and Newmarket.
- Around a third of respondents (32%) mention they commonly drive alone – with significantly higher mentions among students surveyed at non-CBD locations, including Massey, MIT Ōtara, AUT South, AUT North and Unitec. AUT South students (33%) were also more likely to be commonly dropped off.
- University shuttles were more commonly used by AUT students at all three campuses.
- University of Auckland students at all three campuses were more likely to walk and students at Newmarket were more likely to cycle.

Main Mode Used:

- Overall, half of respondents (51%) use some form of public transport as their **main mode** of travel to/from campus - most commonly the bus (37%), followed by the train (12%) and ferry (1%). However, a third of respondents (34%) mention that their main mode of travel is by car (either as a driver or as a passenger).
- Students at the campuses located in the central city are significantly more likely to use some form of public transport as their main mode of travel to and from campus and/or to travel by a means other than a car. (Note: Comparisons of public transport use from previous studies also show an increase in non-car modes and public transport use over time).
- Conversely, public transport and non-car based main modes are significantly less prevalent non-CBD campuses.

Type of PT User – By Campus

- Eighty seven percent of all respondents are either common (60%) or occasional (27%) users of public transport, with more common public transport users at CBD or CBD fringe campuses.
- Types of public transport user vary greatly by campus – with those at MAINZ, AUT City, MIT Manukau, and the University of Auckland City, Newmarket and Grafton campuses significantly more likely to be common public transport users.

Peak Time Travel:

- The share travelling during peak times varies by day of the week, ranging from 77% travelling during peak times on a Thursday, up to 80% on a Friday.
- The share travelling during the peak differ across campuses, with University of Auckland Grafton and MIT Ōtara students most likely to travel during peak times on all days. Conversely, Unitec students were significantly less likely to travel during peak times across all five days.

Perceptions and Overall Experience:

- Just over seven in ten students agree, to some extent, that it is easy to take public transport to the campus they study at (with 71% giving a rating of 6-10), including 51% who gave a rating of 8 or higher, and 23% giving the highest possible rating of 10.
- More than three quarters of students stated that they would recommend public transport to other students, with 77% giving a rating of 6 or more, including 54% who gave a rating between 8 and 10, and a quarter of students (25%) giving the highest possible rating of 10.
- Overall, students had a net promoter score of +3, however the scores varied across the campuses. Students at MIT Manukau (+21), AUT City (+17), University of Auckland City (+17) and MAINZ (+12) had the highest net promoter scores, indicating a high share of promoters. In contrast, Massey (-29), AUT South (-13), AUT North (-9) and Unitec (-5) all have negative net promoter scores, indicating a higher share of detractors.
- One in five (21%), stated increased frequency of services would make using public transport to or from campus easier and more convenient. More direct routes and having more reliable services were also commonly mentioned.
- The most commonly mentioned barrier to using public transport to get to campus was a perception that public transport is not cheaper or does not save money (however mention of this has declined significantly since 2016). This was followed by suggestions to increase frequency of services, and mention of services being too indirect and that other options are faster.

Tertiary Student Concession and AT HOP Card:

- The majority of students either said they currently have an AT HOP card (89%) or intend to get one (5%), leaving only a small proportion who either do not intend to get an AT HOP card (6%) or are unaware of the card (<1%). Students at University of Auckland City Newmarket and Grafton campuses as well as AUT City campus are all significantly more likely to own a HOP card.
- Seven in ten students (69%) with an AT HOP card had applied for a student discount/concession and a further 21% intend to apply for a discount.
- Seventy eight percent of students agreed, to some extent (giving a rating of 6-10), that it is easy to get tertiary student discounts for public transport, including 58% rating 8-10, of which 32% gave the highest rating of 10 (*Strongly agreeing*). *Note: ratings for ease have declined significantly since 2016.*
- Ninety six per cent of students would recommend the AT HOP card to other students to some extent, including 89% who gave a rating of 8 or more and 68% who gave the highest rating of 10.

- All campuses have a positive Net Promoter Scores for AT HOP, ranging from +79 for AUT City, to +67 for Unitec and AUT South.
- The most commonly mentioned improvements to the AT HOP card were to have better discounts/cheaper, making the concession process easier, linking the card to a phone/bank card and to be able to use the card to buy other things like food, parkin or printing.

Transport Information Sources and the Journey Planner

- Two fifths of respondents (40%) have used the AT website to get their transport information and a further 32% have used the AT smartphone app. The next most common means of finding information were from Google (29%) and by word of mouth (14%).

Car parking and Carpooling:

- Just under half of all respondents who drive, or have access to a vehicle, disagreed that it is easy to find parking near the campus (47% giving a rating of 4 or less), while the same share (47%) disagree that parking charges are reasonable (rating 0-4). Parking is seen as significantly more difficult and more expensive for those at CBD or CBD fringe campuses when compared with non-CBD campuses.
- When asked what would make carpooling easier, students mentioned some way of finding people who live nearby would make it easier, as well as providing more parking and having a way to find people to carpool with.
- Just 2% of students said they currently use a carpooling website or app, while a further 9% said they were aware of apps or websites for carpooling, but have not used them. This leaves 89% who are not aware of apps or websites at all.
- Those who have used carpooling apps or websites before used Uber Pool most, followed by Auckland Transport's Smart Travel app. Nearly half (48%) of students who were aware or used carpool apps or websites but have not used the Smart Travel app said that they would be unlikely to use it in the future.

Walking and Cycling

- Over a quarter of students (28%), indicated they lived close enough to either walk and/or cycle to campus, including 22% who mentioned that they lived close enough to campus to **walk**, and 16% who said they live close enough to **cycle**.
- Eighty four percent of students who live close enough to walk to the campus gave a rating of 6-10 when asked about ease of walking to or from the campus, including 66% giving a rating of 8 or higher.
- Of the suggestions made to improve walking, the most common suggestions included having more protection from weather and having more pedestrian crossings or over bridges.
- Of the students who live close enough to cycle, 69% agree to some extent that cycling would be easy (gave a rating of 6-10).

- Over a third of students interviewed (34%) mentioned that having bigger, better or more cycle lanes would make cycling to the campus easier. Other commonly mentioned suggestions include having a bike (8%) and the need for safer routes or less traffic (8%).

Moving closer to or further from the campus

- Nearly three quarters of students are living at the same address as they were when they began studying at the campus.
- Of the students who have moved since beginning study at the campus, 55% moved closer, 33% moved further away and 11% remained about the same distance from the campus.
- When asked about their motivations for moving, 58% of students said that walking, cycling or public transport were not motivations for their move.
- However one in five students did mention that ease of walking (22%) or better public transport (21%) had impacted their decision to some extent, while only 5% mentioned that easier cycling options played a role in their relocation decision.
- Of the students who moved, 53% said that cost impacted their decision to move, with the most commonly mentioned cost related reasons being moving to an area that is cheaper in terms of rent or weekly payments, moving for cheaper transport costs and moving to a location where they can walk or cycle to campus.

Note: Time series data (2016 versus 2018 data) by campus is appended.

2. INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES

This research explored students' travel patterns of tertiary students at eleven Auckland Campuses including:

- University of Auckland (UoA) city campus;
- University of Auckland (UoA) Grafton campus;
- University of Auckland (UoA) Newmarket campus;
- Unitec Mt Albert campus;
- Auckland University of Technology (AUT) city campus;
- AUT Akoranga North Shore (NS) campus;
- AUT South campus;
- Manukau Institute of Technology (MIT) Ōtara campus;
- Manukau Institute of Technology (MIT) Manukau campus;
- Massey University Albany campus; and
- MAINZ city campus.

The survey collected information on:

- How students travel to and from university campuses;
- Which days of the week students travel, and whether they are travelling during the morning peak traffic periods (7:00am to 9:00am and 9:00am to 10:00am);
- If students use Public Transport (including for trips not related to Uni/study);
- Awareness and use of carpooling apps, including Auckland Transport's Smart Travel app;
- Use of public transport by students and whether they have changed their frequency of use of public transport when compared with last year;
- How easy or difficult they think it is to use public transport, as well as how easy they think it is to walk, to cycle and to drive;
- If students know about (and have applied for) tertiary student discounts on Public Transport;
- How students found the process of applying for tertiary concessions on Public Transport; and
- Whether students have moved house/flat for cost or transport related reasons.

The information collected through this survey will be used to better understand the tertiary student market, identify travel modes they typically use, propensity and motivations for behaviour change in order to support service provision, marketing and tertiary concession initiatives. This research will also support AT working collaboratively with the tertiary sector to meet the transport needs of institutions.

3. METHODOLOGY

An intercept survey methodology was employed, whereby interviewers conducted a short face-to-face interview with students randomly intercepted at assigned locations throughout the eleven campuses.

To ensure a random sample of students were surveyed; interviewers approached every 3rd person passing their specified interview location (a range of locations were selected to ensure representation of all faculties). After being checked for eligibility and being given a brief explanation of the research, respondents were interviewed using a structured questionnaire (see Appendix). *Note: Those who are not tertiary students, or tertiary students who are not currently studying at the Campus where surveying was being conducted, or who had already completed the questionnaire, were deemed ineligible for this survey.*

In 2018 we also trialled an online survey option for those students who were approached for the survey, but who did not have time to stop and complete the survey at the time (i.e. they on their way to a lecture, etc). These students completed the same survey, but in their own time.

Intercept interviewing took place over the period from the 12th March to the 20th April 2018, with shifts scheduled for each day of the week, covering mornings and afternoons. The interview was approximately ten minutes in length.

In total n=2,157 respondents completed the survey (n=1983 intercept, n=174 online). The maximum margin of error for this sample size is $\pm 2.1\%$, at the 95% confidence interval. Table 3.1 shows the sample sizes by individual campuses and their associated margins of error as well as the split by mode (intercept and online).

Table 3.1: Number of Interviews and Margins of Error by Campus (%)

Campus	Sample size		Method	
	Total 2018	Margin of Error	Intercept	Online
AUT City	214	$\pm 6.7\%$	200	14
AUT South	158	$\pm 7.8\%$	151	7
AUT Akoranga	213	$\pm 6.7\%$	204	9
University of Auckland City	232	$\pm 6.4\%$	201	31
University of Auckland Newmarket	143	$\pm 8.2\%$	127	16
University of Auckland Grafton	236	$\pm 6.4\%$	201	35
Massey Albany	227	$\pm 6.5\%$	204	23
MIT Mankuau	190	$\pm 7.1\%$	181	9
MIT Ōtara	208	$\pm 6.8\%$	201	7
MAINZ	105	$\pm 9.6\%$	100	5
Unitec Mt Albert	231	$\pm 6.4\%$	213	18
Total	2157	$\pm 2.1\%$	1983	174

Table 3.2 shows the distribution of interviews conducted by time of day.

Table 3.2: Time of Day of Interviews by Campus (%)

Campus	8:00am– 10:30am	10:30am– 1:00pm	1:00pm– 3:30pm	3:30pm– 5:00pm	After 5pm
AUT City (n=214)	24%	49%	24%	1%	2%
AUT South (n=158)	22%	48%	20%	5%	6%
AUT Akoranga (n=213)	9%	44%	31%	9%	8%
University of Auckland City (n=232)	21%	38%	18%	7%	16%
University of Auckland Newmarket (n=143)	22%	53%	16%	6%	4%
University of Auckland Grafton (n=236)	27%	30%	18%	7%	19%
Massey Albany (n=227)	23%	47%	22%	4%	3%
MIT Mankuau (n=190)	14%	41%	28%	13%	5%
MIT Ōtara (n=208)	27%	51%	16%	3%	3%
MAINZ (n=105)	19%	56%	31%	7%	18%
Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)	17%	33%	29%	13%	7%
Total	20%	42%	23%	7%	8%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Tables 3.3 and 3.4 outline the demographic spread of survey respondents, across the eleven campuses. Demographics include gender, age and study status and faculty.

Table 3.3: Demographics – Gender/age/enrolment (%)

Campus	Gender		Age group						Student Type		Number of years enrolled for					
	Male	Female	15-17	18-19	20-24	25-29	30-39	39+	Under-graduate	Post-graduate	1	2	3	4	5	5+
AUT City (n=214)	55%	45%	2%	34%	45%	12%	7%	1%	84%	16%	44%	25%	21%	7%	3%	-
AUT South (n=158)	42%	58%	6%	47%	30%	8%	8%	1%	97%	3%	61%	22%	15%	3%	-	1%
AUT Akoranga (n=213)	27%	73%	1%	33%	39%	14%	10%	3%	90%	10%	44%	27%	21%	6%	1%	1%
University of Auckland City (n=232)	44%	56%	3%	41%	41%	8%	5%	2%	82%	18%	47%	25%	15%	9%	2%	2%
University of Auckland Newmarket (n=143)	75%	25%	-	1%	43%	32%	22%	3%	27%	73%	31%	18%	21%	20%	6%	4%
University of Auckland Grafton (n=236)	37%	62%	1%	29%	55%	11%	3%	1%	75%	25%	20%	33%	24%	11%	7%	4%
Massey Albany (n=227)	44%	56%	3%	30%	44%	13%	8%	2%	85%	15%	47%	26%	17%	9%	1%	<1%
MIT Mankuau (n=190)	55%	45%	5%	19%	43%	21%	12%	1%	72%	28%	59%	20%	15%	4%	2%	1%
MIT Ōtara (n=208)	56%	44%	7%	27%	38%	18%	9%	2%	83%	17%	51%	27%	14%	6%	1%	1%
MAINZ (n=105)	69%	31%	6%	41%	43%	8%	3%	-	91%	10%	45%	31%	16%	7%	1%	1%
Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)	58%	42%	4%	25%	44%	16%	7%	4%	83%	17%	58%	20%	15%	4%	2%	1%
Total	49%	51%	3%	30%	43%	14%	8%	2%	80%	20%	46%	25%	18%	8%	2%	1%

Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%

Green highlighting indicates a campus with a statistically significantly higher share of responses compared to the total result for all campuses, while red highlighting indicates a significantly lower share.

Table 3.4: Demographics – Faculty (%)

Faculty	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
		AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
Medical and Health Sciences	25%	4%	41%	82%	4%	-	77%	6%	2%	38%	-	7%
Engineering	19%	21%	6%	1%	15%	93%	6%	9%	1%	39%	7%	24%
Business/Creative industries	16%	26%	19%	2%	15%	1%	1%	27%	59%	1%	5%	12%
Sciences	15%	20%	8%	8%	33%	9%	17%	38%	4%	-	-	10%
Arts/Humanities/Social Sciences	9%	11%	4%	2%	28%	-	1%	14%	1%	4%	24%	10%
Design/Creative Arts	6%	6%	6%	1%	4%	-	-	1%	2%	2%	51%	15%
Technology and Built Environment	6%	2%	4%	-	1%	-	-	7%	27%	8%	-	17%
Education	2%	2%	5%	7%	<1%	-	-	2%	-	4%	2%	2%
Law	2%	6%	6%	-	10%	-	2%	-	1%	-	-	-
Environmental Sciences	1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
Cultural and Society	1%	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	-	-	1%
Music	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15%	<1%
Māori Development	<1%	1%	1%	-	<1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	<1%
Other	2%	7%	1%	-	<1%	-	-	1%	6%	4%	-	2%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a campus with a statistically significantly higher share of responses compared to the total result for all campuses, while red highlighting indicates a significantly lower share.

4. TRAVEL MODE USE

4.1. Common Means of Travel To/From Campus

Students were asked how they normally travel to and from the campus during the semester, including all modes of transport used for part, or all, of the trip(s).

- Half (50%) of all respondents surveyed mentioned that they commonly use a **public bus** for some of their trips (or for at least part of their travel) to or from their place of study. Students travelling to and from CBD and CBD fringe campuses – including University of Auckland City (74%), Grafton (60%) and Newmarket (59%) campuses, the AUT City campus (61%) and MAINZ campus (59%) - are all significantly more likely to commonly use the bus when compared with respondents from all other campuses.
- Other forms of public transport are not used as commonly, with 20% of all students mentioning the train and only 1% mentioning the ferry. However, it should be noted that use of these forms of public transport do differ by campus, with significantly higher mentions of train travel at MAINZ (43%), MIT Manukau (39%) and University of Auckland Grafton (26%), as well as significantly higher mentions of ferry travel at University of Auckland City campus (3%).
- Around a third of respondents (32%) mention they commonly drive alone – with significantly higher mentions among students surveyed at Massey University (60%), MIT Ōtara (56%), AUT South (48%), AUT North (46%), and Unitec Mt Albert (44%). Levels of driver only car use are significantly lower for the CBD and CBD fringe campuses, with the University of Auckland City campus having the lowest share of respondents who commonly drive alone (7%), followed by MAINZ (9%), University of Auckland Grafton (13%), AUT City (15%) and University of Auckland Newmarket.
- Significantly more respondents at all three University of Auckland campuses mentioned that they commonly walk or run (34% Grafton, 32% Newmarket and 23% City) and University of Auckland Newmarket students are also significantly more likely to cycle (11%) or use a motorbike or scooter (4%).
- University shuttle buses are significantly more common with AUT students (13% North, 9% South and 7% City), while AUT South respondents are also significantly more likely to mention that they are commonly dropped off (33%).

- When compared with the Total 2016 results, in 2018 there has been a significant decline in the use of a car – as with a driver or passenger – including declines in the share:
 - driving along in a car – down from 35% in 2016, to 32%;
 - being a passenger who is dropped off – down from 14%, to 9%;
 - driving themselves and others – down from 6%, to 3%; and
 - being a passenger in a car which parked near the campus – down from 2%, to 1%.
- In contrast, in 2018 there has been a small but statistically significant increase in the share cycling (up from 2%, to 3%) and in the share using uber/taxi (up from no mentions to 1%).

Table 4.1: Means of Travel to and from Campus – ALL MODES (%)

All Travel Modes Used	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
Public Bus	50%	50%	61%	36%	42%	74%	59%	60%	31%	46%	41%	59%	40%
Drive alone in car	35%	32%↓	15%	48%	46%	7%	20%	13%	60%	29%	56%	9%	44%
Train	18%	20%	21%	10%	9%	24%	22%	26%	4%	39%	15%	43%	23%
Walk/run	16%	17%	18%	8%	11%	23%	32%	34%	15%	3%	5%	23%	15%
Passenger in car (dropped off)	14%	9%↓	7%	33%	4%	9%	1%	6%	6%	11%	13%	5%	7%
University shuttle bus	5%	4%	7%	9%	13%	<1%	-	-	2%	2%	-	-	4%
Drove myself and others in car	6%	3%↓	1%	1%	5%	1%	5%	5%	4%	2%	2%	3%	6%
Cycle	2%	3%↑	1%	-	2%	3%	11%	4%	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%
Passenger in car (parked near campus)	2%	1%↓	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	-	1%	1%	1%
Ferry	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	3%	-	1%	<1%	-	1%	3%	1%
Motorcycle/Scooter	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	<1%	4%	<1%	<1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%
Taxi/Uber	-	1%↑	2%	1%	-	<1%	-	2%	1%	2%	-	2%	1%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Note: Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently, the table may total more than 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a campus with a statistically significantly higher share of responses compared to the total result for all campuses, while red highlighting indicates a significantly lower share.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

4.2. Main Means of Travel To/From Campus

Main Mode Used – By Campus

Students were then asked to specify their main mode of transport (either the one used most commonly, or the one used for the longest distance)

- Overall, half of all respondents (51%) use some form of public transport as their main mode of travel to/from campus, including 37% using the bus, 13% using the train and 1% using the ferry.
- However, a third of respondents (34%) mention that their main mode of travel is by car (either as a driver or as a passenger).
- Students at the campuses located in the central city are significantly more likely to use some form of public transport as their main mode of travel to and from campus and/or to travel by a means other than a car (75% public transport and 96% non-car). CBD Fringe campuses are also significantly more likely to use non-car transport (61% public transport and 87% non-car). CBD fringe students were also significantly more likely to cycle (5%) or walk/run (20%).
- Conversely, public transport and non-car based main modes are significantly less likely at non-CBD campuses (37% public transport and 48% non-car).
- When compared with total results for 2016 across all campuses, in 2018 there has been a significant increase in non-car related travel (up significantly from 63% in 2016, to 68%), including individual significant increases in use of the train (up from 11%, to 13%), walking/running (up from 10%, to 12%) and cycling (up from 1%, to 2%).

Table 4.2: Main Means of Travel to and from Campus (%)

Main Travel Mode Used	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=1990)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=198)	AUT South (n=144)	AUT North (n=192)	UoA City (n=214)	UoA Newmarket (n=136)	UoA Grafton (n=214)	Massey Albany (n=219)	MIT Manukau (n=177)	MIT Ōtara (n=186)	MAINZ City (n=186)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=223)
Public Bus	36%	37%	52%	24%	29%	59%	45%	45%	22%	33%	24%	44%	27%
Drive alone in car	27%	28%	6%	46%	43%	2%	13%	7%	58%	24%	57%	1%	39%
Train	11%	13%↑	16%	4%	3%	15%	12%	18%	-	31%	5%	33%	16%
Walk/run	10%	12%↑	17%	3%	10%	18%	16%	23%	12%	2%	5%	14%	9%
Passenger in car (dropped off)	6%	4%↓	2%	19%	2%	1%	0%	1%	4%	7%	8%	3%	2%
University shuttle bus	3%	2%↓	5%	2%	7%	-	-	-	1%	2%	-	-	1%
Cycle	1%	2%↑	-	-	2%	1%	9%	2%	2%	-	-	1%	2%
Drove myself and others in car	3%	1%↓	-	1%	2%	1%	4%	2%	1%	1%	-	1%	3%
Passenger in car (parked near campus)	1%	1%	-	-	2%	-	-	1%	1%	-	2%	-	1%
Motorcycle/Scooter	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	-	-	<1%
Ferry	1%	1%	1%	-	-	2%	-	1%	-	-	-	2%	-
Taxi/Uber	-	<1%	-	1%	-	1%	-	-	-	1%	-	-	-

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable, don't know responses and those who say that it varies too much to say

Note: Due to rounding table may not total 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a campus with a statistically significantly higher share of responses compared to the total result for all campuses, while red highlighting indicates a significantly lower share.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

Table 4.3: Main Means of Travel to and from Campuses by area (%)

Main Travel Mode Used	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=1990)	CBD Campuses 2018 (n=499)	City fringe campuses 2018 (n=350)	Non-CBD campuses 2018 (n=1,141)
Public Bus	36%	37%	54%	45%	27%
Drive alone in car	27%	28%	3%	9%	45%
Train	11%	13%↑	19%	16%	10%
Walk/run	10%	12%↑	17%	20%	7%
Passenger in car (dropped off)	6%	4%↓	1%	1%	6%
University shuttle bus	3%	2%↓	2%	-	2%
Cycle	1%	2%↑	1%	5%	1%
Drove myself and others in car	3%	1%↓	<1%	3%	1%
Passenger in car (parked near campus)	1%	1%	-	<1%	1%
Ferry	1%	1%	2%	<1%	-
Motorcycle/Scooter	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Taxi/Uber	-	<1%	<1%	-	<1%
Total Public Transport (excl. University shuttle bus)	48%	51%	75%	61%	37%
Total Non-Car (scooter/motorcycle/shuttle incl. as non-car)	63%	68%↑	96%	87%	48%

Base is all respondents studying full time who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses Note: Due to rounding table may not total 100%.

Note on comparability: 2006-2010 mode use was measured by questions on modes used for each trip in previous seven days and an average daily mode use then computed. The 2014 survey measured the main mode used. Whilst not precisely comparable, Auckland Transport analyses has shown these two approaches deliver very similar mode share results with very good comparability.

Note: 2006-2010 result were expanded to reflect the total full-time student population by weighting using student role data provided by the institutions.

Green highlighting indicates an area with a statistically significantly higher share of responses compared to the total result for all campuses, while red highlighting indicates a significantly lower share.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

4.4. Use Of Public Transport

Travel to Campus by Public Transport

- Of those who did not mention that they use public transport commonly, 27% said that they have used public transport before to travel to or from the campus, while 73% said they have not ever used public transport to make the trip.
- Previous travel to/from campus by public transport was significantly more likely to be mentioned by students surveyed at the University of Auckland Newmarket (55%), University of Auckland Grafton (49%) and MIT Manukau (39%) campuses, while significantly more students from MIT Ōtara (85%), Massey (82%) and AUT South (81%) have never used public transport to/from the campus.
- When compared with 2016 results, the share who have used public transport before to travel to/from the campus has increased significantly (up from 19%, to 27%).

Table 4.4: Public Transport To/From Campus (%)

Do you ever use public transport to travel to/from campus?	Total 2016 (n=811)	Total 2018 (n=870)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=57)	AUT South (n=97)	AUT North (n=121)	UoA City (n=38)	UoA Newmarket (n=42)	UoA Grafton (n=59)	Massey Albany (n=157)	MIT Manukau (n=51)	MIT Ōtara (n=120)	MAINZ City (n=17)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=111)
Yes	19%	27%↑	37%	19%	22%	37%	55%	49%	19%	39%	15%	47%	25%
No	81%	73%↓	63%	81%	78%	63%	45%	51%	82%	61%	85%	53%	75%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses. Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

Use of PT to or from campus highest among...

- CBD Fringe (52%) and CBD (38%) campuses
- post-graduate students (44%)
- students aged 25-29 years (39%)
- second year students (33%)
- male students (31%)

Non-use of PT to or from campus highest among...

- non-CBD students (79%)
- undergraduate students (77%)
- female students (76%)

4.5. Use of PT For Any Trip

- Those who do not use public transport commonly to travel to/from campus were also asked if they ever use public transport for any other trips. Just under two thirds (59%) of respondents reported that while they did not commonly use Public Transport to commute to their place of study, they do use it at other times (i.e. travelling in the weekends, to social occasions etc.), leaving 41% who have not used public transport for any trips.
- AUT South (57%) and MIT Ōtara (50%) students were significantly less likely to use public transport for other travel.
- When compared with the total results for 2016, there has been a slight (but not statistically significant) increase in the share of respondents who have used public transport for any other travel (up from 55%, to 59% of those who have never used public transport to travel to/from campus).

Table 4.5: Public Transport for Other Travel (%)

Do you ever use public transport for any other travel?	Total 2016 (n=811)	Total 2018 (n=870)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=57)	AUT South (n=97)	AUT North (n=121)	UoA City (n=38)	UoA Newmarket (n=42)	UoA Grafton (n=59)	Massey Albany (n=157)	MIT Manukau (n=51)	MIT Ōtara (n=120)	MAINZ City (n=17)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=111)
Yes	55%	59%	67%	43%	60%	71%	69%	70%	62%	49%	50%	53%	63%
No	45%	41%	33%	57%	41%	29%	31%	31%	38%	51%	50%	47%	37%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses. Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

Note: there are no significant differences by other groups of interest.

4.6. Type of PT User – By Campus

Using the “all modes” and “main mode” information combined with the results from the additional questions asking respondents if they have ever used PT to travel to the campus and/or for any other trips, students can be grouped into three broad segments – those who use public transport commonly (as their main mode or often use to get to the campus), those who use it occasionally (have used it to travel to campus previously and/or have used it for any other types of trips before), and non-users.

- Eighty seven percent of all respondents are either common (60%) or occasional (27%) users of public transport.
- Respondents from CBD and CBD fringe campuses were significantly more likely to be common public transport users (80% CBD; 73% CBD fringe), while students at non-CBD campuses were significantly more likely to be either occasional (33%) or non-public transport (20%) users.
- Types of public transport user vary greatly by campus – with those at MAINZ (84%), the University of Auckland City (84%), Grafton (75%), and Newmarket (71%) campuses, as well as AUT City (73%), and MIT Manukau (73%) campuses are significantly more likely to be **common** public transport users.
- **Occasional** public transport users were significantly more likely among Massey (45%), AUT North (37%) and Unitec (33%) students.
- Overall 14% of students were **non-public transport users**, with significantly more non-public transport users at AUT South (30%), MIT Ōtara (26%), Massey (24%) and AUT North (20%).
- When compared with the total results for 2016, in 2018 there are significantly more **occasional** users of public transport – up from 23% in 2016, to 27% (with the shares of common and non-public transport users both declining slightly).

Table 4.6: Type of PT User – By Campus (%)

Type of PT user	Total 2016 (n=2108)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
Use PT Commonly	62%	60%	73%	39%	43%	84%	71%	75%	31%	73%	42%	84%	52%
Use PT Occasionally	23%	27% [↑]	22%	32%	37%	13%	23%	20%	45%	17%	31%	11%	33%
Non PT Users	16%	14%	5%	30%	20%	4%	6%	5%	24%	10%	26%	5%	15%

Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly share of high users /low non-users when compared to the results for all campuses, while red highlighting indicates significantly lower users/higher non-users

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

Table 4.7: Type of PT User – By area (%)

Type of PT user	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	CBD Campuses 2018 (n=551)	City fringe campuses 2018 (n=379)	Non-CBD campuses 2018 (n=1,227)
Use PT Commonly	62%	60%	80%	73%	47%
Use PT Occasionally	23%	27% [↑]	16%	21%	33%
Non PT Users	16%	14%	4%	6%	20%

Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly share of high users /low non-users when compared to the results for all campuses, while red highlighting indicates significantly lower users/higher non-users

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

4.8. Days and Times of Travel

Days of travel to Campus – by Campus

- By day of the week the largest share of respondents travelling to and from the campus on a Tuesday (86%), while fewer students visit campus on a Friday (71%). Just under half of respondents (47%) stated they travelled to and from the campus every day.
- Students from University of Auckland Grafton (74%), City (71%), and Newmarket (66%) campuses as well as those at Massey (57%) and AUT City (53%), campuses are all significantly more likely to travel to the campus every day when compared with all respondents.
- Conversely, students from most non-CBD campuses, including MIT Ōtara (36%), AUT North (29%), Unitec (23%) and MIT Manukau (13%) were significantly less likely to travel to the campus every day.

Table 4.8: Days of Travel to and from Campus/University (%)

On which days of the week do you <u>usually</u> travel to this campus?	Total 2016 (n=2108)	Total 2018 (n=2157)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
Monday	82%	82%	82%	80%	73%	93%	81%	89%	88%	82%	64%	98%	79%
Tuesday	88%	86%	86%	83%	83%	97%	83%	89%	89%	70%	78%	99%	88%
Wednesday	87%	84%↓	91%	84%	87%	92%	84%	89%	86%	71%	71%	90%	79%
Thursday	87%	83%↓	90%	80%	78%	95%	85%	89%	84%	72%	77%	91%	78%
Friday	75%	71%↓	82%	74%	72%	84%	84%	89%	71%	38%	67%	66%	56%
Total every day (Mon-Fri)	54%	47%↓	53%	43%	29%	71%	66%	74%	57%	13%	36%	51%	23%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates an area with a statistically significantly higher share of responses compared to the total result for all campuses, while red highlighting indicates a significantly lower share.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

4.9. Travel to Campus During Peak Times – by Campus and days of the week

- The share of students who travel during peak times (7:00am-10:00am) vary across the days of the week, from 77% on Thursday to 80% on Friday.
- The share who travel during peak times also vary across campus, with University of Auckland Grafton and MIT Ōtara students significantly more likely to travel during peak times on all days of the week. Conversely, Unitec students were significantly less likely to travel during peak times (7:00am-10:00am) over all five days.
- Students from the University of Auckland Newmarket and MAINZ are significantly more likely to travel between 9:01am and 10:00am across all five days, while students from MIT Ōtara and Massey students are significantly more likely to travel between 7:00am and 9:00am.

Table 4.9: Travel Time by Campus(%)

What time do you <u>usually</u> arrive at this campus?		Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
				AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
7:00am to 9:00am	Monday	52%	50%	37%	39%	56%	46%	35%	57%	54%	60%	82%	21%	52%
	Tuesday	58%	49%	40%	34%	54%	47%	36%	55%	62%	53%	76%	17%	46%
	Wednesday	57%	49%	39%	32%	48%	46%	36%	61%	55%	55%	79%	26%	43%
	Thursday	57%	49%	39%	35%	53%	46%	35%	59%	57%	48%	78%	23%	44%
	Friday	49%	49%	41%	44%	52%	46%	34%	56%	57%	59%	75%	19%	44%
9:01am to 10:00am	Monday	-	29%	38%	39%	27%	31%	43%	28%	29%	18%	13%	47%	18%
	Tuesday	-	29%	38%	37%	29%	30%	44%	30%	22%	21%	16%	49%	21%
	Wednesday	-	29%	37%	40%	30%	30%	43%	26%	27%	16%	14%	48%	21%
	Thursday	-	28%	33%	37%	26%	28%	43%	27%	27%	20%	14%	52%	20%
	Friday	-	31%	38%	27%	32%	31%	45%	30%	27%	22%	19%	54%	20%
Combined peak 7:00am to 10:00am	Monday	-	79%	75%	78%	83%	77%	78%	85%	83%	78%	95%	68%	70%
	Tuesday	-	78%	78%	71%	83%	77%	80%	85%	84%	74%	92%	66%	67%
	Wednesday	-	78%	76%	72%	78%	76%	79%	87%	82%	71%	93%	74%	64%
	Thursday	-	77%	72%	72%	79%	74%	78%	86%	84%	68%	92%	75%	64%
	Friday	-	80%	79%	71%	84%	77%	79%	86%	84%	81%	94%	73%	64%
Some other time	Monday	48%	21%	25%	23%	17%	24%	22%	15%	18%	22%	5%	32%	30%
	Tuesday	42%	22%	22%	29%	17%	23%	20%	15%	16%	27%	9%	34%	33%
	Wednesday	43%	22%	24%	28%	22%	24%	22%	13%	18%	30%	7%	27%	36%
	Thursday	43%	23%	28%	28%	21%	27%	22%	14%	17%	32%	8%	25%	36%
	Friday	51%	20%	21%	28%	16%	23%	21%	15%	16%	19%	6%	28%	36%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses. Due to rounding, percentages may not total 100. Note: percentages shown are based on all respondents, regardless of if they travel to the campus on that day of the week or not. Note: in 2014, respondents were asked about peak travel from 7-10am. In 2016 this was changed to ask about peak travel from 7-9am. In 2018, this was separated into travel from 7-9am and 9-10am.

Green highlighting indicates an area with a statistically significantly higher share of responses compared to the total result for all campuses, while red highlighting indicates a significantly lower share.

5. PERCEPTIONS OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT

5.1. Ease of Taking Public Transport to the Campus

Ease of Taking Public Transport – By Campus

- Just over seven in ten students agree, to some extent, that it is easy to take public transport to the campus they study at (with 71% giving a rating of 6-10). This includes just over half (51%) giving a rating of 8 or more, and 23% giving the highest possible rating of 10, *strongly agree*.
- Students at AUT City (86% rating 6-10, 62% rating 8-10 and 30% rating 10 *strongly agree*), University of Auckland (86% rating 6-10, 60% rating 8-10) MAINZ (85% rating 6-10, 62% rating 8-10) and MIT Manukau (79% rating 6-10, 63% rating 8-10 and 35% rating 10 *strongly agree*) were significantly more likely to agree that it is easy to take public transport to their campus.
- In contrast, significantly higher shares of students disagreed (rating 0-4) from Massey (37%), AUT South (30%), AUT North (30%), MIT Ōtara (27%) and Unitec (26%).
- Students from CBD and CBD fringe campuses were significantly more likely to agree to some extent that it is easy to catch public transport to the campus, with 61% of CBD students rating ease 8-10 and 57% of CBD fringe students giving an ease rating of 8 or higher. In contrast, non-CBD students are significantly less likely to rate ease highly, with over a quarter (28%) giving an ease rating of 4 or less.
- When compared with the Total 2016 results, the share giving positive ratings for the ease of use has increased significantly, including:
 - the share giving a rating of 6-10 up significantly from 67%, to 71%;
 - the share giving a rating of 8-10 up from 47%, to 51%; and
 - the share giving a 'top box' rating of 10 up from 16%, to 23%.

Table 5.1: Ease of taking PT to this Campus (%)

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2016 (n=1,151)	Total 2018 (n=2,038)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=200)	AUT South (n=141)	AUT North (n=195)	UoA City (n=221)	UoA Newmarket (n=139)	UoA Grafton (n=231)	Massey Albany (n=212)	MIT Manukau (n=186)	MIT Ōtara (n=187)	MAINZ City (n=103)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=223)
10	16%	23%↑	30%	21%	20%	23%	21%	23%	12%	35%	28%	26%	20%
9	12%	10%	13%	9%	8%	12%	15%	13%	5%	14%	4%	8%	9%
8	19%	18%	20%	14%	14%	25%	22%	21%	12%	14%	14%	28%	15%
Total 8-10	47%	51%↑	62%	43%	42%	60%	58%	56%	29%	63%	47%	62%	43%
7	13%	13%	15%	11%	11%	19%	10%	16%	13%	11%	10%	17%	8%
6	7%	7%	9%	5%	7%	7%	5%	10%	9%	4%	9%	6%	6%
Total 6-10	67%	71%↑	86%	59%	61%	86%	73%	82%	52%	79%	65%	85%	57%
5	9%	9%	7%	11%	9%	6%	7%	5%	11%	5%	8%	8%	17%
4	6%	4%↓	3%	5%	6%	3%	8%	4%	4%	2%	8%	1%	4%
3	7%	4%↓	2%	8%	4%	2%	2%	5%	4%	2%	3%	4%	5%
2	4%	4%	1%	3%	8%	1%	4%	2%	8%	5%	3%	1%	7%
1	3%	2%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	<1%	5%	1%	1%	-	3%
0	4%	7%↓	1%	13%	10%	2%	6%	2%	16%	6%	12%	2%	8%
Total 4-0	24%	21%↓	8%	30%	30%	8%	21%	13%	37%	16%	27%	8%	26%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

Table 5.2: Ease of taking PT to this Campus by area (%)

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2016 (n=1,151)	Total 2018 (n=2038)	CBD campuses 2018 (n=524)	City fringe campuses 2018 (n=370)	Non-CBD campuses 2018 (n=1,144)
10	16%	23%↑	26%	22%	22%
9	12%	10%	12%	14%	8%
8	19%	18%	24%	21%	14%
Total 8-10	47%	51%↑	61%	57%	44%
7	13%	13%	17%	14%	11%
6	7%	7%	8%	8%	7%
Total 6-10	67%	71%↑	86%	78%	62%
5	9%	9%	7%	6%	10%
4	6%	4%↓	3%	5%	5%
3	7%	4%↓	2%	4%	4%
2	4%	4%	1%	3%	6%
1	3%	2%	1%	1%	3%
0	4%	7%↓	2%	3%	11%
Total 4-0	24%	21%↓	8%	16%	28%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses. Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

Overall 51% of respondents gave a rating of 8-10. Those significantly more likely to give a rating of 8-10 are...

- students aged 15-27 (63%) or aged 18-19 (58%)
- common PT users (61%)
- CBD (61%) or CBD fringe (57%) campuses
- first year students (55%)

Overall 21% of respondents gave a rating of 0-4. Those significantly more likely to give a rating of 0-4 are...

- non-PT users (49%) or occasional PT users (35%)
- non-CBD campuses (28%)
- third year students (27%)
- students aged 25-29 (25%), aged 30-39 (33%) or aged over 39 (46%)
- female students (23%)

5.3. Ease of Taking Public Transport – By Main Mode Used

- Not surprisingly, students currently using public transport as their main mode of transport to the campus are significantly more likely to agree to some extent that it is easy to take public transport to campus, particularly those currently catching the train (88% rating 6-10 - including 70% rating 8-10 and 31% giving a 'top box' rating of 10) or a public bus (85% giving a rating of 6-10 – including 63% rating 8-10, and 28% giving a 'top box' rating of 10) as their main mode. Positive ratings given by those who walk or run as their main mode were also significantly higher (83% rating 6-10 , including 58% giving a rating of 8-10). Although cyclists were not significantly more likely to give a rating between six and ten, cyclists were significantly less likely to disagree than all other students, with only 3% disagreeing (i.e. giving a rating of 0-4).
- In contrast, those students whose main mode of travel to campus is to drive alone in a car are significantly less likely to agree it is easy to take public transport to campus, with almost half (49%) giving a rating of 0-4, including one in five (21%) *strongly disagreeing* (giving a rating of 0).

Table 5.3: Easy to take PT to this campus – by Main Mode Used (%)

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2018 (n=2,038)	Main Mode											
		Drove car alone (n=508)	Drove Others (n=22)	Passenger in a car (dropped off) (n=71)	Passenger in a car (parked nearby) (n=11)	Motorcycle/ scooter (n=16)	AT Bus (n=725)	Train (n=257)	Ferry (n=9)	Uni Shuttle (n=29)	Cycle (n=30)	Walk/ Run (n=192)	Taxi/ Uber (n=3)
10	23%	13%	-	17%	27%	25%	28%	31%	22%	14%	13%	29%	33%
9	10%	3%	9%	9%	-	-	12%	18%	22%	14%	13%	13%	-
8	18%	8%	18%	9%	-	19%	23%	21%	11%	17%	30%	17%	-
Total 8-10	51%	25%	27%	34%	27%	44%	63%	70%	56%	45%	57%	58%	33%
7	13%	7%	9%	20%	27%	19%	15%	14%	22%	10%	17%	17%	-
6	7%	8%	5%	3%	9%	6%	8%	5%	11%	13%	10%	8%	33%
Total 6-10	71%	39%	41%	56%	64%	69%	85%	88%	89%	69%	83%	83%	67%
5	9%	11%	18%	16%	9%	6%	7%	5%	-	10%	13%	5%	-
4	4%	7%	9%	7%	-	-	3%	2%	-	10%	-	3%	-
3	4%	6%	-	6%	9%	-	2%	3%	-	3%	-	3%	-
2	4%	11%	9%	4%	9%	13%	1%	1%	11%	3%	-	3%	-
1	2%	5%	-	3%	-	13%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
0	7%	21%	23%	9%	9%	-	1%	1%	-	3%	3%	3%	33%
Total 4-0	21%	49%	41%	28%	27%	25%	8%	7%	11%	21%	3%	12%	33%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses. Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

5.4. Ease of Taking Public Transport – By Campus Over Time

Note: This question was asked at AUT City and University of Auckland City campuses in 2008 and 2010 but using a 5 point scale (very easy to difficult). For purposes of comparison, ratings from the 2014 survey onwards have been grouped as follows: ratings of 9-10 = very easy, 7-8 = quite easy, 5-6 = just okay, 3-4 = not so easy, 0-2 = difficult.

- The share of respondents from **AUT City campus** rating the ease of taking public transport to the campus positively (very easy/quite easy or a rating of 7-10) has increased from 74% in 2016, to 78% in 2018. However it should be noted that this change in overall positive ratings is not a statistically significant increase.
- Overall positive ratings (very easy/quite easy or a rating of 7-10) from **Auckland University City** campus students have increased significantly this measure (up from 67% in the 2016 survey, to 79% in 2018), while ratings of 9-10/very easy have increased slightly, but not statistically significantly (up from 28% in 2016, to 35%).

Table 5.4: Easy to take PT to this Campus – By Campus Over Time (%)

Rating from 10-0 / 5 point scale from Very easy to Difficult	AUT City Students					UoA City Students				
	2008 (n=554)	2010 (n=423)	2014 (n=195)	2016 (n=203)	2018 (n=200)	2008 (n=611)	2010 (n=423)	2014 (n=206)	2016 (n=214)	2018 (n=221)
Very easy (9-10)	26%	27%	43%	35%	43%	30%	28%	33%	28%	35%
Quite easy (7-8)	38%	40%	30%	39%	35%	32%	40%	36%	39%	44%
Total 7-10 (quite easy/very easy)	64%	67%	73%	74%	78%	62%	68%	69%	67%	79%
Just okay (5-6)	25%	27%	15%	16%	16%	21%	27%	18%	17%	13%
Not so easy (3-4)	5%	4%	7%	6%	5%	6%	4%	5%	10%	5%
Difficult (0-2)	4%	3%	5%	3%	3%	9%	3%	7%	6%	4%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly higher share of responses when compared to the previous measure. Red highlighting indicates a significantly lower share of responses.

5.5. Recommend Public Transport to Other Students

Recommending of Public Transport to Other Students – By Campus

- More than three quarters of students (77%) stated that they would recommend public transport to other students, giving a rating of 6 or more, including 54% who gave a rating between 8 and 10, and a quarter of students (25%) giving the highest possible 'top box' rating of 10.
- Students significantly more likely to recommend public transport are those surveyed at University of Auckland City (85% rating 6-10; 61% rating 8-10), AUT City (84% rating 6-10; 66% rating 8-10), and MIT Manukau campuses (63% rating 8-10). Although not statistically significantly more likely to recommend public transport overall, MIT Ōtara students were significantly more likely to give a rating of 10 *strongly agree* (33%).
- In contrast, Massey students were significantly more likely to give a rating of 0-4 (19%).

Net Promoter Scores (NPS) have been calculated by subtracting the percentage of Detractors (those giving a score of 0-6) from the percentage of Promoters (those giving a score of 9 or 10).

- Overall, in 2018 students across all campuses had a net promoter score of +3, which is a significant increase when compared with the total NPS for 2018 (NPS of -8). However the scores varied across the campuses. Students at MIT Manukau (+21), AUT City (+17), University of Auckland City (+17) and MAINZ (+12) had the highest net promoter scores, indicating a high share of promoters. In contrast, Massey (-29), AUT South (-13), AUT North (-9) and Unitec Mt Albert (-5) all had negative net promoter scores, indicating a higher share of detractors.
- Overall, campuses closer to the CBD had the higher net promoter scores (with a score of +16 for the CBD campuses), followed by the CBD fringe campuses (+9), while overall the non-CBD campuses had a negative NPS (-5). *However it should be noted that the only non-CBD campus to have a positive NPS (MIT Manukau – NPS of +21) actually had the highest NPS of all campuses.*
- Current users of Public transport unsurprisingly had the higher net promoter scores, including those students whose main mode of travel was the train (NPS +26), ferry (NPS +25) and bus (NPS +15), as did those who currently mainly walk or run to campus (NPS +24).
- In contrast, Net Promoter Scores were lowest among students who use cars - either as a driver with passengers (NPS -68), a driver alone (NPS -27), a passenger who was dropped off (NPS -14) or a passenger in a car parked nearby (NPS -10) – as well as those who travel by motorcycle/scooter (NPS -25). All these groups have a high level of detractors and low level of promoters.

Table 5.5: Recommend Public Transport to Other Students by Campus(%)

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2016 (n=2,028)	Total 2018 (n=2,103)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=213)	AUT South (n=152)	AUT North (n=203)	UoA City (n=231)	UoA Newmarket (n=138)	UoA Grafton (n=234)	Massey Albany (n=220)	MIT Manukau (n=189)	MIT Ōtara (n=192)	MAINZ City (n=104)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=227)
10	17%	25% ↑	27%	24%	25%	27%	24%	20%	15%	31%	33%	32%	26%
9	12%	9% ↓	13%	1%	6%	12%	15%	14%	6%	14%	6%	8%	8%
8	17%	19%	26%	23%	16%	22%	20%	21%	16%	19%	17%	20%	15%
Total 8-10	47%	54%↑	66%	49%	47%	61%	59%	55%	36%	63%	56%	60%	50%
7	16%	14%	11%	13%	12%	18%	11%	21%	16%	14%	10%	13%	11%
6	8%	9%	7%	10%	10%	6%	9%	9%	13%	5%	8%	7%	9%
Total 6-10	71%	77%↑	84%	71%	70%	85%	79%	85%	64%	82%	75%	79%	70%
5	15%	14%	11%	17%	20%	9%	11%	8%	17%	11%	16%	14%	18%
4	5%	2% ↓	1%	5%	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%	3%	4%	4%
3	4%	2% ↓	1%	3%	3%	2%	1%	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%	3%
2	3%	2% ↓	2%	1%	2%	<1%	2%	1%	4%	2%	2%	2%	2%
1	2%	1% ↓	1%	-	-	<1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-	1%
0	1%	3% ↑	1%	3%	3%	3%	2%	1%	8%	2%	2%	1%	3%
Total 4-0	14%	10%↓	6%	12%	10%	6%	10%	7%	19%	8%	10%	8%	12%
Net Promoter Score	-8	+3↑	+17	-13	-9	+17	+8	+9	-29	+21	+5	+12	-5

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%. Net Promoter score = Promoters (ratings of 9+10) – Detractors (ratings of 0-6).

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

Table 5.6: Likelihood to recommend to other students – by area (%)

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2016 (n=2,028)	Total 2018 (n=2,103)	CBD Campuses (n=551)	City fringe campuses (n=372)	Non-CBD campuses (n=1,183)
10	17%	25%↑	28%	21%	25%
9	12%	9%↓	11%	14%	7%
8	17%	19%	23%	21%	17%
Total 8-10	47%	54%↑	62%	55%	48%
7	16%	14%	14%	18%	13%
6	8%	9%	6%	9%	9%
Total 6-10	71%	77%↑	83%	83%	72%
5	15%	14%	11%	9%	17%
4	5%	2%↓	2%	2%	3%
3	4%	2%↓	2%	2%	3%
2	3%	2%↓	1%	2%	2%
1	2%	1%↓	<1%	1%	1%
0	1%	3%↑	2%	2%	4%
Total 4-0	14%	10%↓	6%	8%	12%
Net Promoter Score	-8	+3↑	+16	+9	-5

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

Overall 54% of respondents gave a rating of 8-10. Those significantly more likely to give a rating of 8-10 are...

- CBD campuses (62%)
- common PT users (61%)
- first year students (60%)
- post-graduate students (59%)

Overall 10% of respondents gave a rating of 0-4. Those significantly more likely to give a rating of 0-4 are...

- occasional (13%) and non-PT users (22%)
- non-CBD campuses (12%)

Table 5.7: Likelihood to recommend – by main mode used (%)

Rating from 10-0 (10 = “Strongly agree”)	Total 2016 (n=2,028)	Total 2018 (n=2,103)	Main Mode											
			Drove a car (n=530)	Drove Others (n=22)	Passenger in a car (dropped off) (n=75)	Passenger in a car (parked nearby) (n=10)	Motorcycle/ scooter (n=16)	AT Bus (n=724)	Train (n=253)	Ferry (n=8)	Uni Shuttle (n=31)	Cycle (n=29)	Walk/ Run (n=234)	Taxi/ Uber (n=4)
10	17%	25%↑	21%	-	23%	30%	6%	27%	34%	50%	19%	14%	33%	25%
9	12%	9%↓	3%	5%	5%	-	-	12%	14%	-	13%	17%	12%	25%
8	17%	19%	15%	23%	9%	20%	31%	24%	18%	25%	19%	24%	19%	-
Total 8-10	47%	54%↑	39%	27%	37%	50%	38%	62%	66%	75%	52%	55%	63%	50%
7	16%	14%	11%	-	21%	10%	31%	14%	13%	-	16%	10%	17%	-
6	8%	9%	8%	9%	15%	20%	-	9%	6%	-	3%	14%	6%	25%
Total 6-10	71%	77%↑	57%	36%	73%	80%	69%	86%	85%	75%	71%	79%	86%	75%
5	15%	14%	24%	23%	12%	-	19%	9%	11%	13%	23%	14%	8%	25%
4	5%	2%↓	4%	23%	3%	-	-	1%	2%	-	-	3%	2%	-
3	4%	2%↓	5%	-	4%	20%	6%	1%	<1%	-	3%	3%	<1%	-
2	3%	2%↓	3%	5%	5%	-	-	1%	1%	-	3%	-	1%	-
1	2%	1%↓	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	<1%	-	-	-	<1%	-
0	1%	3%↑	6%	14%	3%	-	6%	1%	1%	13%	-	-	2%	-
Total 4-0	14%	10%↓	19%	41%	15%	20%	13%	6%	4%	13%	7%	7%	6%	-
Net Promotor Score	-8	+3↑	-27	-68	-13	-10	-25	+15	+26	+25	0	-3	+24	0

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

5.8. Suggestions for Improvements to Public Transport

Suggestions for Improvements to Public Transport – By Campus

- One in five (21%), stated increased frequency of services would make using public transport to or from campus easier and more convenient. More direct routes (11%) and having more reliable services (9%) were also commonly mentioned.
- Students at University of Auckland Newmarket and AUT North were significantly more likely to suggest more frequent services (31% University of Auckland Newmarket; 28% AUT North). AUT North students were also significantly more likely to suggest that services need to be more reliable/on time (12%).
- Significantly more students at AUT South and AUT City suggested more direct routes or shorter trips (23% AUT South; 16% AUT City). AUT City students were also significantly more likely to suggest the need for stops closer to their home or campus (13%)
- Students from both University of Auckland Grafton and AUT City were significantly more likely to say they will never travel by public transport (12% University of Auckland Grafton; 10% AUT City).
- Massey (45%) and MIT Manukau (41%) were both significantly more likely to say they have no suggestions for improvement.
- When compared with the Total result for 2016, there has been a significant decline in the share of students suggesting each of the most commonly mentioned suggestions, and a significant increase in the share of students with either no suggestions and in the share stating they would never travel by public transport.

Table 5.8: Easier to use PT to or from this campus (%)

What would make it easier and more convenient?	Total 2016 (n=1,274)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=214)	AUT City (n=158)	AUT South (n=213)	AUT North (n=232)	UoA City (n=143)	UoA Newmarket (n=236)	UoA Grafton (n=227)	Massey Albany (n=190)	MIT Manukau (n=208)	MIT Ōtara (n=105)	MAINZ City (n=231)
More frequent services	25%	21%↓	22%	10%	20%	28%	24%	31%	23%	18%	13%	12%	20%
More direct routes (shorter trips)	15%	11%↓	8%	16%	23%	4%	10%	9%	14%	7%	11%	6%	10%
On time/reliable	13%	9%↓	7%	6%	4%	12%	13%	11%	12%	7%	5%	8%	9%
Cheaper	11%	8%↓	7%	10%	7%	9%	4%	12%	5%	4%	6%	12%	10%
Stops closer to home/campus	8%	8%	7%	13%	10%	5%	5%	7%	10%	2%	6%	10%	10%
Increase/improve network in general	6%	5%	3%	1%	7%	7%	4%	5%	4%	7%	5%	7%	7%
I would never travel here by public transport	2%	5%↑	1%	10%	6%	1%	2%	2%	12%	1%	7%	1%	6%
No suggestions	20%	30%↑	34%	36%	20%	30%	29%	22%	21%	45%	41%	29%	23%

Note: Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Showing responses mentioned by 3% or more people.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly lower share suggesting an improvement when compared to results for all campuses. Red highlighting indicates a higher share.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

5.9. Suggestions for Improvements to Public Transport – By Current PT Use

- Common users of public transport were significantly more likely to suggest increased frequency (24%) and that services need to be more reliable/on time (10%).
- Occasional users were significantly more likely to suggest more direct routes (13%) or having stops closer to home/campus (11%).
- Unsurprisingly, non-public transport users (19%) and occasional users (7%) were significantly more likely to say they would never travel here by public transport.

Table 5.9: Easier to use PT to or from this campus – By Current PT Use (%)

	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Use PT Commonly (n=1,287)	Use PT Occasionally (n=575)	Non PT Users (n=295)
More frequent services	25%	21%↓	24%	16%	12%
More direct routes (shorter trips)	15%	11%↓	10%	13%	11%
On time/reliable	13%	9%↓	10%	7%	3%
Cheaper	11%	8%↓	8%	7%	8%
Stops closer to home/campus	8%	8%	6%	11%	8%
Increase/improve network in general	6%	5%	5%	5%	7%
I would never travel here by public transport	2%	5%↑	0%	7%	19%
No suggestions	20%	30%↑	30%	30%	26%

Note: Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Showing responses mentioned by 3% or more people.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly low share suggesting an improvement when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a high share

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

5.10. Perceptions of Public Transport in General – Motivations and Barriers

Regardless of whether students currently use public transport or not, all respondents were asked what the best reasons and biggest barriers were for using public transport for students in general.

Barriers to Using Public Transport – By Campus

- The most commonly mentioned barrier to using public transport to get to campus was a perception that public transport is not cheaper or does not save money (27%) and was mentioned significantly more by students at MAINZ (42%) and AUT City (33%).
- The next most commonly mentioned barrier is that services are not frequent enough (25%) which was significantly more common among University of Auckland Grafton students (36%).
- One in five (21%) students felt that services are not direct enough and this was more commonly mentioned by North Shore campuses – 29% of students from both Massey and AUT North mentioned this (which is significantly higher than all other campuses).
- Other significant differences by campus include:
 - AUT South and North students were significantly more likely to say that other options are faster (37% South and 28% North).
 - Overcrowding on public transport was mentioned significantly more often by AUT City (20%), University of Auckland City (19%) and University of Auckland Grafton (18%) students.
 - Students at AUT North (16%), University of Auckland City (13%) and Massey (13%) were significantly more likely to say that public transport is either not available to them or unrealistic.
- When compared with the total results for 2016, the most notable change has been the significant decline in the share stating that using public transport is not cheaper than alternative options – down from 45% in 2016, to 27%.
- There have also been significant declines in the shares commenting that public transport is unreliable (down from 29%, to 18%) and that public transport is overcrowded (down from 23%, to 10%).
- Also of note have been the significant increase in the share stating that there are no barriers to using public transport (up significantly from 1% in 2016, to 5% in 2018) and in the share stating they *don't know* (up from 4%, to 9%).

Table 5.10: Perceptions of Public Transport (%)

	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,155)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=188)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
Does not save money/not cheaper	45%	27%↓	33%	29%	29%	28%	29%	28%	24%	20%	23%	42%	23%
Not frequent enough	27%	25%	24%	18%	19%	30%	30%	36%	27%	26%	19%	16%	19%
Services are not direct enough	23%	21%	11%	26%	29%	16%	20%	25%	29%	18%	22%	17%	19%
Other options are faster	19%	20%	17%	37%	28%	13%	22%	17%	19%	20%	18%	9%	16%
PT Unreliable	29%	18%↓	19%	18%	18%	20%	22%	23%	19%	11%	15%	11%	20%
PT overcrowded	23%	10%↓	20%	3%	6%	19%	9%	18%	2%	1%	6%	11%	10%
PT is not available/ unrealistic	8%	8%	7%	3%	16%	13%	3%	3%	13%	3%	3%	3%	10%
Not enough stops/too far from home/campus	7%	7%	8%	9%	4%	8%	5%	9%	4%	8%	5%	7%	8%
Don't know	4%	9%↑	10%	7%	5%	12%	13%	4%	8%	15%	11%	10%	9%
NO barriers	1%	5%↑	2%	1%	1%	3%	6%	3%	5%	10%	7%	11%	8%

Note: Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%. Showing responses mentioned by 3% or more people.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly low share mentioning a barrier when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a high share

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

Barriers to Using Public Transport – By Current Use of PT

- While the key barriers to using public transport are similar across the current user groups, occasional users are significantly more likely to mention that other options are faster the public transport (22%), while current public transport users are significantly more likely to mention overcrowding on public transport as a barrier to use (12%).

Table 5.11: Biggest Barriers to using PT to get to this campus – By Current PT Use (%)

Barriers to using PT to get to this campus	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,155)	Use PT Commonly (n=1,285)	Use PT Occasionally (n=575)	Non PT Users (n=295)
Does not save money/not cheaper	45%	27%↓	28%	26%	26%
Not frequent enough	27%	25%	26%	24%	21%
Services are not direct enough	23%	21%	20%	24%	23%
Other options are faster	19%	20%	18%	22%	22%
PT Unreliable	29%	18%↓	17%	19%	22%
PT overcrowded	23%	10%↓	12%	7%	5%
PT is not available/ unrealistic	8%	8%	7%	9%	9%
Not enough stops/too far from home/campus	7%	7%	8%	6%	5%
Don't know	4%	9%↑	9%	9%	9%
NO barriers	1%	5%↑	5%	5%	4%

Note: Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Showing responses mentioned by 3% or more people.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly low share mentioning a barrier when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a high share

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

Barriers to Using Public Transport – By Main Mode

- Of public transport users, train users were significantly more likely to say that cost is a barrier to using public transport (33%), bus users were significantly more likely to mention frequency of services as a barrier (28%) or overcrowding on public transport (13%).
- Students who walk or run to campus are significantly more likely to say that public transport is unreliable (24%).
- Students who currently drive alone in a car were significantly more likely to mention services not being direct enough (29%), other options being faster (26%) and public transport being either unreliable or unrealistic (10%).

Table 5.12: Biggest Barriers to using PT to get to this campus – By main mode of transport (%)

Barriers to using PT to get to this campus	Total 2016 (n=2,028)	Total 2018 (n=2,143)	Main Mode											
			Drove a car (n=551)	Drove Others (n=23)	Passenger in a car (dropped off) (n=79)	Passenger in a car (parked nearby) (n=11)	Motorcycle /scooter (n=16)	AT Bus (n=728)	Train (n=256)	Ferry (n=9)	Uni Shuttle (n=31)	Cycle (n=31)	Walk/ Run (n=237)	Taxi/ Uber (n=4)
Does not save money/not cheaper	45%	27%↓	25%	29%	24%	64%	25%	26%	33%	33%	19%	36%	31%	-
Not frequent enough	27%	25%	24%	21%	16%	18%	25%	28%	17%	22%	19%	26%	23%	50%
Services are not direct enough	23%	21%	29%	25%	16%	36%	13%	19%	18%	11%	13%	16%	12%	25%
Other options are faster	19%	20%	26%	29%	19%	18%	19%	18%	14%	-	13%	19%	16%	-
PT Unreliable	29%	18%↓	18%	25%	19%	18%	13%	18%	12%	-	13%	23%	24%	-
PT overcrowded	23%	10%↓	4%	21%	5%	-	13%	13%	11%	11%	3%	13%	12%	-
PT is not available/ unrealistic	8%	8%	10%	8%	8%	-	-	7%	4%	-	10%	13%	7%	25%

Not enough stops/too far from home/campus	7%	7%	7%	4%	4%	-	6%	8%	9%	-	7%	-	4%	-
Don't know	4%	9%↑	8%	4%	14%	-	6%	9%	15%	33%	13%	3%	10%	25%
NO barriers	1%	5%↑	3%	4%	6%	9%	6%	6%	4%	-	-	3%	8%	-

Note: Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Showing responses mentioned by 3% or more people.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly low share mentioning a barrier when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a high share

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

6. TERTIARY STUDENT CONCESSION

6.1. Ease of Getting Tertiary Student Discounts for Public Transport

- Seventy eight percent of students agreed, to some extent (giving a rating of 6-10), that it is easy to get tertiary student discounts for public transport, including 58% rating 8-10, of which 32% giving the highest 'top box' rating of 10 (*strongly agreeing*). Conversely, 13% disagreed, giving a rating of 4 or less.
- Unitec students were significantly more likely to give a positive rating when compared with all campuses overall – with 65% giving a rating of 8-10.
- In contrast, students at AUT South and Massey Albany were significantly less likely to give a positive rating (49% of AUT South students and 50% of Massey students gave a rating of 8-10).
- When compared with other modes of transport used, cyclists were significantly more likely to respond with a negative rating (27% giving a rating of 0-4).
- When compared with total results for 2016, perceptions of the ease of getting tertiary student discounts have declined significantly, including:
 - the share giving a rating of 6-10 down significantly from 95%, to 78%;
 - the share giving a rating of 8-10 down significantly from 86%, to 58%; and
 - the share giving a 'top box' rating of 10 down significantly from 55%, to 32%.

Table 6.1: It is easy to get tertiary student discounts for PT – by campus (%)

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2016 (n=1,878)	Total 2018 (n=2,021)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=206)	AUT South (n=137)	AUT North (n=198)	UoA City (n=226)	UoA Newmarket (n=139)	UoA Grafton (n=231)	Massey Albany (n=205)	MIT Manukau (n=180)	MIT Ōtara (n=181)	MAINZ City (n=103)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=215)
10	23%	32%↑	32%	26%	31%	30%	30%	29%	27%	40%	37%	30%	40%
9	12%	10%↓	11%	7%	9%	13%	12%	10%	8%	12%	9%	9%	10%
8	15%	16%	20%	16%	20%	13%	19%	16%	15%	13%	17%	11%	15%
Total 8-10	50%	58%↑	64%	49%	60%	56%	60%	55%	50%	64%	63%	50%	65%
7	12%	12%	10%	15%	13%	15%	10%	9%	13%	10%	11%	18%	10%
6	7%	8%	7%	9%	7%	8%	4%	11%	8%	7%	9%	11%	4%
Total 6-10	69%	78%↑	81%	73%	80%	78%	74%	75%	71%	82%	83%	79%	80%
5	11%	9%↓	8%	15%	7%	8%	12%	10%	11%	10%	5%	10%	7%
4	6%	4%↓	4%	2%	7%	4%	6%	5%	4%	3%	4%	3%	3%
3	6%	4%↓	3%	7%	2%	4%	2%	5%	6%	3%	2%	4%	4%
2	3%	2%↓	2%	-	2%	3%	4%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%
1	3%	1%↓	1%	-	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
0	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%	4%
Total 4-0	20%	13%↓	11%	12%	14%	14%	14%	16%	18%	8%	12%	12%	13%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

Table 6.2: It is easy to get tertiary student discounts for PT – by modes (%)

Rating from 10-0 (10 = “Strongly agree”)	Total 2016 (n=1,878)	Total 2018 (n=2,021)	Main Mode											
			Drove a car (n=490)	Drove Others (n=22)	Passenger in a car (dropped off) (n=70)	Passenger in a car (parked nearby) (n=11)	Motorcycle/scooter (n=14)	AT Bus (n=710)	Train (n=251)	Ferry (n=9)	Uni Shuttle (n=28)	Cycle (n=30)	Walk/Run (n=223)	Taxi/Uber (n=2)
10	23%	32%↓	33%	23%	24%	27%	21%	34%	35%	22%	32%	17%	34%	50%
9	12%	10%↓	9%	9%	6%	9%	21%	10%	13%	-	4%	10%	10%	-
8	15%	16%	17%	9%	20%	36%	7%	16%	12%	22%	18%	17%	18%	-
Total 8-10	50%	58%↓	59%	41%	50%	73%	50%	60%	60%	44%	54%	43%	62%	50%
7	12%	12%↑	11%	14%	10%	9%	14%	11%	11%	22%	14%	10%	14%	-
6	7%	8%↑	6%	-	17%	9%	7%	8%	9%	-	14%	7%	7%	-
Total 6-10	69%	78%↓	76%	55%	77%	91%	71%	79%	80%	67%	82%	60%	82%	50%
5	11%	9%↑	10%	14%	11%	9%	7%	9%	8%	11%	7%	13%	8%	-
4	6%	4%↑	4%	9%	3%	-	7%	5%	4%	-	7%	3%	3%	-
3	6%	4%↑	5%	14%	9%	-	-	3%	3%	11%	-	3%	2%	50%
2	3%	2%↑	2%	9%	-	-	7%	2%	2%	-	4%	10%	3%	-
1	3%	1%↑	1%	-	-	-	-	1%	<1%	-	-	3%	1%	-
0	2%	2%↑	3%	-	-	-	7%	2%	3%	11%	-	7%	2%	-
Total 4-0	20%	13%↑	14%	32%	11%	-	21%	13%	12%	22%	11%	27%	10%	50%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results

Overall 55% of respondents gave a rating of 8-10. Those significantly more likely to give a rating of 8-10 are...

- first year students (63%)

Overall 13% of respondents gave a rating of 0-4. Those significantly more likely to give a rating of 0-4 are...

- third year students (19%)

6.3. Recommending the HOP Card to Students

- Ninety six per cent of students would recommend the AT HOP card to other students to some extent, including 89% who gave a rating of 8 or more and 68% who gave the highest 'top box' rating of 10.
- Only 2% would not recommend the AT HOP card (giving a recommendation rating of 4 or less).
- Overall MAINZ students were the most likely to recommend the AT HOP card, with all students surveyed (100%) giving a rating of at least 6 out of 10. Looking at ratings of 8+, although not statistically significant, students from MIT Manukau were most likely to recommend the AT HOP card (93% rating 8-10), while Unitec students were significantly less likely to recommend the AT HOP card (85% rating 8-10).
- All campuses have a very positive Net Promoter Scores, ranging from +79 for AUT City down to to +67 for Unitec and AUT South.
- When compared with the Total 2016 results, there has been a significant increase in the share of students giving the highest 'top box' recommendation rating of 10 (up from 55% in 2016, to 68% in 2018). This significant increase has led to a significant increase in the Net Promoter Score – up from +62 in 2016, to +74 in 2018. So despite the significant declines in ratings for the ease of getting tertiary student discounts this measure, students are significantly more likely to be promoters of the AT HOP Card.

Table 6.3: Recommend the AT HOP card to other students (%)

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2016 (n=1,987)	Total 2018 (n=2,122)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=213)	AUT South (n=150)	AUT North (n=210)	UoA City (n=230)	UoA Newmarket (n=142)	UoA Grafton (n=234)	Massey Albany (n=223)	MIT Manukau (n=189)	MIT Ōtara (n=200)	MAINZ City (n=104)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=227)
10	55%	68%↑	68%	65%	66%	69%	67%	66%	66%	72%	73%	73%	66%
9	16%	12%↓	14%	10%	14%	12%	11%	16%	10%	10%	10%	5%	9%
8	15%	10%↓	9%	12%	9%	10%	12%	9%	11%	11%	6%	10%	11%
Total 8-10	86%	89%↑	90%	87%	90%	91%	90%	91%	87%	93%	89%	86%	85%
7	6%	5%	7%	6%	5%	4%	4%	4%	5%	3%	6%	10%	7%
6	3%	2%↓	1%	3%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%	4%
Total 6-10	95%	96%	99%	95%	96%	97%	96%	97%	94%	96%	96%	100%	96%
5	3%	2%↓	1%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	-	2%
4	1%	<1%↓	1%	1%	1%	-	1%	1%	<1%	1%	-	-	-
3	1%	<1%↓	-	-	-	<1%	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	0%	<1%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	<1%	<1%	1%	-	-	-
1	0%	<1%	-	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1%
0	0%	1%↑	-	1%	1%	<1%	-	-	2%	-	2%	-	1%
Total 4-0	2%	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%	1%	2%	-	2%
Net Promoter Score	+62	+74↑	+79	+67	+75	+77	+73	+77	+69	+77	+77	+75	+67

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%. Net Promoter score = (ratings of 9+10) – (ratings of 0-6).

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

Overall 89% of respondents gave a rating of 8-10.
 Those significantly more likely to give a rating of 8-10 are...

- post-graduate students (93%)
- common PT users (91%)

Overall 2% of respondents gave a rating of 0-4. Those significantly more likely to give a rating of 0-4 are...

- students in fifth year or higher (10%)
- non-PT users (4%)

6.4. Possession of an AT HOP Card

Possession of AT HOP card – by Campus

- The majority of respondents either currently have an AT HOP card (89%) or intend to get one (5%). This leaves only a small proportion of students who either do not intend to get an AT HOP card (6%) or are unaware of the card (<1%).
- Students at University of Auckland Newmarket (99%) Grafton (98%) and City (97%) campuses as well as students at AUT City campus (96%), are all significantly more likely to own a HOP card.
- AUT South (87%), MIT Ōtara (88%), Massey (89%), and Unitec (89%) are all significantly less likely to currently own/intend to get an AT HOP card.
- As well as being less likely to own or intend to get an AT HOP card, students at South Auckland campuses are the only students who are unaware of the AT HOP card - with 3% at AUT South, 1% at MIT Manukau and 1% at MIT Ōtara unaware (AUT South students are significantly more likely to be unaware than all other campuses).
- Overall students at CBD campuses (98%) and CBD fringe campuses (99%) are significantly more likely to own or intend to get an AT HOP card, while non-CBD campuses are significantly less likely (90%).
- When compared with ownership levels of an AT HOP Card in 2016, total ownership levels across all campuses have increased significantly – up from 79%, to 89%.

Table 6.4: Possession of AT HOP card by campus (%)

Do you currently have an AT HOP card?	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
Yes	79%	89% ↑	96%	73%	91%	97%	99%	98%	85%	90%	75%	92%	84%
No, but intend to get one	7%	5% ↓	2%	15%	2%	2%	1%	1%	5%	4%	13%	2%	6%
Total potential (have + intend)	86%	94%↑	99%	87%	92%	99%	99%	98%	89%	93%	88%	94%	89%
No, and do not intend to get one	13%	6% ↓	1%	10%	8%	1%	1%	2%	11%	6%	12%	6%	11%
Do not know what card is	1%	<1% ↓	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	1%	1%	-	-

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses. Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

Table 6.5: Possession of AT HOP card by area (%)

Do you currently have an AT HOP card?	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	CBD Campuses 2018 (n=551)	City fringe campuses 2018 (n=379)	Non-CBD campuses 2018 (n=1227)
Yes	79%	89% ↑	96%	98%	83%
No, but intend to get one	7%	5% ↓	2%	1%	7%
Total potential (have + intend)	86%	94%↑	98%	99%	90%
No, and do not intend to get one	13%	6% ↓	2%	1%	10%
Do not know what card is	1%	<1% ↓	-	-	1%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

Overall 89% of respondents currently have an AT HOP card.

Those significantly more likely are...

- common PT users (98%)
- at CBD fringe (98%) or CBD campuses (96%)
- aged 20-24 (91%)
- *note also that students aged 15-17 are more likely to not have an AT HOP card but do intend to get one (11%)*

Overall 6% of respondents do not have an AT HOP card and do not intend to get one..

Those significantly more likely are...

- non-PT users (32%)
- aged 30-39 (11%) or over 35 (24%)
- non-CBD campuses (10%)

6.6. Possession of AT HOP Card – by Main Mode

- Public transport users, including those students who catch train (100%) and the bus (99%) as their main form of transport to and from the campus, are significantly more likely to currently have an AT Hop card. Although not statistically significant, 100% of ferry users also currently have an AT HOP card.
- Students who use a car, either by driving themselves and others (21%) or driving alone (17%), or as a passenger who is dropped off (19%) were most likely to not intend to get an AT HOP card. Those who drove alone are also the only group who are not aware of the AT HOP card (1%).

Table 6.6: Possession of AT HOP card by main mode of transport(%)

Do you currently have an AT HOP card?	Total 2016 (n=2,028)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Drove alone in car (n=561)	Drove myself and others in car (n=24)	Passenger in car (dropped off) (n=80)	Passenger in car (parked elsewhere) (n=11)	Motorbike / scooter (n=16)	Public bus (n=728)	Train (n=257)	Ferry (n=9)	Uni shuttle bus (n=31)	Cycle (n=31)	Walk /run (n=238)	Taxi/ Uber (n=4)
Yes	79%	89% ↑	72%	75%	68%	91%	88%	99%	100%	100%	84%	90%	91%	100%
No, but intend to get one	7%	5% ↓	9%	4%	14%	9%	6%	1%	-	-	13%	-	6%	-
Total potential (have + intend)	86%	94%↑	82%	79%	81%	100%	94%	100%	100%	100%	97%	90%	97%	100%
No, and do not intend to get one	13%	6% ↓	17%	21%	19%	-	6%	<1%	<1%	-	3%	10%	3%	-
Do not know what card is	1%	<1% ↓	1%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

6.7. Student Discount/Concession Application

Applied for Tertiary Discount – by Campus

- Seven in ten (69%) students with an AT HOP card had applied for a student discount/concession and a further 21% intend to apply for a discount.
- Students at AUT City campus (80%) and at University of Auckland Newmarket (79%), City (78%) and Grafton (76%) campuses were all significantly more likely to have applied for a student concession, while around a third of students at MIT Ōtara (34%) and AUT South (31%) mentioned that they intend to get a student concession.
- In contrast, students at Massey were significantly more likely to not have a concession (only 53% do) and say they do not intend to get one (21%).

Table 6.7: Tertiary Discounts/Concessions (%)

Note: This question was only asked of those who have a HOP Card

Have you applied for the tertiary student concession/discount?	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=1918)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=206)	AUT South (n=115)	AUT North (n=193)	UoA City (n=226)	UoA Newmarke t (n=141)	UoA Grafton (n=230)	Massey Albany (n=192)	MIT Manukau (n=170)	MIT Ōtara (n=155)	MAINZ City (n=97)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=193)
Yes	73%	69%↓	80%	53%	66%	78%	79%	76%	53%	73%	53%	67%	66%
No, but intend to get one	17%	21%↑	12%	31%	21%	16%	16%	19%	26%	17%	34%	29%	25%
Total potential (have + intend)	91%	90%	92%	84%	87%	94%	94%	95%	78%	89%	86%	96%	92%
No, and do not intend to get one	9%	10%	7%	14%	12%	5%	6%	5%	21%	10%	13%	4%	8%
Do not know what they are	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	-	-	1%	1%	1%	-	1%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses. Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

Overall 69% of respondents currently have an AT HOP card discount. Those significantly more likely are...

- common PT users (77%)
- students at CBD (77%) & CBD fringe campuses (77%)
- postgraduate students (74%)
- first year students (72%)

Overall 10% of respondents do not have an AT HOP card discount and do not intend to get one..

Those significantly more likely are...

- non-users (35%) & occasional PT users (15%)
- fifth year or higher (24%)
- non-CBD campuses (13%)

6.8. Applied for Tertiary Discount – by Main Mode

- Not surprisingly, when compared with all other modes, significantly more students who catch train (79%) or the bus (78%) as their main mode of travel to campus have already applied for an AT HOP tertiary discount/concession. Conversely, the share who drive alone in a car are significantly less likely to have applied for a discount (47%).
- Those who drive alone are also significantly more likely to not intend to get an AT HOP card discount/concession (24%).

Table 6.8: Tertiary Discounts/Concessions (%)

Note: This question was only asked of those who have a HOP Card

Do you currently have an AT HOP card?	Total 2016 <i>(n=2,028)</i>	Total 2018 <i>(n=1,918)</i>	Drove alone in car <i>(n=406)</i>	Drove myself and others in car <i>(n=18)</i>	Passenger in car (dropped off) <i>(n=54)</i>	Passenger in car (parked elsewhere) <i>(n=10)</i>	Motorbike / scooter <i>(n=14)</i>	Public bus <i>(n=717)</i>	Train <i>(n=256)</i>	Ferry <i>(n=9)</i>	Uni shuttle bus <i>(n=26)</i>	Cycle <i>(n=28)</i>	Walk /run <i>(n=217)</i>	Taxi/ Uber <i>(n=4)</i>
Yes	79%	69% ↓	47%	50%	57%	60%	43%	78%	79%	56%	69%	64%	68%	25%
No, but intend to get one	7%	21% ↑	28%	33%	24%	30%	21%	18%	18%	44%	27%	32%	22%	25%
Total potential (have + intend)	86%	90%	75%	83%	81%	90%	64%	96%	97%	100%	96%	96%	90%	50%
No, and do not intend to get one	13%	10%	24%	17%	17%	-	29%	4%	4%	-	4%	4%	10%	50%
Do not know what card is	1%	1%	1%	-	2%	10%	7%	<1%	-	-	-	-	1%	-

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

6.9. Suggestions for AT HOP Card

- Nearly three in five students have *no suggestions* for how the AT HOP card could be made more useful (46%), or said they *don't know* (12%).
- The most commonly mentioned improvements were to:
 - have better discounts/cheaper transport - 8% of all respondents; with significantly higher mentions from AUT City (13%) and University of Auckland City (12%);
 - make the concession process easier/quicker – 8% of all respondents;
 - link the HOP Card to a phone/bank card/electronic - 7% of all respondents; and
 - be able to use the card to *buy other things e.g. food, parking, printing* - 6% overall; significantly higher mentions from AUT South students 20%.
- When compared with Total 2016 results, there has been a significant increase in mention of a number of suggestions, including linking the AT HOP card to phone/bank card (up from 2%, to 7%), being able to use HOP Cards to buy other things (up from 2% to 6%), having text/mobile/app top up options (up from 2% to 5%), and having bonuses/discounts for travel and other items (up from 1%, to 2%).
- Also of note is that the share of respondents who no suggestions for how the AT Hop card could be improved has increased significantly (up from 26% in 2016, to 46%), while the share of respondents who said they don't know has declined significantly (down from 24%, to 12%).

Table 6.9: How Could AT HOP Card Be Made More Useful? (%)

	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
Better discount/cheaper	13%	8%↓	13%	3%	7%	12%	5%	8%	5%	7%	7%	11%	10%
Concession process made easier/quicker	11%	8%↓	7%	4%	9%	9%	11%	14%	12%	3%	2%	11%	5%
Link to phone/bank card/ electronic	2%	7%↑	10%	6%	8%	6%	8%	9%	8%	8%	2%	7%	8%
Use to buy other things E.g. food, parking, printing	2%	6%↑	4%	20%	3%	5%	8%	5%	3%	8%	5%	2%	7%
Easier to top up/more places	11%	5%↓	7%	3%	3%	7%	4%	8%	3%	1%	3%	7%	8%
Txt/mobile/app top up/more reliable	2%	5%↑	10%	2%	4%	7%	6%	7%	3%	3%	1%	9%	4%
Have top up/service centres on campus	6%	3%↓	1%	1%	5%	<1%	1%	5%	4%	1%	3%	2%	5%
Bonuses/discounts on travel and other items (i.e. points card)	1%	2%↑	1%	6%	-	1%	2%	1%	1%	5%	2%	1%	3%
No suggestions	26%	46%↑	41%	51%	46%	46%	47%	36%	47%	59%	58%	41%	39%
Don't know	24%	12%↓	14%	10%	12%	10%	11%	12%	12%	7%	14%	11%	14%

Note: Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Showing responses mentioned by 2% or more people.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly low share mentioning an improvement when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a high share

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

6.10. Source of Transport Information

- The most common source of transport information is the Auckland Transport website, with two out of five respondents (40%) mentioning they use the AT website. Around a third (32%) mention they use the Auckland Transport smartphone app, while 7% mentioned the Auckland Transport Customer Service Centres.
- Other than Auckland Transport sources, Google/Google Maps was commonly mentioned (32%), as was word of mouth from family or friends (14%).
- There are some notable variations of AT information sources across the campuses. Unitec students (52%) and AUT North (49%) students were significantly more likely to use the **AT website**, while University of Auckland Grafton (45%), Newmarket (43%), and City (38%) students were significantly more likely to use the **AT App**. In contrast, MIT Manukau students were significantly more likely to use the **AT customer service centres** (12%), while AUT South students are more likely to mention getting information from **AT HOP advertising**.
- Mention of other sources of information also varied by campus, with University of Auckland Newmarket (52%) and AUT City (35%) students significantly more likely to use Google (52%), and MIT Ōtara students more likely to mention getting information from their place of study (*NOTE: some of this is likely to be AT advertising/information*).
- First year students were significantly more likely to get their information via word of mouth (16%)
- Google/Google Maps use varied across different demographics and were significantly more likely to be used by several groups, including those studying at CBD fringe campuses (39%), post-graduate students (39%), students aged 25-29 (38%) or 30-39 (41%), male students (33%), and both occasional (33%) and non-PT users (35%).
- When compared with 2016 total results, there has been statistically significant increases in mention of the AT App (up from 24%, to 32%), advertising about public transport or HOP cards (up from 2%, to 3%) and emails from AT (up from 1%, to 2%).
- In contrast, use of the AT Website (down from 58%, to 40%) and At Customer Service Centres (down from 10%, to 7%) have decreased.

Table 6.10: Source of Transport Information (%)

Where do you get your transport information from?	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
AT website	58%	40%↓	38%	30%	49%	44%	44%	34%	46%	31%	27%	43%	52%
AT public transport app	24%	32%↑	30%	18%	32%	38%	43%	45%	30%	28%	21%	31%	30%
Google/Google Maps	30%	29%	35%	34%	23%	19%	52%	31%	27%	20%	27%	31%	29%
Word of mouth (friends/family)	9%	14%↑	9%	22%	12%	11%	11%	13%	12%	15%	21%	19%	13%
AT customer service centres (Eg. train and busway stations)	10%	7%↓	8%	4%	9%	4%	3%	4%	8%	12%	8%	8%	9%
From the university	7%	7%	7%	10%	7%	5%	4%	4%	7%	8%	10%	4%	8%
Advertising about public transport or AT HOP cards	2%	3%↑	2%	8%	4%	4%	1%	3%	3%	2%	5%	2%	5%
Emails from AT	-	2%↑	1%	1%	4%	1%	4%	3%	<1%	1%	1%	-	5%
NA – I don't seek travel information	1%	3%↑	2%	2%	1%	3%	-	2%	3%	2%	3%	4%	4%

Note: Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Showing responses mentioned by 2% or more people.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share mentioning a source of information when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a low share.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

7. CARPARKING/CAR POOLING

Note: Questions in this section were only asked of those who mentioned they drove/were a passenger in a vehicle (when asked what mode of transport they used) and those who had access to a vehicle to drive to the campus during weekdays (asked of those who had not mentioned driving during the mode of transport questions).

7.1. Easy to Find Parking Near Campus

- When asked about ease of finding parking near campus, of those who either use a car to get to campus or have access to a car, 47% disagree to some extent (ratings of 0-4), while a slightly smaller share (40%) agree to some extent (rated 6-10) including one in five (22%) who gave ratings of 8-10. Only 11% of all those who answered this question gave a 'top box' rating of 10.
- Students at MIT Manukau (75% giving a rating of 6+, including 51% giving a rating of 8+ and 29% giving a rating of 10), Unitec (66% rating 6+; 41% rating 8+, 18% giving a rating of 10), MIT Ōtara (64% 6+; 36% 8+, 20% giving a rating of 10) and AUT South (57% 6+) were significantly more likely to agree to some extent that parking is easy to find near the campus.
- In contrast, MAINZ (87%), University of Auckland Grafton (78%), AUT City (73%), University of Auckland City (72%), University of Auckland Newmarket (64%) and AUT North (60%) students were all significantly more likely to disagree to some extent (ratings from 0-4). This includes significantly higher shares giving a rating of zero (*strongly disagreeing*) at MAINZ (39%), AUT City (37%), University of Auckland Grafton (32%) and University of Auckland City (26%).
- Ratings vary by area, with 75% of students at CBD campuses disagreeing it is easy to find parking (which is significantly higher than the total), 73% of CBD fringe campuses (which is also significantly higher) and 32% of non-CBD campuses (which is significantly lower when compared to all students overall). Non-CBD campuses were also significantly more likely to respond positively (30% rating 8-10, 15% giving a 'top box' rating of 10).
- Overall, Total 2018 ratings across all campuses for the ease of parking are similar to those in 2016. The only notable significant change has been an increase in the share giving a rating of zero (up significantly from 9% in 2016, to 17%).

Table 7.1: Ease of finding parking near this campus (%)

Note: This question was only asked of those who mentioned they drove/were a passenger in a vehicle at or who had access to a vehicle

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2016 (n=1,369)	Total 2018 (n=1,274)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=106)	AUT South (n=124)	AUT North (n=149)	UoA City (n=101)	UoA Newmarket (n=73)	UoA Grafton (n=127)	Massey Albany (n=164)	MIT Manukau (n=91)	MIT Ōtara (n=153)	MAINZ City (n=46)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=140)
10	11%	11%	5%	11%	3%	5%	11%	2%	12%	29%	20%	2%	18%
9	6%	3%↓	1%	3%	2%	-	-	-	2%	7%	7%	-	5%
8	9%	8%	3%	8%	4%	-	7%	3%	10%	15%	9%	2%	18%
Total 8-10	25%	22%	9%	23%	9%	5%	18%	5%	25%	51%	36%	4%	41%
7	9%	10%	4%	18%	9%	7%	-	4%	12%	15%	14%	2%	13%
6	8%	9%	5%	17%	5%	4%	10%	6%	9%	9%	14%	-	12%
Total 6-10	43%	40%	17%	57%	34%	16%	27%	14%	46%	75%	64%	7%	66%
5	12%	13%	10%	21%	16%	12%	8%	8%	13%	8%	13%	7%	14%
4	9%	7%	5%	7%	9%	5%	14%	6%	7%	3%	5%	13%	5%
3	13%	9%↓	9%	4%	12%	15%	18%	12%	9%	3%	7%	9%	7%
2	9%	10%	12%	5%	11%	20%	12%	19%	9%	4%	3%	15%	3%
1	5%	5%	9%	3%	5%	7%	1%	9%	7%	-	1%	11%	1%
0	9%	17%↑	37%	2%	22%	26%	19%	32%	9%	7%	8%	39%	4%
Total 4-0	45%	47%	73%	22%	60%	72%	64%	78%	41%	18%	23%	87%	20%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses. Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

Table 7.2: Ease to find parking near this campus – by area (%)

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2016 (n=1,369)	Total 2018 (n=1,274)	CBD Campuses 2018 (n=253)	City fringe campuses 2018 (n=200)	Non-CBD campuses 2018 (n=821)
10	11%	11%	4%	5%	15%
9	6%	3%↓	<1%	-	4%
8	9%	8%	2%	5%	10%
Total 8-10	25%	22%	6%	10%	29%
7	9%	10%	5%	3%	13%
6	8%	9%	4%	7%	11%
Total 6-10	43%	40%	15%	19%	54%
5	12%	13%	10%	8%	15%
4	9%	7%	6%	9%	6%
3	13%	9%↓	12%	14%	7%
2	9%	10%	16%	17%	6%
1	5%	5%	9%	6%	3%
0	9%	17%↑	33%	28%	9%
Total 4-0	45%	47%	75%	73%	32%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses. Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

7.3. Parking Charges around Campus

- Overall, almost half (47%) of students disagree that parking charges are reasonable (giving a rating of 0-4), including 17% giving a rating of zero. In contrast, two in five (40%) agree to some extent (6-10), including 22% giving a rating of 8-10.
- Students at MIT Manukau (75% giving a rating of 6+; 51% at rating of 8+ and 29% a 'top box' rating of 10), Unitec (66% 6+; 41% 8+ and 18% a rating of 10) and MIT Ōtara (64% 6+; 36% 8+ and 20% a rating of 10) were all significantly more likely to agree that parking charges were reasonable and overall
- In contrast, students from MAINZ (87% rating 0-4; 39% rating 0), University of Auckland Grafton (78% rating 0-4; 32% rating 0), AUT City (73% rating 0-4; 37% rating 0), University of Auckland City (72% rating 0-4; 26% rating 0) and AUT North (60% rating 0-4) were significantly more likely to disagree that parking charges are reasonable.
- Across all students, a significantly higher proportion of students from CBD (75%) and CBD fringe (73%) campuses disagreed that parking charges are reasonable, while only a third (32%) of those studying at non-CBD campuses disagree.
- When compared with the total results from 2016, there has been a significant decline in the share giving a rating of 8-10 for parking changes (down from 29%, to 22%) and in the share giving a 'top box' rating of 10 (down from 16%, to 11%). There has also been a significant increase in the share giving a rating of zero (up from 12%, to 17%).

Table 7.3: Parking charges around this campus are reasonable – by campus (%)

Note: This question was only asked of those who mentioned they drove/were a passenger in a vehicle at or who had access to a vehicle

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2016 (n=1,230)	Total 2018 (n=1,274)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=106)	AUT South (n=124)	AUT North (n=149)	UoA City (n=101)	UoA Newmarke t (n=73)	UoA Grafton (n=127)	Massey Albany (n=164)	MIT Manukau (n=91)	MIT Ōtara (n=153)	MAINZ City (n=46)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=140)
10	16%	11%↓	5%	11%	3%	5%	11%	2%	12%	29%	20%	2%	18%
9	5%	3%↓	1%	3%	2%	-	-	-	2%	7%	7%	-	5%
8	8%	8%	3%	8%	4%	-	7%	3%	10%	15%	9%	2%	18%
Total 8-10	29%	22%↓	9%	23%	9%	5%	18%	5%	25%	51%	36%	4%	41%
7	5%	10%↑	4%	18%	9%	7%	-	4%	12%	15%	14%	2%	13%
6	7%	9%	5%	17%	5%	4%	10%	6%	9%	9%	14%	-	12%
Total 6-10	41%	40%	17%	57%	24%	16%	27%	14%	46%	75%	64%	7%	66%
5	12%	13%	10%	21%	16%	12%	8%	8%	13%	8%	13%	7%	14%
4	8%	7%	5%	7%	9%	5%	14%	6%	7%	3%	5%	13%	5%
3	10%	9%	9%	4%	12%	15%	18%	12%	9%	3%	7%	9%	7%
2	9%	10%	12%	5%	11%	20%	12%	19%	9%	4%	3%	15%	3%
1	8%	5%↓	9%	3%	5%	7%	1%	9%	7%	-	1%	11%	1%
0	12%	17%↑	37%	2%	22%	26%	19%	32%	9%	7%	8%	39%	4%
Total 4-0	47%	47%	73%	22%	60%	72%	64%	78%	41%	18%	23%	87%	20%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

Table 7.4: Parking charges around this campus are reasonable – by area (%)

Rating from 10-0 <i>10 being 'Strongly agree'</i>	Total 2016 (n=1,369)	Total 2018 (n=1,274)	CBD Campuses 2018 (n=253)	City fringe campuses 2018 (n=200)	Non-CBD campuses 2018 (n=821)
10	16%	11%↓	4%	5%	15%
9	5%	3%↓	<1%	-	4%
8	8%	8%	2%	5%	10%
Total 8-10	29%	22%↓	6%	10%	29%
7	5%	10%↑	5%	3%	13%
6	7%	9%	4%	7%	11%
Total 6-10	41%	40%	15%	19%	54%
5	12%	13%	10%	8%	15%
4	8%	7%	6%	9%	6%
3	10%	9%	12%	14%	7%
2	9%	10%	16%	17%	6%
1	8%	5%↓	9%	6%	3%
0	12%	17%↑	33%	28%	9%
Total 4-0	47%	47%	75%	73%	32%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

7.5. Making Carpooling Easier and more Convenient

- When asked what would make carpooling easier or more convenient, 9% of students said finding people who live nearby would make it easier, with a significantly higher share from AUT North (14%) as well as University of Auckland Grafton, Massey and Unitec campuses (all 13%) mentioning this.
- The second most mentioned improvements were to provide more parking (6%) - significantly higher among University of Auckland Grafton (17%) and MAINZ (11%) students - having a way to find people to carpool with (6%), and providing cheaper parking (4%) – significantly higher among MAINZ (12%), University of Auckland Grafton (9%) and University of Auckland City (8%) students.
- Overall, 37% of students said they have no suggestions and a further 13% said they would never carpool. Students from Unitec (26%) were significantly more likely to say they would never carpool.
- When compared with 2016, there has been a significant increase in the share of students suggesting the need for more carpooling lanes and more dedicated carpooling car-parks (both up from no mentions, to 2% in 2018).

Table 7.5: Suggestions for carpooling (%)

	Total 2016 (n=1,270)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
Finding people who live nearby	13%	9%↓	7%	5%	14%	7%	4%	13%	13%	4%	7%	5%	13%
More parking	10%	6%↓	8%	1%	4%	5%	6%	17%	5%	1%	1%	11%	4%
A way to find people to carpool with online or on phone	6%	6%	7%	9%	6%	5%	8%	6%	5%	5%	3%	4%	7%
Cheaper parking	8%	4%↓	6%	5%	2%	8%	4%	9%	<1%	4%	-	12%	<1%
Coordinating timetables/people	5%	2%↓	1%	3%	1%	2%	-	3%	2%	2%	1%	-	4%
Better traffic/More carpool lanes	-	2%↑	2%	2%	1%	4%	3%	5%	-	-	-	2%	1%
Free parking	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	4%	2%	<1%	1%	1%	3%	1%
More dedicated student parking/lot	-	2%↑	2%	-	-	1%	-	6%	-	1%	1%	7%	-
Knowing more people/carpooling with people I know	3%	2%	-	-	4%	4%	1%	1%	2%	-	1%	1%	2%
Would never travel by carpool	16%	13%↓	9%	7%	11%	17%	12%	11%	12%	10%	10%	15%	26%
No suggestions	28%	37%↑	37%	41%	39%	35%	37%	28%	45%	48%	50%	31%	18%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Showing responses mentioned by 2% or more people.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly low share mentioning an improvement when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a high share

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

7.6. Awareness and use of carpooling apps and websites

- For the first time in 2018, students were asked whether they have used carpooling websites or apps before. Overall, just 2% of students said that they currently use at least one carpooling website or app, while a further 9% said they are aware of websites or apps but have not used them before. This means that nine in ten students across all campuses (89%) have not used and are not aware of carpooling apps or websites.
- Use and awareness varies across campuses, with significantly more students at MAINZ and AUT City (6% MAINZ; 4% AUT) currently using at least one website or app. Massey students were significantly more likely to be aware of websites or apps, with 20% saying they are aware of, but have not used any websites or apps.
- AUT North (94%), MIT Manukau (94%) and MIT Ōtara (93%) students were all significantly more likely to have never used or not be aware of any apps or websites and overall.

Table 7.6: Awareness/Use of carpooling apps and websites (%)

	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
		AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=23)
Yes – Currently use at least one carpooling website/ app	2%	4%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	6%	1%
Yes – I’m aware, but don’t currently use them	9%	6%	10%	5%	12%	13%	7%	20%	4%	6%	6%	13%
No	89%	90%	89%	94%	85%	86%	92%	78%	94%	93%	89%	86%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don’t know responses

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

7.7. Use of carpooling apps and websites

- Those students who have used a carpooling website or app before (2% of all students) were then asked which websites or apps they have used. The Uber Pool app was mentioned most often (77%; n=33), followed by Auckland Transport’s Smart Travel app (12%; n=5).
- There are no significant differences among campuses, due to the small base sizes.

Table 7.7: Carpooling apps and websites used (%)

Note: This question was only asked of those who currently use carpooling apps or websites

	Total 2018 (n=43)	Campus										
		AUT City (n=9)	AUT South (n=2)	AUT North (n=1)	UoA City (n=7)	UoA Newmarket (n=2)	UoA Grafton (n=3)	Massey Albany (n=5)	MIT Manukau (n=3)	MIT Ōtara (n=2)	MAINZ City (n=6)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=6)
Uber pool/using Uber to carpool	77% (n=33)	100% (n=9)	100% (n=2)	-	71% (n=5)	50% (n=1)	100% (n=3)	40% (n=2)	100% (n=3)	50% (n=1)	100% (n=6)	33% (n=1)
Smart Travel (Auckland Transport’s app)	12% (n=5)	-	-	-	14% (n=1)	-	-	20% (n=1)	-	-	33% (n=2)	33% (n=1)
Rides	5% (n=2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	20% (n=1)	-	-	17% (n=1)	-
Zoomy	5% (n=2)	11% (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33% (n=1)
Chariot	2% (n=1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	20% (n=1)	-	-	-	-
Other	14% (n=6)	-	-	-	14% (n=1)	-	-	60% (n=3)	-	-	33% (n=2)	-
I can’t remember the name	12% (n=5)	-	-	100% (n=1)	-	50% (n=1)	-	20% (n=1)	-	50% (n=1)	-	33% (n=1)

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don’t know responses *Sample sizes by campus vary and some are small, comparisons should be made with caution.

Note: Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

7.8. Smart Travel website awareness and use

- Those who had not already said they are aware of the Smart Travel website, but are aware of carpooling apps and websites were asked about their awareness of Auckland Transport’s Smart Travel website. Of those asked, four in five (81%; n=193) were not aware, while one in five (19%; n=46) were aware.
- This means that only 21% (n=51) of those who use or are aware of carpooling apps are aware of or use Smart Travel. Overall, this is only 2% of all students surveyed.

Table 7.8: Awareness and use of Smart Travel website (%)

Note: This question was only asked of those who have not already said they use Smart Travel, those who are aware of but do not currently use carpool apps or websites

	Total 2018 (n=239)	Campus										
		AUT City (n=21)	AUT South (n=17)	AUT North (n=12)	UoA City (n=34)	UoA Newmarket (n=20)	UoA Grafton (n=20)	Massey Albany (n=49)	MIT Manukau (n=11)	MIT Ōtara (n=14)	MAINZ City (n=10)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=31)
Aware of the Smart Travel website	19% (n=46)	14% (n=3)	12% (n=2)	33% (n=4)	29% (n=10)	15% (n=3)	25% (n=5)	12% (n=6)	18% (n=2)	7% (n=1)	30% (n=3)	23% (n=7)
Not aware of the Smart Travel website	81% (n=193)	86% (n=18)	88% (n=15)	67% (n=8)	71% (n=24)	85% (n=17)	75% (n=15)	88% (n=43)	82% (n=9)	93% (n=13)	70% (n=7)	77% (n=24)

*Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don’t know responses *Sample sizes by campus vary and some are small, comparisons should be made with caution*

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

7.9. Likelihood of using Smart Travel in future

- Those who were aware of or used carpooling apps or websites (but have not used Smart Travel yet) were asked how likely they are to use Smart Travel in future. Overall, 6% said they are *very likely* (rating of 5) and 23% likely to some extent (rating 4-5). Just under half (48%) said they were unlikely (giving a rating of 1 or 2).
- Although not statistically significant, AUT City students were most likely to consider using Smart Travel (50%) and AUT South were least likely (18%).

Table 7.9: Likelihood of using Smart Travel in future (%)

Note: This question was only asked of those who are aware of or have used carpooling apps or websites, but excludes those who have used Smart Travel

Rating from 1-5 with 1 being very unlikely and 5 being very likely	Total 2018 (n=222)	Campus										
		AUT City (n=20)	AUT South (n=17)	AUT North (n=10)	UoA City (n=32)	UoA Newmarket (n=20)	UoA Grafton (n=19)	Massey Albany (n=45)	MIT Manukau (n=8)	MIT Ōtara (n=14)	MAINZ City (n=9)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=28)
1	34% (n=75)	10% (n=2)	53% (n=9)	60% (n=6)	22% (n=7)	45% (n=9)	21% (n=4)	44% (n=20)	38% (n=3)	43% (n=6)	44% (n=4)	18% (n=5)
2	14% (n=31)	15% (n=3)	18% (n=3)	-	16% (n=5)	10% (n=2)	21% (n=4)	16% (n=7)	25% (n=2)	21% (n=3)	-	7% (n=2)
3	29% (n=64)	25% (n=5)	12% (n=2)	20% (n=2)	38% (n=12)	25% (n=5)	32% (n=6)	20% (n=9)	25% (n=2)	14% (n=2)	33% (n=3)	57% (n=16)
4	17% (n=38)	35% (n=7)	18% (n=3)	10% (n=1)	22% (n=7)	15% (n=3)	26% (n=5)	13% (n=6)	-	14% (n=2)	11% (n=1)	11% (n=3)
5	6% (n=14)	15% (n=3)	-	10% (n=1)	3% (n=1)	5% (n=1)	-	7% (n=3)	13% (n=1)	7% (n=1)	11% (n=1)	7% (n=2)
Total Unlikely	48% (n=106)	25% (n=5)	71% (n=12)	60% (n=6)	38% (n=12)	55% (n=11)	42% (n=8)	60% (n=27)	63% (n=5)	64% (n=9)	44% (n=4)	25% (n=7)
Total Likely	23% (n=52)	50% (n=10)	18% (n=3)	20% (n=2)	25% (n=8)	20% (n=4)	26% (n=5)	20% (n=9)	13% (n=1)	21% (n=3)	22% (n=2)	18% (n=5)

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses *Sample sizes by campus vary and some are small, comparisons should be made with caution

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

8. WALKING AND CYCLING

8.1. Distance Reasonable to Walk or Cycle

- Over a quarter of students (28%), indicated they lived close enough to either walk and/or cycle to campus, including 22% who mentioned that they lived close enough to campus to **walk**, and 16% who said they live close enough to **cycle**.
- Students at the University of Auckland Newmarket were significantly more likely to live close enough to either walk (38%) or cycle (35%). Students from the University of Auckland Grafton campus (27%) were also significantly more likely to live close enough to walk, while Unitec students were significantly more likely to live close enough to cycle (20%).
- MIT Ōtara (81%) and AUT North (79%) students were significantly more likely to say they did not live close enough to either walk or cycle.

Table 8.1: Live close enough to walk or cycle (%)

	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
I could walk	19%	22% ↑	22%	19%	14%	23%	38%	27%	24%	16%	15%	18%	21%
I could cycle	13%	16% ↑	6%	17%	12%	16%	35%	19%	15%	13%	9%	13%	20%
Could walk or cycle (net)	26%	28%	22%	27%	21%	29%	55%	34%	28%	22%	19%	23%	31%
No, neither	74%	72%	78%	73%	79%	71%	45%	66%	72%	78%	81%	77%	69%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

8.2. Distance Reasonable to Walk or Cycle – by main mode used

- Just over a quarter (27%) of passengers who parked near the campus and around one in five of those who were dropped off (21%), drove themselves and other (21%) or drove alone (18%) said they live close enough to walk or cycle to campus.
- When compared with the results from 2016, the only significant change has been that those who drove alone are significantly less likely to say they live close enough to cycle (down from 19% to 13%).

Table 8.2: Live close enough to walk or cycle by car-based modes of transport (%)

Car based main modes	Drove alone in car		Drove myself and others in car		Passenger in car (dropped off)		Passenger in car (parked car near campus)	
	2016 (n=570)	2018 (n=561)	2016 (n=60)	2018 (n=24)	2016 (n=137)	2018 (n=80)	2016 (n=21)	2018 (n=11)
I could walk	12%	10%	17%	17%	12%	16%	19%	-
I could cycle	19%	13%↓	5%	8%	18%	11%	10%	27%
Could walk or cycle (net)	20%	23%	20%	21%	24%	21%	19%	27%
No, neither	80%	82%	80%	79%	76%	79%	81%	73%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

8.3. Ease of Walking To/From Campus

Note: These questions were only asked of those who said they lived close enough to walk.

Ease of Walking – By Campus

- Eighty four percent of students who live close enough to walk to the campus agreed to some extent (giving a rating of 6-10) that it is easy to walk to/from the campus, including two thirds of students (66%) who gave a rating of 8-10 when asked about ease of walking. This leaves only 9% who disagree that it is easy for them to walk (rating 0-4).
- There were not many statistically significant differences across the campuses, however students at AUT North were significantly more likely to *strongly agree* that it is easy to walk to campus (70%), while significantly more MIT Ōtara students *strongly disagree* (6% giving a rating of 0).
- Occasional public transport users (77%) and first year students (74%) were significantly more likely to give a rating of 8-10 for the ease of walking.
- In contrast, third year students (17%) and those who currently use public transport (15%) were significantly more likely to give a rating of 0-4 for ease.
- Total 2018 ratings are similar to the total 2016 ratings, with the only notable difference being a significant increase in ‘top box’ ratings this measure (up from 41% giving a ‘top box’ rating of 10 in 2016, to 48%).

Table 8.3: Ease of walking to or from this campus (%)

Note: This question was only asked of those who said they lived close enough to walk

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2016 (n=391)	Total 2018 (n=460)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=46)	AUT South (n=29)	AUT North (n=30)	UoA City (n=54)	UoA Newmarket (n=53)	UoA Grafton (n=64)	Massey Albany (n=53)	MIT Manukau (n=31)	MIT Ōtara (n=32)	MAINZ City (n=19)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=49)
10	41%	48% ↑	57%	35%	70%	52%	26%	48%	49%	32%	50%	47%	57%
9	11%	7% ↓	7%	3%	-	11%	6%	16%	8%	3%	-	-	8%
8	15%	12%	9%	14%	7%	7%	25%	8%	15%	16%	16%	11%	2%
Total 8-10	67%	66%	72%	52%	77%	70%	57%	72%	72%	52%	66%	58%	67%
7	9%	10%	11%	14%	7%	9%	11%	11%	8%	13%	3%	16%	14%
6	6%	7%	-	7%	7%	6%	9%	8%	4%	13%	13%	16%	4%
Total 6-10	81%	84%	83%	72%	90%	85%	77%	91%	83%	77%	81%	90%	86%
5	8%	8%	4%	24%	-	6%	9%	6%	8%	10%	9%	5%	8%
4	5%	4%	7%	-	3%	4%	8%	2%	4%	3%	3%	5%	-
3	3%	2%	4%	3%	-	2%	2%	2%	2%	7%	-	-	-
2	1%	1%	-	-	3%	4%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	4%
1	1%	<1%	-	-	3%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-
0	1%	2%	2%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	3%	6%	-	2%
Total 4-0	10%	9%	13%	3%	10%	9%	13%	3%	9%	13%	9%	5%	6%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses*

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

*Sample sizes by campus vary and some are small, comparisons should be made with caution.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

8.4. Suggestions to Improve Ease of Walking

- The majority of respondents (77%) either gave *no suggestions* (68%) as to how to make it easier and more convenient to walk to or from campus, or said they *don't know* (9%).
- Of the suggestions made, the most common ones included having more protection from weather (5%) and having more pedestrian crossings or over bridges (4%).
- When compared with 2016 results across all campuses, students are significantly more likely to suggest needing more protection from the weather (up from 1% in 2016, to 5%) and less likely to call for better lighting (down from 5%, to 2%).

Table 8.4: Things that would make walking to or from this campus easier(%)

	Total 2016 (n=332)	Total 2018 (n=463)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=46)	AUT South (n=30)	AUT North (n=30)	UoA City (n=54)	UoA Newmarke t (n=54)	UoA Grafton (n=64)	Massey Albany (n=54)	MIT Manukau (n=31)	MIT Ōtara (n=32)	MAINZ City (n=19)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=49)
More protection from weather	1%	5% ↑	9%	7%	7%	7%	4%	3%	6%	7%	-	5%	-
More pedestrian crossings/over bridge	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%	2%	4%	6%	7%	-	-	-	2%
More pedestrian friendly streets	1%	2%	-	7%	-	4%	4%	-	4%	-	-	-	4%
No hills	2%	2%	4%	-	-	7%	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-
Better lighting	5%	2% ↓	-	-	-	-	-	6%	6%	-	3%	-	-
Shortcut/direct path	2%	2%	2%	-	-	-	2%	-	4%	-	3%	5%	2%
Don't know	2%	9% ↑	22%	3%	7%	4%	11%	8%	7%	7%	3%	16%	8%
No suggestions	68%	68%	59%	67%	73%	74%	72%	61%	59%	87%	75%	53%	74%

Note: Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Showing responses mentioned by 2% or more people.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly low share mentioning an improvement when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a high share

*Sample sizes by campus vary and some are small, comparisons should be made with caution.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

8.5. Ease of Cycling To/From Campus

- Of the students who live close enough to cycle, 69% agree to some extent that cycling would be easy (gave a rating of 6-10), including 45% giving a rating between 8 and 10. One in five (20%) disagree to some extent that cycling would be easy (gave a rating of 0-4).
- Unitec students were significantly more likely to agree that cycling is easy (82% giving a rating of 6-10, including 60% rating 8-10 and 42% giving a ‘top box’ rating of 10), while UoA City students were significantly more likely to disagree that cycling is easy (35% giving a rating of 4 or less).

Table 8.5: Ease of cycling to campus (%)

Note: These questions were only asked of those who said they lived close enough to cycle.

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total 2016 (n=250)	Total 2018 (n=303)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=12)	AUT South (n=26)	AUT North (n=23)	UoA City (n=34)	UoA Newmarket (n=42)	UoA Grafton (n=38)	Massey Albany (n=33)	MIT Manukau (n=23)	MIT Ōtara (n=18)	MAINZ City (n=9)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=45)
10	23%	23%	17%	27%	13%	18%	14%	21%	24%	22%	17%	22%	42%
9	7%	10%	-	-	4%	6%	17%	13%	12%	26%	6%	11%	7%
8	17%	13%	8%	12%	17%	9%	10%	3%	12%	17%	39%	22%	11%
Total 8-10	47%	45%	25%	39%	35%	32%	41%	37%	49%	65%	61%	56%	60%
7	12%	11%	17%	19%	4%	6%	10%	13%	12%	13%	6%	11%	13%
6	7%	13%↑	25%	8%	13%	15%	17%	8%	15%	13%	17%	11%	9%
Total 6-10	66%	69%	67%	65%	52%	53%	67%	58%	76%	91%	83%	78%	82%
5	10%	11%	17%	15%	13%	12%	10%	13%	9%	-	17%	11%	9%
4	6%	4%	-	4%	13%	6%	2%	5%	-	-	-	11%	2%
3	6%	5%	8%	8%	9%	9%	7%	11%	3%	-	-	-	-
2	3%	6%	-	8%	13%	12%	5%	8%	3%	4%	-	-	2%
1	5%	2%	-	-	-	3%	2%	3%	3%	4%	-	-	-
0	3%	4%	8%	-	-	6%	7%	3%	6%	-	-	-	4%
Total 4-0	24%	20%	17%	19%	35%	35%	24%	29%	15%	9%	-	11%	9%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses* Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

*Sample sizes by campus vary and some are small, comparisons should be made with caution. ↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

8.6. Suggestions to Improve Ease of Cycling

- A third of students interviewed (34%) mentioned that having bigger, better or more cycle lanes would make cycling to the campus easier. This was mentioned significantly more by University of Auckland Newmarket (54%) and Grafton (47%) students.
- Other commonly mentioned suggestions include having a bike (8%) and the need for safer routes or less traffic (8%). Safety was significantly likely to be mentioned by University of Auckland City students (16%).
- Overall, 29% said they have no suggestions (significantly higher for Massey – 46%) and 4% said that they would never cycle to the campus.
- Suggestions for how to make cycling to/from the campus easier are similar to those given in 2016, with no significant changes in suggestions given.

Table 8.6: Suggestions to make Cycling to or from this campus easier (%)

	Total 2016 (n=238)	Total 2018 (n=334)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=13)	AUT South (n=27)	AUT North (n=25)	UoA City (n=36)	UoA Newmarket (n=50)	UoA Grafton (n=44)	Massey Albany (n=35)	MIT Manukau (n=25)	MIT Ōtara (n=18)	MAINZ City (n=14)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=47)
Bigger/better/more cycle lanes	34%	34%	39%	52%	48%	33%	54%	47%	17%	16%	22%	7%	17%
Having a bike	10%	8%	15%	11%	4%	6%	2%	5%	6%	12%	6%	29%	15%
Safer/less traffic	11%	8%	-	7%	-	8%	16%	14%	9%	8%	6%	-	4%
More/better bike parks/racks and security	8%	5%	15%	11%	8%	3%	4%	2%	6%	-	11%	7%	2%
Less hills	3%	4%	23%	7%	8%	3%	6%	2%	3%	-	-	-	2%
Better route	1%	3%	-	4%	-	17%	2%	-	3%	-	-	7%	2%
Would never cycle to this campus	3%	4%	-	-	4%	6%	2%	7%	6%	4%	6%	-	4%
No suggestions	36%	29%	23%	26%	20%	19%	18%	25%	46%	48%	39%	36%	30%

Note: Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Showing responses mentioned by 2% or more people.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly low share mentioning an improvement when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a high share

*Sample sizes by campus vary and some are small, comparisons should be made with caution.

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

9. Moving Closer or Further Away from Campus

9.1 Moving address since starting study at this campus

- Nearly three quarters of students are still living at the same address (73%) as they were when they began studying at this campus, which leaves just over a quarter (27%) who have moved.
- Significantly more students from Massey (38%) and AUT North (35%) have moved since beginning study at their campus.
- When compared with the Total results for 2016, significantly more students mentioned they have moved address since starting to study at their campus (up from 24% in 2016, to 27%).

Table 9.1: Still living at the same address since starting study at this campus (%)

	Total 2016 (n=2,108)	Total 2018 (n=2,157)	Campus										
			AUT City (n=214)	AUT South (n=158)	AUT North (n=213)	UoA City (n=232)	UoA Newmarket (n=143)	UoA Grafton (n=236)	Massey Albany (n=227)	MIT Manukau (n=190)	MIT Ōtara (n=208)	MAINZ City (n=105)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=231)
Yes – Living at the same address	76%	73%↓	73%	89%	65%	73%	68%	68%	62%	78%	83%	73%	72%
No	24%	27%↑	27%	11%	35%	27%	32%	32%	38%	22%	17%	27%	28%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a lower share

↑↓ indicates a significant change when compared with Total 2016 results.

9.2 Moved closer or further away

- Of the students who have moved since beginning study at the campus, 55% moved closer, 33% moved further away and 11% remained about the same distance from the campus.
- MIT Manukau students were significantly more likely to have moved further away (52%) and significantly less likely to mention they have moved closer (36%). AUT City students (47%) were also significantly more likely to mention that they have moved further away.

Table 9.2: Moved closer or further away (%)

Note: These questions were only asked of those who said they have moved since starting study at the campus.

	Total 2018 (n=590)	Campus										
		AUT City (n=57)	AUT South (n=18)	AUT North (n=74)	UoA City (n=62)	UoA Newmarket (n=46)	UoA Grafton (n=76)	Massey Albany (n=87)	MIT Manukau (n=42)	MIT Ōtara (n=35)	MAINZ City (n=28)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=65)
Moved closer	55%	44%	61%	62%	60%	50%	61%	64%	36%	51%	50%	55%
Moved further away	33%	47%	28%	30%	27%	39%	25%	23%	52%	43%	39%	31%
About the same	11%	9%	11%	8%	13%	11%	15%	13%	12%	6%	11%	14%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a lower share

9.3 Reasons for moving

- When asked about motivations for moving, 58% said that easier walking or cycling or better public transport were not motivations for them.
- However one in five students did mention that ease of walking (22%) or better public transport (21%) had impacted their decision to some extent, while only 5% mentioned that easier cycling options played a role in their relocation decision.
- When compared with students overall, MIT Ōtara students were significantly more likely to move for better access to public transport (34%), while Unitec students were significantly more likely to consider ease of cycling (12%) when moving. MIT Manukau students were significantly less likely to consider ease of walking to campus (7%).

Table 9.3: Reasons for moving(%)

Note: This question was only asked of those who said they have moved since starting study at the campus.

	Total 2018 (n=590)	Campus										
		AUT City (n=57)	AUT South (n=18)	AUT North (n=74)	UoA City (n=62)	UoA Newmarket (n=46)	UoA Grafton (n=76)	Massey Albany (n=87)	MIT Manukau (n=42)	MIT Ōtara (n=35)	MAINZ City (n=28)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=65)
Easier to walk to this campus	22%	26%	11%	24%	29%	26%	26%	16%	7%	14%	21%	26%
Better public transport to campus	21%	21%	11%	15%	16%	17%	17%	20%	26%	34%	39%	23%
Easier to cycle to this campus	5%	4%	6%	1%	3%	7%	7%	3%	2%	-	7%	12%
None of these	58%	58%	83%	62%	53%	57%	55%	64%	67%	51%	46%	52%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a lower share

*Sample sizes by campus vary and some are small, comparisons should be made with caution.

9.4 Did cost impact the decision to move

- Of the students who moved, 53% said that cost impacted their decision to move.
- There were not many statistically significant differences by campus, however MIT Manukau students were significantly less likely to consider cost when moving (24% did consider cost; 76% did not).

Table 9.4: Did cost impact the decision to move (%)

Note: These questions were only asked of those who said they have moved since starting study at the campus.

	Total 2018 (n=590)	Campus										
		AUT City (n=57)	AUT South (n=18)	AUT North (n=74)	UoA City (n=62)	UoA Newmarket (n=46)	UoA Grafton (n=76)	Massey Albany (n=87)	MIT Manukau (n=42)	MIT Ōtara (n=35)	MAINZ City (n=28)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=65)
Yes	53%	44%	67%	62%	47%	61%	55%	53%	24%	60%	46%	63%
No	47%	56%	33%	38%	53%	39%	45%	47%	76%	40%	54%	37%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses

Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a lower share

9.5 How cost impacted the decision to move

- Of the students who moved for cost related reasons, the most commonly mentioned reasons were moving to an area that is cheaper in terms of rent or weekly payments (56%), as well as moving for cheaper transport costs (36%), to a location where they can walk or cycle to campus (17%), and/or to a location that would reduce petrol costs (13%).
- There were not many statistically significant differences across the campuses, however Massey students were significantly more likely to move for cheaper petrol costs (30%), while Unitec students were significantly more likely to move to a location they can walk or cycle from (29%). Massey students were also significantly less likely to move to a location they can walk or cycle from (4%).

Table 9.5: How did cost impact the decision to move (%)

Note: These questions were only asked of those who said they have moved since starting study at the campus due to cost-related reasons.

	Total 2018 (n=313)	Campus										
		AUT City (n=25)	AUT South (n=12)	AUT North (n=46)	UoA City (n=29)	UoA Newmarket (n=28)	UoA Grafton (n=42)	Massey Albany (n=46)	MIT Manukau (n=10)	MIT Ōtara (n=21)	MAINZ City (n=13)	Unitec Mt Albert (n=41)
Moved to an area that is cheaper (Cheaper rent/weekly payments)	56%	56%	50%	61%	52%	61%	55%	59%	50%	52%	62%	54%
Moved so transport costs are lower (e.g. fewer stages travelled on public transport)	36%	24%	58%	30%	24%	43%	43%	33%	20%	43%	39%	46%
Moved to a location where I can walk/cycle to campus	17%	20%	8%	17%	24%	18%	24%	4%	-	10%	-	29%
Moved closer to reduce my petrol costs	13%	4%	17%	9%	7%	4%	7%	30%	10%	5%	15%	20%
Moved in with parents/other family/partner to reduce rental costs (Cheaper accommodation)	7%	16%	17%	4%	3%	4%	10%	4%	10%	5%	15%	5%
Some other cost-related reason	2%	-	-	-	-	4%	-	2%	10%	5%	-	2%
Some other non-cost related reason	1%	8%	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-
Don't know/can't think of any specific ones	5%	4%	17%	4%	7%	4%	5%	4%	20%	5%	-	5%

Base is all respondents who answered the question, excluding not applicable and don't know responses. Multiple responses to this question permitted. Consequently the table may total more than 100%.

*Sample sizes by campus vary and some are small, comparisons should be made with caution.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share when compared to results for all campuses Red highlighting indicates a lower share



Appendix One: Student Travel Questionnaire

Introduction

Face to face

Good [insert “morning”/”afternoon”/”evening”] my name is [insert interviewer’s name] from a company called Gravitas Research. Today we are conducting a survey with students at the [enter campus name] about their travel patterns.

If needed/if person is in a hurry: The survey is also being conducted online. Could you please give me your email address? [Record email address. Check spelling. If refused to give email address, hand a complete-online card] You can complete the survey by following the link on this card.

If needed: The survey will take less than 10 minutes of your time and your answers will be used to help with travel planning for this area in the future.

If needed: The survey is for Auckland Transport

If needed: The information that you provide will help to guide Auckland transport with travel planning for surrounding areas of your campus

Online

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this survey. This survey is about student’s travel patterns.

The questionnaire should take around 10 minutes to complete, depending on how much you have to say. Your answers will be used to help with travel planning for the areas around universities in the future.

All

Face to face: “If needed:” To thank you for your time, all participants will be entered into a prize draw for one of 22 \$50 vouchers of your choice. Please be assured that all your answers to the survey will be treated confidentially and nothing will be tied back to you in the final results.

Online

To begin the survey, please click on the forward arrow button below

Background Information

Time and Date Automatically Recorded

Face to face

A1 Interviewer name

Single response. Don’t read out.

1. Interviewer 1
2. Interviewer 2
3. Interviewer 3



Face to face

A2 Campus

Single response. Don't read out.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. AUT (City Campus) | 7. Massey University Albany |
| 2. AUT (South Campus) | 8. Manukau Institute of Technology (Manukau) |
| 3. AUT (Akoranga Campus) | 9. Manukau Institute of Technology (Ōtara) |
| 4. Auckland University (Auckland City Campus) | 10. MAINZ |
| 5. Auckland University (Newmarket Campus) | 11. Unitec Mt Albert |
| 6. Auckland University (Grafton Campus) | |

Online

Card - A2 At which of the following campuses were you handed a card inviting you to take part in this survey?

Email address -A2 At which of the following campuses were you at when you were invited to take part in this survey? (i.e. When you gave your email address)

Please select one only

- | | |
|--|---|
| 12. AUT (City Campus) | 18. Massey University Albany |
| 13. AUT (South Campus) | 19. Manukau Institute of Technology (Manukau) |
| 14. AUT (Akoranga Campus) | 20. Manukau Institute of Technology (Ōtara) |
| 15. Auckland University (Auckland City Campus) | 21. MAINZ |
| 16. Auckland University (Newmarket Campus) | 22. Unitec Mt Albert |
| 17. Auckland University (Grafton Campus) | 23. None of the above [record as ineligible] |

Screeners

Firstly, just a couple of quick questions to make sure you qualify for the survey.

All

S1 Are you currently a student at the [insert campus]?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

1. Yes
2. No [Record as ineligible. **If online**, display "Thank you for your time. This survey is with students at [insert campus]. If you have any questions, please contact xxx from Gravitas Research on xxx"]

All

S2 Do you come to [insert campus] regularly throughout the semester?

Face to face "If needed:" **All** By regularly, we mean at least once every couple of weeks. This does not include only coming to the campus for exams, the odd study period or an intensive week-long course.

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

1. Yes
2. No [Record as ineligible. **Online:** Thank you for your time. This survey is with students who visit [insert campus] regularly. If you have any questions, please contact xxx from Gravitas Research on xxx"]

Face to face [hidden as covered in disposition codes]

S3 Only ask this question if respondent mentions having done the survey already: Have you already completed this travel survey in the last few weeks?



Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

1. Yes [Record as ineligible]
2. No

Face to face

S4 Great, you qualify for the survey!

Interviewer: The survey proper will start after this section

If, for any reason, the respondent can no longer proceed with the survey, present the online option: The survey is also being conducted online. Could you please give me your email address?

Record email address. Check spelling.

If refused to give email address, hand a complete-online card: You can complete the survey by following the link on this card

1. OK to proceed with survey
2. Refused to take card [screened out]
3. Accepted complete-online card [re-direct to a new survey]
4. Gave email address [collect email address]

Travel Mode Use This Year

All

We are interested in how you travel to and from this campus.

Q1a On which days of the week do you usually travel to this campus?

Face to face "If needed:" For this question, we are interested in weekdays (Monday to Friday), not the weekend

Face to face "If needed" Online: "note:"By usually we mean on a typical week during the semester, not if you come in for a one-off reason.

Face to face Multiple response. Read out if needed.

Online Please select all that apply.

1. Monday
2. Tuesday
3. Wednesday
4. Thursday
5. Friday
6. Every day (Monday-Friday) [exclusive]



All

Q1b Face to face: And on each of these days, please tell me what time you usually arrive at this campus. So starting with read first day in the list do you arrive read out the three time periods

Online: And for each of these days, please select the time you usually arrive at this campus.....

Face to face: "If needed" Online "Note:" By usually we mean on a typical week during the semester, not if you come in for a one-off reason.

Face to face Single response for each day. Read out each day and time period for each.

Online Please select one response for each day.

[only display the day/s selected at Q1a, one option only for each row]

Face to face "Read out column headings"	Between 7:00am and 9:00am	Between 9:01am and 10:00am	At some other time (before 7am or after 10am)
1. Monday			
2. Tuesday			
3. Wednesday			
4. Thursday			
5. Friday			

All

Q2a Online "Which of the following best describes how" Face to face "How do" you normally travel to and from this campus?

Face to face "If needed:" Online "Note:" By "normally", we are talking about travel **during the semester**

Face to face: Probe: How else do you normally travel to/from this campus?

Face to face "If needed: If respondent says "car" or "drove", check if they are a driver/passenger. If they say "bus", check if this is a university shuttle or public bus"

Face to face Multiple response. Read out if needed. Show card if needed

Online Please select as many as apply.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Drive alone in a car | 8. Train |
| 2. Drive myself and others in a car | 9. Ferry |
| 3. As a passenger in a car (someone dropped me off on their way to somewhere else) | 10. University shuttle bus (shuttle bus around or between campuses run by the university) |
| 4. As a passenger in a car (car was parked somewhere near this campus) | 11. Cycle |
| 5. Motorcycle/Scooter | 12. Walk/run |
| 7. Public bus (Auckland Transport bus service) | 13. Taxi/Uber |
| | 14. Other (specify) |

[No code 6 to match previous data]

All

[If Q2a is multiple responses, show those selected at Q2A]

Q2b And which of these would you say is the **one** MAIN mode you use to travel to and from this campus?

Face to Face "if needed" Online "Note:" 'Main mode' is the one used most days of the week OR the one used to travel the longest distance.

Face to face Single response. Read out if needed.

Online Please select one only.



[Show only those selected at Q2A]

1. Drove alone in a car
2. Drove myself and others in a car
3. As a passenger in a car (someone dropped me off on their way to somewhere else)
4. As a passenger in a car (car was parked somewhere near this campus)
5. Motorcycle/Scooter
7. Public bus (Auckland Transport bus service)
8. Train
9. Ferry
10. University shuttle bus (shuttle bus around or between campuses run by the university)
11. Cycle
12. Walk/run
13. Taxi/Uber
14. Other (specify)
15. Varies too much to say or is split 50/50

[No code 6 to match previous data]

[If Q2a = 7, 8, or 9 (i.e. use public transport), skip to Q5]

All

Q3 Do you ever use public transport to travel to or from [insert campus]?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Face to Face: "If needed: Have you ever used public transport to travel here? "

Online Please select one only.

1. Yes
2. No

All

Q4 Do you ever use public transport for any other travel?

Face to face "If needed:" **Online** "Note:" This includes any trips other than trips to this campus

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

1. Yes
2. No

B. Perceptions of parking/carpooling

[If Q2A does not = codes 1, 2,3 or 4 ask]

All

Q5 Do you have access to a vehicle that you could use to drive to this campus during the weekdays?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

1. Yes
2. No [Skip to Q6c]
3. Don't know [Skip to Q6c]



[Only ask if Q2A= codes 1, 2, 3 or 4 OR Q5=1]

All

Q6 Thinking about driving to this campus, Face to face "on a scale of zero to ten, where zero means strongly disagree and ten means strongly agree," how much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one answer per row.

Show statements one at a time

	0 Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 Strongly Agree	Don't know	Not applicable
Q6a It is easy to find parking near this campus	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Q6b The parking charges around this campus are reasonable	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

All

Q6c What would make it easier and more convenient for you to carpool to or from this campus?

Face to face "Probe: What else would make it easier and more convenient to carpool to this campus?"

Face to face Record suggestions, don't read out codes

Online Please provide as much detail as possible.

Write in suggestions _____

1. I would never travel here by carpool if selected ask: Why would you not carpool? Face to face "Probe: Why else would you not carpool?" Write in suggestions _____

2. No suggestions
3. Don't know

C. Smart Travel App

Q6d Are you aware of and/or currently using any websites or apps that facilitate carpooling?

Face to face : Single response, read out if necessary

Online Please select one option only

1. Yes – I currently use at least one carpooling website or app
2. Yes – I'm aware, but don't currently use them
3. No

[Only ask if Q6d=1]

Q6e Which carpooling websites or apps do you currently use?

Face to face Multiple response. Don't read out. Probe: What other carpooling websites or apps do you use?

Online Please select all that apply.

1. Smart Travel
2. Chariot
3. Uber pool/using Uber to carpool
4. Rides
5. Jayride
6. Other website/App 1: (Specify) _____
7. Other website/App 2: (specify) _____
8. Other website/App 3: (specify) _____
9. I can't remember the name

[Only ask if Q6e=2-9 (skip if Q6e=1)] OR if Q6d=2

The 'Smart Travel' app offers a simple and flexible tool that enables you to match-a-ride with others who travel to and from the same places.

Online For more information you can visit

<https://www.smarttravel.org.nz/Public/Home.aspx?CustomSubSite=auckland>



Q6f Are you aware of the Smart Travel website?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out

Online Please select one only

1. Yes
2. No

[Only ask if Q6f=1]

Q6g Have you downloaded or signed up online for carpooling on the 'Smart Travel' app or website?

Face to face Single response. Read out if necessary

Online Please select one only

1. Yes, I have downloaded/signed up and have used it at least once
2. Yes, I have downloaded/signed up but yet to use it
3. No, I didn't know I can register for carpooling
4. No, I haven't registered as I already carpool
5. No, I'm not interested/have not thought about it

[Only ask if Q6e=2-9 OR if Q6d=2 but exclude if Q6g=1]

Q6h On a scale of one to five, where one means very unlikely and five means very likely, how likely are you to consider using this carpooling app (Smart Travel) in the future?

1	2	3	4	5	6
Very unlikely				Very likely	Unsure
1	2	3	4	5	6



Perceptions of Public Transport for Personal Use

All

Now thinking about travelling to this campus and using public transport (that is buses, trains or ferries run by Auckland Transport) for you personally.

Q7 Face to face "On a scale of zero to ten, where zero means strongly disagree and ten means strongly agree," how much do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one answer per row.

Show statements one at a time

	0 Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 Strongly Agree	Don't know	Not applicable
Q7a It is easy for me to take public transport to this campus	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Q7b I would recommend using public transport to other students	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

All

Q8 What would make it easier and more convenient for you to use public transport to travel to or from this campus?

Face to face "Probe: What else would make it easier and more convenient for you to use public transport to travel to or from this campus? "

Face to face Multiple response. Don't read out.

Online Please provide as much detail as possible.

Write in suggestions _____

1. I would never travel here by public transport
2. No suggestions
3. Don't know

Walking and Cycling

All

Q9 Do you live close enough to be able to walk or cycle to and from this campus?

Face to face Multiple response. Don't read out.

Face to face "If necessary, clarify whether they could walk, cycle or both"

Online Please select all that apply.

1. Yes - could **walk**
2. Yes - could **cycle**
3. No [exclusive] [skip to Q12]
4. Don't know [exclusive] [skip to Q12]



[Only ask if Q9=1]

All

Q10a Face to face “On a scale of zero to ten (again where zero means strongly disagree and ten means strongly agree)” how much do you agree or disagree with the statement..... it is easy for me to **walk** to this campus?

Face to face Single response. Read out if needed.

Online Please select one only.

0. 0 = Strongly disagree
1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. 10
11. Don't know
12. Not applicable

[Only ask if Q9=1]

All

Q10b What would make it easier and more convenient for you to walk to or from this campus?

Face to face”Probe: What else would make it easier and more convenient? ”

Online Please provide as much detail as possible.

Face to face Record suggestions, don't read codes

Write in suggestions _____

1. I would never walk to this campus
2. No suggestions
3. Don't know



[Only ask if Q9=2]

All

Q11a Face to face “On a scale of zero to ten (again where zero means strongly disagree and ten means strongly agree)” how much do you agree or disagree with this statement..... it is easy for me to **cycle** to campus?

Face to face Single response. Read out if needed.

Online Please select one only.

- 0. 0 = Strongly disagree
- 1. 1
- 2. 2
- 3. 3
- 4. 4
- 5. 5
- 6. 6
- 7. 7
- 8. 8
- 9. 9
- 10. 10
- 11. Don't know
- 12. Not applicable

[Only ask if Q9=2]

All

Q11b What would make it easier and more convenient for you to cycle to or from this campus?

Face to face”Probe: What else would make it easier and more convenient? ”

Online Please provide as much detail as possible.

Face to face Record suggestions, don't read codes

Write in suggestions _____

- 1. I would never cycle to this campus
- 2. No suggestions
- 3. Don't know



Perceptions of Public Transport in General - Motivations and barriers

All

For these next questions, please think about travelling to this campus and using public transport, for students in general.

Face to face "If necessary:" **Online** "Note:" Public transport includes buses, trains or ferries run by Auckland Transport)

Q12 Thinking generally, what are the biggest barriers stopping students from using public transport to get to this campus?

Face to face"Probe: What else would stop students from using public transport? "

Face to face Multiple response. Don't read out.

Online Please provide as much detail as possible.

Online – Only show an open ended box and codes 1/19 below

Face to face – Show codeframe below

1. NO barriers [exclusive]
2. Cost – its expensive (Does not save money/its not cheaper)
3. Have access to free/cheap parking
4. Drive others/carpool
5. Need to use car for work
6. Drop off child/ren
7. Personal use of car during the day (e.g. shopping, gym, banking, etc.)
8. PT is not available/unrealistic
9. PT Unreliable
10. PT overcrowded
11. Other options are faster
12. Services are not direct enough
13. Not frequent enough
14. Students don't come to the campus every day
15. Unsafe
16. Not suitable if you have an impairment/disability
17. Accessibility of tickets/tickets hard to get
18. Other (please specify)
19. Don't know [exclusive]

Concession Use

Now thinking about student discounts for using public transport (that is buses, trains or ferries run by Auckland Transport).....

All

Q13 Face to face “On a scale of zero to ten, where zero means strongly disagree and ten means strongly agree,”
Face to Face/Online how much do you agree or disagree with each of these statements?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one answer per row.

Show statements one at a time

	0 Strongly Disagree	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 Strongly Agree	Don't know	Not applicable
Q13a It is easy to get tertiary student discounts for public transport	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Q13b I would recommend the AT HOP card to other students	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

All

Q14 Do you currently have an AT HOP card

Face to face Single response. Read out

Online Please select one only.



1. Yes
2. No, But I intend to get one [\[skip to Q16\]](#)
3. No, and do not intend to get one [\[skip to Q16\]](#)
4. Do not know what this card is [\[skip to Q16\]](#)

All – If Q14=code 1 (all others skip to Q16)

Q15 Have you applied for the tertiary student discounts/concessions on your AT HOP/HOP card **this year**?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

1. Yes
2. No, But I intend to
3. No, and do not intend to
4. Do not know what they are



All

Q16 How could the AT Hop card be made more useful or easier to use for students?

Face to face **Probe:** What else would make the HOP card more useful or easier for students? "

Face to face "If needed" **Online** "Note:" This can include how it can be made easier to use or other things it could be used for.

Online Please provide as much detail as possible.

Write in suggestions _____

1. No suggestions
2. Don't know

All

Q17 Where do you get your travel and transport information from?

Face to face "If needed"/**Online** "Note": where do you go or who do you ask?"

Face to face Multiple response. Read out if needed.

Online Please select all that apply.

1. Auckland Transport's public transport smartphone app (AT Mobile)
2. Auckland Transport website ('AT Journey Planner' and timetables)
3. Calling Auckland Transport (call centres)
4. Emails from Auckland Transport
5. Auckland Transport customer service centres (e.g. at train and busway station, at AUT city campus)
6. From the university
7. Word of mouth (from friends/family)
9. Advertising about public transport or AT Hop Cards
10. Google Maps
11. Other (specify)
12. N/A – I don't seek out travel information [exclusive]

[No number 8 to match previous survey]

Classification Questions

All

These final questions are just to ensure we get a good mix of students.

Q18 Are you still living at the same address as you were living **before** you started studying at [insert campus]?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

1. Yes [skip to Q21]
2. No



[If Q18 = Code 2]

All

Q19 Did you move closer to the campus or further away?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

Face to face"If needed: " **Online** "Note:" If you have moved multiple times, please think about your most recent move

1. Closer
2. Further away
3. About the same

All

Q20a Which of the following, if any, was part of your decision to choose to live at this new address?

Face to face Multiple response. Read out.

Online Please select all that apply.

1. Better public transport to this campus
2. Easier to walk to this campus
3. Easier to cycle to this campus
4. None of these [exclusive]

All

Q20b Thinking about transport costs, living costs or any other day-to-day costs, did cost influence your decision to move to this new address?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

1. Yes
2. No [Skip to Q21]

[If Q20b = Code 1]

All

Q20c What cost related factors influenced your decision to move to this new address?

Face to face Multiple response. Don't read out.

Online Please select all that apply.

1. Moved to an area that is cheaper (Cheaper rent/weekly payments)
2. Moved in with parents/other family/partner to reduce rental costs (Cheaper accommodation)
3. Moved closer to reduce my petrol costs
4. Moved so transport costs are lower (e.g. fewer stages travelled on public transport)
5. Moved to a location where I can walk or cycle to campus
6. Some other cost-related reason (*please specify*)
7. Don't know/can't think of any specific ones



All

Q21 Including this year, how many years have you been enrolled at [insert campus]?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

1. 1 year (including if this is the first year)
2. 2 years
3. 3 years
4. 4 years
5. 5 years
6. More than 5 years

All

Q22 Are you an undergraduate or postgraduate student?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

1. Undergraduate Student
2. Postgraduate
3. Other (specify)

All

Q23 In which faculty or faculties are you based?

Face to face Multiple response. Read out if needed. SHOW CARD IF NECESSARY.

Probe: What other faculties are you based in?

Online Please select all that apply.

1. Arts/Humanities/Social Sciences
2. Education
3. Business / Creative Industries
4. Design/Creative Arts/Creative Technologies
5. Environmental Sciences
6. Culture and Society
7. Māori Development
8. Technology and built environment
9. Sciences
10. Engineering
11. Law
12. Medical and Health Sciences
13. Other (please specify)

All

Q24a Which age group do you fall into?

Face to face Single response. Read out.

Online Please select one only.

1. 15-17 years
2. 18 to 19 years
3. 20 to 24 years
4. 25 to 29 years
5. 30 to 39 years
6. Over 39 years

Q24b Online Please select your gender below:



Face to Face: Enter Gender (*if needed*: What Gender do you identify with. *if needed*: This is a standard question and we need to make sure we get accurate information about which gender you identify as)

Please select one only.

1. Male
2. Female
3. Gender Diverse
4. **Online**: Prefer not to say/**Face to face**: Refused

All

Q25 Do you own a smartphone, with a data plan, that can access the internet?

Face to face “If needed, clarify if they have a data plan or not”

Face to face Single response.

Online Please select one only.

1. Yes – smartphone with a dataplan
2. Yes – smartphone but NO dataplan
3. No – I do not have a smartphone
4. Don’t know

All

Q26 So that we can calculate the distance people are travelling, please could you enter the address you **most often travel from** to get to this campus?

Face to Face: Pass the tablet to the respondent to enter details. Check spelling if you are entering the details yourself

Online: Please provide details below

(If Applicable) Flat/Unit/Apartment Number

Street Number _____

Street Name _____

Suburb _____

1. **Face to face** “Respondent is uncomfortable to give details above” **Online** “I am uncomfortable to give details above”

[If uncomfortable giving this detail at Q26]

Q26 Would you be able to give me an idea of this location by providing the street name and nearest intersecting street?

Face to Face: Pass the tablet to the respondent to enter details. Check spelling if you are entering the details yourself

Online: Please provide details below

Main street name

Nearest intersecting street _____

Suburb name _____

1. **Face to face** “Respondent is uncomfortable to give details above” **Online** “I am uncomfortable to give details above”



Prize Draw/further research

All

Q27a Would you like to be entered in the prize draw to win one of 22 \$50 vouchers of your choice?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

All

Q27b Auckland Transport may be conducting some further research about transport in the next few months. If this research does go ahead, would you be interested in being invited to participate in it?

Face to face Single response. Don't read out.

Online Please select one only.

If needed/Note: This research is not compulsory and you can opt out at any time

- 1. Yes
- 2. No

[Only ask if either Q27a or Q27b = 1]

Q27c And finally, so that we can contact you [if Q27a=1,"if you win the prize draw" or if Q27b=1, "to take part in further research" or if Q27a AND Q27b=1, "if you win the prize draw or to take part in further research"], what are your name and a contact phone number or email address?

Face to face Pass the tablet to the respondent to enter

Face to face Check spelling if you are entering the details yourself – If needed, read back the details you recorded to confirm.

Online Please provide your contact details below.

Name: _____
 Phone number: _____
 Email: _____

Outro

Face to face

Thank you very much for your time today
That's all the questions I need to ask you.

If needed: If you have any queries or comments about this survey you can call Gravitass Research on 0508 RESEARCH (73732724)

Enjoy the rest of your day!

Interviewer, If necessary, record any other comments made by the respondent before survey is filed out as a completed case:



Online

Thank you for completing the survey.

If you have any further queries or comments about this survey, you can email Gravitas Research on michael@gravitas.co.nz or call 0508 RESEARCH (73732724)

Face to face (For interviewer to complete)

Interviewer, before moving on to the next survey:

I declare that this survey has been completed fully and accurately.

Please select your name from the list below to confirm your declaration:

1. Interviewer 1
2. Interviewer 2
3. Interviewer 3



Appendix Two: Time Series Data (2016 v 2018)

All travel modes used – by campus

All Travel Modes Used	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=2,108	n=2,157	n=204	n=214	n=202	n=158	n=202	n=213	n=217	n=232	n=134	n=143	n=219	n=236	n=204	n=227	n=202	n=190	n=200	n=208	n=134	n=105	n=207	n=231
Public Bus	50%	50%	69%	61%	33%	36%	43%	42%	65%	74%	72%	59%	73%	60%	29%	31%	37%	46%	46%	41%	58%	59%	29%	40%
Drive alone in car	35%	32%	16%	15%	50%	48%	52%	46%	10%	7%	21%	20%	14%	13%	65%	60%	33%	29%	48%	56%	19%	9%	48%	44%
Train	18%	20%	27%	21%	12%	10%	11%	9%	17%	24%	13%	22%	16%	26%	3%	4%	32%	39%	10%	15%	40%	43%	18%	23%
Walk/run	16%	17%	19%	18%	11%	8%	10%	11%	21%	23%	43%	32%	19%	34%	7%	15%	1%	3%	6%	5%	31%	23%	18%	15%
Passenger in car dropped off	14%	9%	17%	7%	28%	33%	9%	4%	9%	9%	5%	1%	9%	6%	8%	6%	19%	11%	23%	13%	15%	5%	14%	7%
University shuttle bus	5%	4%	7%	7%	14%	9%	29%	13%	0%	<1%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	2%	0%	2%	0%	-	0%	-	3%	4%
Drove myself and others in car	6%	3%	4%	1%	5%	1%	8%	5%	1%	1%	7%	5%	2%	5%	14%	4%	6%	2%	8%	2%	2%	3%	8%	6%
Cycle	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	-	0%	2%	3%	3%	2%	11%	3%	4%	0%	3%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	4%	2%
Passenger in car parked near campus	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%	2%	9%	2%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	-	4%	1%	0%	1%	3%	1%
Ferry	1%	1%	0%	2%	0%	-	0%	1%	1%	3%	4%	-	1%	1%	0%	<1%	0%	-	2%	1%	4%	3%	1%	1%
Motorcycle/Scooter	1%	1%	2%	3%	0%	1%	0%	1%	3%	<1%	1%	4%	3%	<1%	0%	<1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	2%	1%	0%	<1%
Taxi/Uber	-	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	-	0%	<1%	0%	-	0%	2%	0%	1%	0%	2%	1%	-	1%	2%	0%	1%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly higher share of responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low share of responses



Main mode used – by campus

Main Travel Mode Used	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=2,108	n=1,990	n=204	n=198	n=202	n=144	n=202	n=192	n=217	n=214	n=134	n=136	n=219	n=214	n=204	n=219	n=202	n=177	n=200	n=186	n=134	n=186	n=207	n=223
Public Bus	36%	37%	54%	52%	20%	24%	23%	29%	55%	59%	44%	45%	56%	45%	22%	22%	30%	33%	33%	24%	37%	44%	21%	27%
Drive alone in car	27%	28%	6%	6%	41%	46%	41%	43%	5%	2%	10%	13%	7%	7%	58%	58%	29%	24%	45%	57%	7%	1%	40%	39%
Train	11%	13%	16%	16%	6%	4%	0%	3%	12%	15%	10%	12%	11%	18%	1%	-	24%	31%	3%	5%	32%	33%	12%	16%
Walk/run	10%	12%	10%	17%	5%	3%	7%	10%	18%	18%	25%	16%	15%	23%	6%	12%	1%	2%	3%	5%	15%	14%	8%	9%
Passenger in car dropped off	6%	4%	6%	2%	17%	19%	1%	2%	4%	1%	1%	0%	4%	1%	3%	4%	12%	7%	11%	8%	2%	3%	8%	2%
University shuttle bus	3%	2%	5%	5%	8%	2%	20%	7%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	2%	0%	-	0%	-	1%	1%
Drove myself and others in car	1%	2%	0%	-	1%	-	0%	2%	2%	1%	1%	9%	3%	2%	0%	2%	0%	-	1%	-	1%	1%	2%	2%
Cycle	3%	1%	0%	-	2%	1%	4%	2%	0%	1%	4%	4%	2%	2%	7%	1%	2%	1%	3%	-	0%	1%	5%	3%
Passenger in car parked near campus	1%	1%	0%	-	2%	-	3%	2%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	-	3%	2%	0%	-	1%	1%
Ferry	1%	1%	0%	3%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	4%	2%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	-	0%	-	3%	-	1%	<1%
Motorcycle/Scooter	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	-	0%	-	2%	2%	0%	-	1%	1%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	2%	2%	0%	-
Taxi/Uber	-	<1%	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-
Total PT	48%	51%	70%	71%	26%	29%	23%	33%	68%	75%	58%	59%	67%	64%	23%	23%	54%	64%	36%	29%	72%	77%	34%	44%
Total non-car	65%	68%	86%	94%	41%	36%	54%	52%	88%	97%	87%	79%	85%	90%	36%	37%	57%	70%	42%	34%	89%	94%	48%	57%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly higher share of responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low share of responses



Type of user – by campus

	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=2108	n=2157	n=204	n=214	n=202	n=158	n=202	n=213	n=217	n=232	n=134	n=143	n=219	n=236	n=204	n=227	n=202	n=190	n=200	n=208	n=134	n=105	n=207	n=231
Use PT Commonly	62%	60%	87%	73%	49%	39%	56%	43%	75%	84%	78%	71%	82%	75%	29%	31%	61%	73%	46%	42%	78%	84%	43%	52%
Use PT Occasionally	23%	27%	11%	22%	31%	32%	22%	37%	22%	13%	13%	23%	11%	20%	39%	45%	21%	17%	32%	31%	16%	11%	31%	33%
Non PT Users	16%	14%	2%	5%	21%	30%	22%	20%	4%	4%	8%	6%	7%	5%	32%	24%	18%	10%	23%	26%	6%	5%	26%	15%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses

Type of user – by area

	Total		CBD Campuses		CBD Fringe campuses		Non-CBD Campuses	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=2108	n=2157	n=555	n=551	n=353	n=379	n=1200	n=1227
Use PT Commonly	62%	60%	80%	80%	80%	73%	47%	47%
Use PT Occasionally	23%	27%	16%	16%	12%	21%	29%	33%
Non PT Users	16%	14%	4%	4%	7%	6%	24%	20%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Days of travel during peak times (7:00am – 9:00am) – by campus

	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=2108	n=2157	n=204	n=214	n=202	n=158	n=202	n=213	n=217	n=232	n=134	n=143	n=219	n=236	n=204	n=227	n=202	n=190	n=200	n=208	n=134	n=105	n=207	n=231
Monday	52%	50%	38%	37%	42%	39%	43%	56%	57%	46%	37%	35%	78%	57%	46%	54%	49%	60%	70%	82%	45%	21%	57%	52%
Tuesday	58%	49%	50%	40%	46%	34%	49%	54%	54%	47%	40%	36%	79%	55%	55%	62%	66%	53%	77%	76%	60%	17%	59%	46%
Wednesday	57%	49%	44%	39%	49%	32%	49%	48%	53%	46%	42%	36%	81%	61%	56%	55%	55%	55%	81%	79%	49%	26%	59%	43%
Thursday	57%	49%	46%	39%	49%	35%	50%	53%	57%	46%	39%	35%	81%	59%	55%	57%	60%	48%	76%	78%	45%	23%	56%	44%
Friday	49%	49%	39%	41%	51%	44%	37%	52%	56%	46%	35%	34%	80%	56%	49%	57%	34%	59%	65%	75%	34%	19%	45%	44%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Ease of taking PT to campus – by campus

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=1151	n=2038	n=203	n=200	n=195	n=141	n=172	n=195	n=214	n=221	n=127	n=139	n=217	n=231	n=196	n=212	n=199	n=186	n=181	n=187	n=130	n=103	n=177	n=223
10	16%	23%	22%	30%	9%	21%	11%	20%	11%	23%	28%	21%	12%	23%	10%	12%	27%	35%	11%	28%	26%	26%	14%	20%
9	12%	10%	13%	13%	13%	9%	11%	8%	17%	12%	19%	15%	13%	13%	6%	5%	14%	14%	7%	4%	15%	8%	10%	9%
8	19%	18%	25%	20%	13%	14%	15%	14%	22%	25%	20%	22%	28%	21%	10%	12%	18%	14%	19%	14%	21%	28%	13%	15%
Total 8-10	47%	51%	60%	62%	36%	43%	37%	42%	50%	60%	68%	58%	53%	56%	26%	29%	59%	63%	37%	47%	62%	62%	37%	43%
7	13%	13%	14%	15%	13%	11%	10%	11%	17%	19%	9%	10%	18%	16%	13%	13%	6%	11%	12%	10%	10%	17%	16%	8%
6	7%	7%	8%	9%	9%	5%	10%	7%	9%	7%	6%	5%	9%	10%	6%	9%	4%	4%	6%	9%	5%	6%	8%	6%
Total 6=10	67%	71%	82%	86%	58%	59%	58%	61%	77%	86%	82%	73%	81%	82%	44%	52%	68%	79%	55%	65%	76%	85%	60%	57%
5	9%	9%	8%	7%	6%	11%	15%	9%	8%	6%	6%	7%	6%	5%	8%	11%	14%	5%	11%	8%	12%	8%	10%	17%
4	6%	4%	4%	3%	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%	3%	2%	8%	4%	4%	12%	4%	3%	2%	7%	8%	5%	1%	7%	4%
3	7%	4%	2%	2%	9%	8%	12%	4%	4%	2%	2%	2%	7%	5%	12%	4%	3%	2%	6%	3%	3%	4%	11%	5%
2	4%	4%	1%	1%	9%	3%	2%	8%	4%	1%	6%	4%	1%	2%	9%	8%	5%	5%	6%	3%	1%	1%	6%	7%
1	3%	2%	1%	1%	6%	1%	5%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	<1%	7%	5%	1%	1%	5%	1%	2%	-	2%	3%
0	4%	7%	1%	1%	5%	13%	2%	10%	1%	2%	0%	6%	0%	2%	8%	16%	6%	6%	11%	12%	1%	2%	4%	8%
Total 4-0	24%	21%	10%	8%	35%	30%	28%	30%	15%	8%	13%	21%	13%	13%	47%	37%	18%	16%	34%	27%	12%	8%	30%	26%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Ease of taking PT to campus – by area

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		CBD Campuses		CBD Fringe campuses		Non-CBD Campuses	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=1151	n=2038	n=547	n=524	n=344	n=370	n=1120	n=1144
10	16%	23%	18%	26%	18%	22%	14%	22%
9	12%	10%	15%	12%	15%	14%	10%	8%
8	19%	18%	23%	24%	25%	21%	15%	14%
Total 8-10	47%	51%	56%	61%	59%	57%	39%	44%
7	13%	13%	14%	17%	15%	14%	12%	11%
6	7%	7%	7%	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%
Total 6=10	67%	71%	78%	86%	81%	78%	57%	62%
5	9%	9%	9%	7%	6%	6%	11%	10%
4	6%	4%	5%	3%	3%	5%	7%	5%
3	7%	4%	3%	2%	5%	4%	9%	4%
2	4%	4%	2%	1%	3%	3%	6%	6%
1	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	4%	3%
0	4%	7%	1%	2%	0%	3%	6%	11%
Total 4-0	24%	21%	13%	8%	13%	16%	32%	28%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



What would make using PT more easy or convenient – by campus

What would make it easier and more convenient?	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=1274	n=2157	n=204	n=214	n=185	n=158	n=202	n=213	n=217	n=232	n=134	n=143	n=219	n=236	n=204	n=227	n=202	n=190	n=200	n=208	n=134	n=105	n=207	n=231
More frequent services	25%	21%	28%	22%	16%	10%	28%	20%	41%	28%	19%	24%	35%	31%	29%	23%	6%	18%	22%	13%	24%	12%	16%	20%
More direct routes (shorter trips)	15%	11%	6%	8%	11%	16%	35%	23%	6%	4%	15%	10%	17%	9%	26%	14%	8%	7%	15%	11%	6%	6%	15%	10%
On time/reliable	13%	9%	10%	7%	11%	6%	9%	4%	17%	12%	6%	13%	23%	11%	10%	12%	13%	7%	13%	5%	16%	8%	11%	9%
Cheaper	11%	8%	9%	7%	9%	10%	13%	7%	10%	9%	11%	4%	17%	12%	9%	5%	7%	4%	11%	6%	20%	12%	8%	10%
Stops closer to home/campus	8%	8%	6%	7%	8%	13%	2%	10%	6%	5%	8%	5%	6%	7%	3%	10%	12%	2%	18%	6%	10%	10%	13%	10%
Increase/improve network in general	6%	5%	4%	3%	5%	1%	4%	7%	9%	7%	-	4%	7%	5%	7%	4%	7%	7%	4%	5%	1%	7%	7%	7%
I would never travel here by public transport	2%	5%	1%	1%	3%	10%	11%	6%	-	1%	-	2%	1%	2%	1%	12%	2%	1%	4%	7%	1%	1%	2%	6%
No suggestions	20%	30%	26%	34%	23%	36%	20%	20%	14%	30%	28%	29%	14%	22%	21%	21%	21%	45%	17%	41%	25%	29%	17%	23%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Likelihood of recommending PT – by campus

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=2028	n=2103	n=203	n=213	n=177	n=152	n=187	n=203	n=215	n=231	n=129	n=138	n=218	n=234	n=199	n=220	n=200	n=189	n=181	n=192	n=133	n=104	n=186	n=227
10	17%	25%	23%	27%	12%	24%	7%	25%	11%	27%	30%	24%	14%	20%	11%	15%	24%	31%	18%	33%	25%	32%	20%	26%
9	12%	9%	15%	13%	11%	1%	11%	6%	15%	12%	14%	15%	14%	14%	8%	6%	14%	14%	10%	6%	16%	8%	10%	8%
8	17%	19%	20%	26%	16%	23%	14%	16%	23%	22%	13%	20%	23%	21%	20%	16%	12%	19%	17%	17%	18%	20%	13%	15%
Total 8-10	47%	54%	86%	66%	60%	49%	60%	47%	76%	61%	83%	59%	78%	55%	63%	36%	69%	63%	62%	56%	77%	60%	67%	50%
7	16%	14%	19%	11%	14%	13%	20%	12%	17%	18%	19%	11%	19%	21%	15%	16%	15%	14%	9%	10%	14%	13%	16%	11%
6	8%	9%	8%	7%	7%	10%	7%	10%	10%	6%	7%	9%	9%	9%	10%	13%	5%	5%	8%	8%	5%	7%	9%	9%
Total 6=10	71%	77%	58%	84%	39%	71%	33%	70%	49%	85%	57%	79%	51%	85%	38%	64%	49%	82%	44%	75%	59%	79%	42%	70%
5	15%	14%	6%	11%	20%	17%	17%	20%	11%	9%	5%	11%	11%	8%	18%	17%	23%	11%	22%	16%	11%	14%	18%	18%
4	5%	2%	1%	1%	6%	5%	10%	2%	5%	1%	3%	3%	5%	1%	5%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%	5%	4%	4%	4%
3	4%	2%	2%	1%	8%	3%	4%	3%	4%	2%	2%	1%	4%	2%	6%	4%	3%	2%	2%	2%	5%	1%	4%	3%
2	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	1%	5%	2%	3%	<1%	2%	2%	1%	1%	4%	4%	2%	2%	4%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%
1	2%	1%	0%	1%	2%	-	2%	-	1%	<1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	4%	1%	1%	-	2%	1%
0	1%	3%	0%	1%	1%	3%	2%	3%	1%	3%	2%	2%	0%	1%	2%	8%	2%	2%	3%	2%	0%	1%	2%	3%
Total 4-0	14%	10%	8%	6%	20%	12%	23%	10%	13%	6%	12%	10%	11%	7%	19%	19%	9%	8%	17%	10%	11%	8%	15%	12%
NPS	-8	+3	15	17	-25	-13	-28	-9	-8	17	20	8	-2	9	-28	-29	1	21	-19	5	14	12	-12	-5

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Likelihood of recommending PT – by area

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		CBD Campuses		CBD Fringe campuses		Non-CBD Campuses	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=2028	n=2103	n=551	n=551	n=347	n=372	n=1130	n=1183
10	17%	25%	19%	28%	20%	21%	15%	25%
9	12%	9%	15%	11%	14%	14%	11%	7%
8	17%	19%	21%	23%	19%	21%	15%	17%
Total 8-10	47%	54%	55%	62%	53%	55%	41%	48%
7	16%	14%	17%	14%	19%	18%	15%	13%
6	8%	9%	8%	6%	8%	9%	8%	9%
Total 6=10	71%	77%	80%	83%	80%	83%	64%	72%
5	15%	14%	9%	11%	9%	9%	19%	17%
4	5%	2%	3%	2%	4%	2%	5%	3%
3	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%	2%	4%	3%
2	3%	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%	3%	2%
1	2%	1%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
0	1%	3%	0%	2%	1%	2%	2%	4%
Total 4-0	14%	10%	11%	6%	11%	8%	17%	12%
NPS	-8	+3	6	16	6	9	-18	-5

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Perceptions of PT – by campus

	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=2108	n=2155	n=204	n=214	n=185	n=158	n=202	n=213	n=217	n=232	n=134	n=143	n=219	n=236	n=204	n=227	n=202	n=188	n=200	n=208	n=134	n=105	n=207	n=231
Does not save money/not cheaper	45%	27%	40%	33%	51%	29%	60%	29%	36%	28%	43%	29%	38%	28%	42%	24%	46%	20%	45%	23%	56%	42%	39%	23%
Not frequent enough	27%	25%	27%	24%	21%	18%	48%	19%	24%	30%	28%	30%	35%	36%	32%	27%	24%	26%	13%	19%	19%	16%	17%	19%
Not direct enough	23%	21%	18%	11%	17%	26%	72%	29%	9%	16%	22%	20%	21%	25%	34%	29%	15%	18%	13%	22%	18%	17%	12%	19%
Other options are faster	19%	20%	18%	17%	21%	37%	42%	28%	7%	13%	9%	22%	32%	17%	33%	19%	5%	20%	11%	18%	7%	9%	14%	16%
PT Unreliable	29%	18%	29%	19%	24%	18%	33%	18%	28%	20%	17%	22%	43%	23%	31%	19%	36%	11%	27%	15%	25%	11%	16%	20%
PT overcrowded	23%	10%	36%	20%	27%	3%	42%	6%	32%	19%	10%	9%	45%	18%	12%	2%	14%	1%	11%	6%	12%	11%	7%	10%
PT is not available/unrealistic	8%	8%	11%	7%	6%	3%	18%	16%	2%	13%	4%	3%	11%	3%	15%	13%	7%	3%	2%	3%	1%	3%	2%	10%
Not enough stops/too far from home/campus	7%	7%	7%	8%	9%	9%	1%	4%	12%	8%	3%	5%	2%	9%	3%	4%	12%	8%	14%	5%	3%	7%	10%	8%
Don't know	4%	9%	3%	10%	4%	7%	0%	5%	0%	12%	0%	13%	0%	4%	1%	8%	2%	15%	0%	11%	4%	10%	0%	9%
NO barriers	1%	5%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%	3%	3%	6%	6%	1%	3%	1%	5%	7%	10%	8%	7%	6%	11%	11%	8%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



It is easy to get PT – by campus

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=1987	n=2021	n=197	n=206	n=164	n=137	n=177	n=198	n=204	n=226	n=129	n=139	n=206	n=231	n=153	n=205	n=188	n=180	n=160	n=181	n=119	n=103	n=181	n=215
10	23%	32%	28%	32%	23%	26%	6%	31%	19%	30%	29%	30%	13%	29%	18%	27%	38%	40%	19%	37%	33%	30%	28%	40%
9	12%	10%	14%	11%	15%	7%	6%	9%	10%	13%	12%	12%	12%	10%	16%	8%	12%	12%	10%	9%	8%	9%	15%	10%
8	15%	16%	16%	20%	17%	16%	6%	20%	22%	13%	16%	19%	13%	16%	22%	15%	14%	13%	11%	17%	13%	11%	17%	15%
Total 8-10	50%	58%	59%	64%	55%	49%	18%	60%	51%	56%	57%	60%	37%	55%	56%	50%	64%	64%	41%	63%	54%	50%	59%	65%
7	12%	12%	11%	10%	12%	15%	10%	13%	12%	15%	12%	10%	14%	9%	12%	13%	14%	10%	15%	11%	11%	18%	12%	10%
6	7%	8%	6%	7%	4%	9%	6%	7%	11%	8%	7%	4%	9%	11%	8%	8%	3%	7%	6%	9%	7%	11%	7%	4%
Total 6=10	69%	78%	76%	81%	71%	73%	33%	80%	74%	78%	76%	74%	61%	75%	76%	71%	81%	82%	62%	83%	71%	79%	78%	80%
5	11%	9%	8%	8%	13%	15%	10%	7%	10%	8%	9%	12%	12%	10%	9%	11%	7%	10%	19%	5%	16%	10%	10%	7%
4	6%	4%	2%	4%	5%	2%	19%	7%	8%	4%	2%	6%	7%	5%	5%	4%	1%	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	7%	3%
3	6%	4%	7%	3%	4%	7%	15%	2%	4%	4%	9%	2%	10%	5%	6%	6%	2%	3%	8%	2%	2%	4%	3%	4%
2	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	-	11%	2%	2%	3%	2%	4%	6%	3%	1%	2%	3%	1%	4%	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%
1	3%	1%	5%	1%	3%	-	6%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
0	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	7%	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	5%	2%	1%	4%
Total 4-0	20%	13%	16%	11%	16%	12%	57%	14%	16%	14%	15%	14%	28%	16%	14%	18%	11%	8%	19%	12%	13%	12%	12%	13%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Likelihood of recommending HOP – by campus

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=1987	n=2122	n=201	n=213	n=177	n=150	n=191	n=210	n=213	n=230	n=132	n=142	n=214	n=234	n=173	n=223	n=195	n=189	n=171	n=200	n=129	n=104	n=191	n=227
10	55%	68%	65%	68%	51%	65%	35%	66%	53%	69%	66%	67%	51%	66%	45%	66%	70%	72%	46%	73%	71%	73%	56%	66%
9	16%	12%	16%	14%	15%	10%	18%	14%	21%	12%	14%	11%	21%	16%	17%	10%	10%	18%	10%	7%	5%	14%	9%	
8	15%	10%	13%	9%	15%	12%	24%	9%	13%	10%	13%	12%	16%	9%	18%	11%	11%	16%	6%	8%	10%	14%	11%	
Total 8-10	86%	89%	94%	90%	81%	87%	76%	90%	86%	91%	93%	90%	88%	91%	81%	87%	91%	93%	80%	89%	85%	86%	84%	85%
7	6%	5%	2%	7%	6%	6%	10%	5%	7%	4%	3%	4%	5%	4%	12%	5%	3%	3%	6%	6%	9%	10%	7%	7%
6	3%	2%	2%	1%	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	4%	2%	1%	3%	6%	4%
Total 6=10	95%	96%	99%	99%	91%	95%	91%	96%	97%	97%	98%	96%	94%	97%	96%	94%	94%	96%	90%	96%	95%	100%	97%	96%
5	3%	2%	1%	1%	7%	2%	5%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	5%	2%	1%	3%	2%	3%	6%	3%	3%	-	2%	2%
4	1%	<1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	1%	2%	<1%	1%	1%	0%	-	0%	-	1%	-
3	1%	<1%	0%	-	1%	-	3%	-	0%	<1%	0%	1%	0%	-	0%	-	1%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-
2	0%	<1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	-	0%	-	1%	1%	0%	<1%	1%	<1%	2%	1%	1%	-	0%	-	0%	-
1	0%	<1%	0%	-	0%	-	1%	1%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	1%	-	0%	-	1%	-	2%	-	0%	1%
0	0%	1%	0%	-	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	<1%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	2%	1%	-	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%
Total 4-0	2%	2%	0%	1%	2%	3%	5%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	3%	3%	4%	1%	4%	2%	2%	-	1%	2%
NPS	62	+74	77	79	54	67	39	75	67	77	77	73	64	77	55	69	74	77	50	77	71	75	61	67

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



How could AT HOP card be made more useful – by campus

	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=2108	n=2157	n=204	n=214	n=185	n=158	n=202	n=213	n=217	n=232	n=134	n=143	n=219	n=236	n=204	n=227	n=202	n=190	n=200	n=208	n=134	n=105	n=207	n=231
Better discount/cheaper	13%	8%	13%	13%	18%	3%	5%	7%	11%	12%	23%	5%	5%	8%	11%	5%	17%	7%	9%	7%	18%	11%	16%	10%
Concession process made easier/quicker	11%	8%	5%	7%	6%	4%	32%	9%	6%	9%	22%	11%	27%	14%	6%	12%	1%	3%	5%	2%	7%	11%	3%	5%
Link to phone/bank card/electronic	2%	7%	2%	10%	1%	6%	3%	8%	2%	6%	1%	8%	0%	9%	0%	8%	3%	8%	2%	2%	0%	7%	2%	8%
Use to buy other things E.g. food, parking, printing	2%	6%	3%	4%	3%	20%	1%	3%	4%	5%	2%	8%	0%	5%	3%	3%	1%	8%	2%	5%	1%	2%	4%	7%
Easier to top up/more places	11%	5%	10%	7%	6%	3%	19%	3%	9%	7%	5%	4%	17%	8%	16%	3%	9%	1%	11%	3%	11%	7%	4%	8%
Txt/mobile/app top up/more reliable	2%	5%	1%	10%	1%	2%	1%	4%	1%	7%	3%	6%	1%	7%	1%	3%	2%	3%	2%	1%	4%	9%	2%	4%
Have top up/service centres on campus	6%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	39%	5%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	5%	5%	2%	4%	1%	1%	2%	3%	0%	2%	3%	5%
Bonuses/discounts on travel and other items (i.e. points card)	1%	2%	-	1%	-	6%	-	-	-	1%	-	2%	-	1%	-	1%	-	5%	-	2%	-	1%	-	3%
No suggestions	26%	46%	28%	41%	35%	51%	13%	46%	40%	46%	13%	47%	37%	36%	24%	47%	28%	59%	16%	58%	26%	41%	24%	39%
Don't know	24%	12%	25%	14%	21%	10%	12%	12%	12%	10%	24%	11%	5%	12%	33%	12%	30%	7%	41%	14%	25%	11%	35%	14%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Ease of parking near campus – by campus

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=1369	n=1274	n=112	n=106	n=146	n=124	n=163	n=149	n=103	n=101	n=51	n=73	n=127	n=127	n=169	n=164	n=127	n=91	n=148	n=153	n=72	n=46	n=151	n=140
10	11%	11%	3%	5%	25%	11%	1%	3%	5%	5%	14%	11%	1%	2%	4%	12%	22%	29%	22%	20%	4%	2%	17%	18%
9	6%	3%	1%	1%	9%	3%	4%	2%	1%	-	12%	-	3%	-	8%	2%	8%	7%	11%	7%	1%	-	4%	5%
8	9%	8%	3%	3%	18%	8%	7%	4%	2%	-	8%	7%	3%	3%	6%	10%	10%	15%	11%	9%	4%	2%	16%	18%
Total 8-10	25%	22%	6%	9%	53%	23%	12%	9%	8%	5%	33%	18%	7%	5%	18%	25%	40%	51%	45%	36%	10%	4%	36%	41%
7	9%	10%	7%	4%	12%	18%	9%	9%	5%	7%	4%	-	6%	4%	11%	12%	12%	15%	11%	14%	3%	2%	16%	13%
6	8%	9%	3%	5%	6%	17%	4%	5%	7%	4%	10%	10%	7%	6%	9%	9%	15%	9%	7%	14%	6%	-	11%	12%
Total 6=10	43%	40%	16%	17%	71%	57%	26%	34%	19%	16%	47%	27%	20%	14%	37%	46%	67%	75%	63%	64%	18%	7%	63%	66%
5	12%	13%	9%	10%	10%	21%	14%	16%	9%	12%	14%	8%	14%	8%	17%	13%	13%	8%	11%	13%	7%	7%	14%	14%
4	9%	7%	12%	5%	7%	7%	9%	9%	11%	5%	8%	14%	11%	6%	13%	7%	7%	3%	5%	5%	13%	13%	7%	5%
3	13%	9%	21%	9%	3%	4%	19%	12%	28%	15%	14%	18%	18%	12%	14%	9%	6%	3%	5%	7%	11%	9%	11%	7%
2	9%	10%	12%	12%	3%	5%	13%	11%	14%	20%	0%	12%	21%	19%	12%	9%	3%	4%	8%	3%	11%	15%	3%	3%
1	5%	5%	12%	9%	3%	3%	6%	5%	7%	7%	6%	1%	7%	9%	4%	7%	1%	-	4%	1%	10%	11%	1%	1%
0	9%	17%	20%	37%	2%	2%	13%	22%	13%	26%	12%	19%	9%	32%	4%	9%	4%	7%	4%	8%	31%	39%	2%	4%
Total 4-0	45%	47%	75%	73%	18%	22%	60%	60%	72%	72%	39%	64%	66%	78%	46%	41%	20%	18%	26%	23%	75%	87%	23%	20%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Ease of parking near campus – by area

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		CBD Campuses		CBD Fringe campuses		Non-CBD Campuses	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=1369	n=1274	n=287	n=253	n=178	n=200	n=904	n=821
10	11%	11%	4%	4%	4%	5%	15%	15%
9	6%	3%	1%	<1%	6%	-	7%	4%
8	9%	8%	3%	2%	4%	5%	11%	10%
Total 8-10	25%	22%	8%	6%	15%	10%	33%	29%
7	9%	10%	5%	5%	5%	3%	12%	13%
6	8%	9%	5%	4%	8%	7%	8%	11%
Total 6=10	43%	40%	18%	15%	28%	19%	53%	54%
5	12%	13%	8%	10%	14%	8%	13%	15%
4	9%	7%	11%	6%	10%	9%	8%	6%
3	13%	9%	21%	12%	17%	14%	10%	7%
2	9%	10%	12%	16%	15%	17%	7%	6%
1	5%	5%	9%	9%	7%	6%	3%	3%
0	9%	17%	20%	33%	10%	28%	5%	9%
Total 4-0	45%	47%	74%	75%	58%	73%	34%	32%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Parking charges are reasonable – by campus

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=1230	n=1274	n=109	n=106	n=146	n=124	n=160	n=149	n=101	n=101	n=44	n=73	n=117	n=127	n=122	n=164	n=123	n=91	n=126	n=153	n=66	n=46	n=116	n=140
10	16%	11%	3%	5%	5%	11%	3%	3%	2%	5%	0%	11%	1%	2%	73%	12%	13%	29%	38%	20%	2%	2%	22%	18%
9	5%	3%	1%	1%	2%	3%	6%	2%	1%	-	16%	-	2%	-	7%	2%	7%	7%	10%	7%	0%	-	10%	5%
8	8%	8%	1%	3%	8%	8%	8%	4%	3%	-	16%	7%	7%	3%	7%	10%	12%	15%	10%	9%	0%	2%	13%	18%
Total 8-10	29%	22%	5%	9%	15%	23%	16%	9%	6%	5%	32%	18%	9%	5%	87%	25%	33%	51%	59%	36%	2%	4%	46%	41%
7	5%	10%	3%	4%	8%	18%	4%	9%	1%	7%	11%	-	6%	4%	2%	12%	7%	15%	4%	14%	2%	2%	11%	13%
6	7%	9%	4%	5%	10%	17%	9%	5%	4%	4%	11%	10%	5%	6%	2%	9%	13%	9%	6%	14%	0%	-	9%	12%
Total 6-10	41%	40%	11%	17%	32%	57%	29%	24%	11%	16%	55%	27%	21%	14%	91%	46%	53%	75%	68%	64%	3%	7%	66%	66%
5	12%	13%	12%	10%	18%	21%	18%	16%	15%	12%	18%	8%	6%	8%	5%	13%	11%	8%	13%	13%	9%	7%	11%	14%
4	8%	7%	10%	5%	10%	7%	10%	9%	19%	5%	2%	14%	15%	6%	1%	7%	7%	3%	1%	5%	5%	13%	5%	5%
3	10%	9%	15%	9%	12%	4%	13%	12%	10%	15%	7%	18%	19%	12%	1%	9%	8%	3%	5%	7%	15%	9%	5%	7%
2	9%	10%	18%	12%	5%	5%	8%	11%	18%	20%	14%	12%	17%	19%	2%	9%	11%	4%	6%	3%	8%	15%	3%	3%
1	8%	5%	15%	9%	8%	3%	8%	5%	12%	7%	2%	1%	14%	9%	0%	7%	8%	-	2%	1%	6%	11%	6%	1%
0	12%	17%	19%	37%	15%	2%	14%	22%	16%	26%	2%	19%	9%	32%	0%	9%	2%	7%	6%	8%	55%	39%	4%	4%
Total 4-0	47%	47%	77%	73%	50%	22%	53%	60%	74%	72%	27%	64%	74%	78%	4%	41%	37%	18%	19%	23%	88%	87%	23%	20%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Parking charges are reasonable – by area

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		CBD Campuses		CBD Fringe campuses		Non-CBD Campuses	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=1369	n=1274	n=276	n=253	n=161	n=200	n=793	n=821
10	16%	11%	2%	4%	1%	5%	24%	15%
9	5%	3%	1%	<1%	6%	-	7%	4%
8	8%	8%	1%	2%	9%	5%	10%	10%
Total 8-10	29%	22%	4%	6%	16%	10%	40%	29%
7	5%	10%	2%	5%	7%	3%	6%	13%
6	7%	9%	3%	4%	7%	7%	8%	11%
Total 6=10	41%	40%	9%	15%	30%	19%	54%	54%
5	12%	13%	12%	10%	9%	8%	13%	15%
4	8%	7%	12%	6%	11%	9%	6%	6%
3	10%	9%	13%	12%	16%	14%	8%	7%
2	9%	10%	16%	16%	16%	17%	6%	6%
1	8%	5%	12%	9%	11%	6%	6%	3%
0	12%	17%	26%	33%	7%	28%	7%	9%
Total 4-0	47%	47%	79%	75%	61%	73%	33%	32%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Improvements to carpooling – by campus

	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=1270	n=2157	n=108	n=214	n=129	n=158	n=165	n=213	n=119	n=232	n=47	n=143	n=154	n=236	n=165	n=227	n=97	n=190	n=107	n=207	n=67	n=105	n=112	n=231
Finding people who live nearby	13%	9%	3%	7%	20%	5%	5%	14%	1%	7%	26%	4%	-	13%	9%	13%	13%	4%	36%	7%	18%	5%	27%	13%
More parking	10%	6%	19%	8%	-	1%	2%	4%	22%	5%	4%	6%	27%	17%	9%	5%	2%	1%	1%	1%	22%	11%	4%	4%
A way to find people to carpool with online or on phone	6%	6%	5%	7%	5%	9%	3%	6%	6%	5%	19%	8%	10%	6%	10%	5%	1%	5%	2%	3%	4%	4%	6%	7%
Cheaper parking	8%	4%	17%	6%	7%	5%	1%	2%	15%	8%	4%	4%	21%	9%	2%	<1%	-	4%	1%	-	21%	12%	2%	<1%
Coordinating timetables/people	5%	2%	4%	1%	9%	3%	4%	1%	3%	2%	9%	-	-	3%	8%	2%	6%	2%	10%	1%	3%	-	6%	4%
Better traffic/More carpool lanes	-	2%	-	2%	-	2%	-	1%	-	4%	-	3%	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	-	1%
Free parking	3%	2%	6%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	8%	2%	2%	4%	5%	2%	2%	<1%	2%	1%	-	1%	9%	3%	1%	1%
More dedicated student parking/lot	-	2%	1%	2%	-	-	-	-	7%	1%	11%	-	6%	6%	5%	-	3%	1%	1%	1%	3%	7%	12%	-
Knowing more people/carpooling with people I know	3%	2%	1%	-	4%	-	-	4%	1%	4%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	1%	-	8%	1%	1%	1%	6%	2%
Would never travel by carpool	16%	13%	15%	9%	12%	7%	38%	11%	1%	17%	15%	12%	3%	11%	7%	12%	43%	10%	14%	10%	16%	15%	13%	26%
No suggestions	28%	37%	29%	37%	33%	41%	32%	39%	30%	35%	17%	37%	32%	28%	38%	45%	24%	48%	21%	50%	18%	31%	19%	18%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Ease of walking to campus – by campus

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=391	n=460	n=30	n=46	n=37	n=29	n=23	n=30	n=50	n=54	n=61	n=53	n=46	n=64	n=35	n=53	n=17	n=31	n=25	n=32	n=28	n=19	n=39	n=49
10	41%	48%	53%	57%	27%	35%	57%	70%	46%	52%	33%	26%	26%	48%	31%	49%	47%	32%	32%	50%	71%	47%	49%	57%
9	11%	7%	10%	7%	5%	3%	9%	-	24%	11%	11%	6%	24%	16%	9%	8%	6%	3%	4%	-	0%	-	5%	8%
8	15%	12%	13%	9%	16%	14%	9%	7%	14%	7%	23%	25%	15%	8%	3%	15%	12%	16%	20%	16%	14%	11%	13%	2%
Total 8-10	67%	66%	77%	72%	49%	52%	74%	77%	84%	70%	67%	57%	65%	72%	43%	72%	65%	52%	56%	66%	86%	58%	67%	67%
7	9%	10%	10%	11%	8%	14%	4%	7%	6%	9%	8%	11%	15%	11%	6%	8%	6%	13%	12%	3%	4%	16%	13%	14%
6	6%	7%	3%	-	5%	7%	4%	7%	4%	6%	3%	9%	11%	8%	14%	4%	6%	13%	4%	13%	4%	16%	5%	4%
Total 6=10	81%	84%	90%	83%	62%	72%	83%	90%	94%	85%	79%	77%	91%	91%	63%	83%	76%	77%	72%	81%	93%	90%	85%	86%
5	8%	8%	10%	4%	14%	24%	9%	-	0%	6%	13%	9%	2%	6%	17%	8%	12%	10%	8%	9%	7%	5%	5%	8%
4	5%	4%	0%	7%	16%	-	9%	3%	0%	4%	3%	8%	7%	2%	9%	4%	6%	3%	4%	3%	0%	5%	3%	-
3	3%	2%	0%	4%	3%	3%	0%	-	4%	2%	3%	2%	0%	2%	9%	2%	0%	7%	8%	-	0%	-	5%	-
2	1%	1%	0%	-	3%	-	0%	3%	2%	4%	0%	2%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	4%
1	1%	<1%	0%	-	3%	-	0%	3%	0%	-	2%	2%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	8%	-	0%	-	3%	-
0	1%	2%	0%	2%	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	3%	4%	6%	3%	0%	6%	0%	-	0%	2%
Total 4-0	10%	9%	0%	13%	24%	3%	9%	10%	6%	9%	8%	13%	7%	3%	20%	9%	12%	13%	20%	9%	0%	5%	10%	6%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



What would make walking to campus easier – by campus

	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=332	n=463	n=24	n=46	n=29	n=30	n=22	n=30	n=47	n=54	n=53	n=54	n=46	n=64	n=29	n=54	n=11	n=31	n=20	n=32	n=26	n=19	n=25	n=49
More protection from weather	1%	5%	-	9%	-	7%	-	7%	-	7%	-	4%	-	3%	-	6%	-	7%	-	-	-	5%	-	-
More pedestrian crossings/over bridge	3%	4%	-	4%	3%	3%	5%	3%	-	2%	2%	4%	7%	6%	10%	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	2%
More pedestrian friendly streets	1%	2%	-	-	-	7%	-	-	-	4%	-	4%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%
No hills	2%	2%	8%	4%	-	-	-	-	2%	7%	2%	-	-	5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-
Better lighting	5%	2%	-	-	-	-	5%	-	-	-	4%	-	17%	6%	10%	6%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	8%	-
Shortcut/direct path	2%	2%	-	2%	-	-	-	-	-	-	2%	2%	2%	-	-	4%	-	-	10%	3%	-	5%	8%	2%
Don't know	2%	9%	-	22%	7%	3%	-	7%	-	4%	4%	11%	2%	8%	3%	7%	9%	7%	-	3%	4%	16%	-	8%
No suggestions	68%	68%	67%	59%	72%	67%	91%	73%	79%	74%	58%	72%	70%	61%	69%	59%	64%	87%	40%	75%	73%	53%	60%	74%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



Ease of cycling to campus – by campus

Rating from 10-0 10 being 'Strongly agree'	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	n=250	n=303	n=23	n=12	n=25	n=26	n=15	n=23	n=19	n=34	n=10	n=42	n=22	n=38	n=27	n=33	n=12	n=23	n=37	n=18	n=32	n=9	n=28	n=45
10	23%	23%	4%	17%	12%	27%	40%	13%	11%	18%	20%	14%	9%	21%	15%	24%	8%	22%	27%	17%	34%	22%	54%	42%
9	7%	10%	4%	-	16%	-	20%	4%	0%	6%	20%	17%	9%	13%	4%	12%	8%	26%	11%	6%	0%	11%	0%	7%
8	17%	13%	35%	8%	20%	12%	7%	17%	26%	9%	30%	10%	9%	3%	15%	12%	17%	17%	16%	39%	22%	22%	0%	11%
Total 8-10	47%	45%	43%	25%	48%	39%	67%	35%	37%	32%	70%	41%	27%	37%	33%	49%	33%	65%	54%	61%	56%	56%	54%	60%
7	12%	11%	13%	17%	12%	19%	0%	4%	21%	6%	10%	10%	18%	13%	11%	12%	0%	13%	0%	6%	22%	11%	14%	13%
6	7%	13%	4%	25%	8%	8%	0%	13%	16%	15%	0%	17%	5%	8%	15%	15%	17%	13%	5%	17%	0%	11%	7%	9%
Total 6=10	66%	69%	61%	67%	68%	65%	67%	52%	74%	53%	80%	67%	50%	58%	59%	76%	50%	91%	59%	83%	78%	78%	75%	82%
5	10%	11%	13%	17%	8%	15%	7%	13%	11%	12%	10%	10%	9%	13%	15%	9%	17%	-	11%	17%	6%	11%	11%	9%
4	6%	4%	13%	-	4%	4%	7%	13%	5%	6%	10%	2%	18%	5%	4%	-	8%	-	3%	-	3%	11%	4%	2%
3	6%	5%	4%	8%	8%	8%	13%	9%	11%	9%	0%	7%	18%	11%	11%	3%	0%	-	3%	-	3%	-	0%	-
2	3%	6%	0%	-	4%	8%	7%	13%	0%	12%	0%	5%	0%	8%	0%	3%	8%	4%	8%	-	0%	-	7%	2%
1	5%	2%	9%	-	4%	-	0%	-	0%	3%	0%	2%	5%	3%	7%	3%	17%	4%	11%	-	3%	-	0%	-
0	3%	4%	0%	8%	4%	-	0%	-	0%	6%	0%	7%	0%	3%	4%	6%	0%	-	5%	-	6%	-	4%	4%
Total 4-0	24%	20%	26%	17%	24%	19%	27%	35%	16%	35%	10%	24%	41%	29%	26%	15%	33%	9%	30%	-	16%	11%	14%	9%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses



What would make cycling to campus easier – by campus

	Total		AUT City		AUT South		AUT North		UoA City		UoA Newmarket		UoA Grafton		Massey Albany		MIT Manukau		MIT Ōtara		MAINZ City		Unitec Mt Albert	
	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018	2016	2018
	m=238	m=334	m=24	m=13	m=32	m=27	m=16	m=25	m=16	m=36	m=9	m=50	m=22	m=44	m=28	m=35	m=7	m=25	m=34	m=18	m=28	m=14	m=22	m=47
Bigger/better/more cycle lanes	34%	34%	25%	39%	22%	52%	25%	48%	44%	33%	22%	54%	59%	47%	50%	17%	14%	16%	35%	22%	30%	7%	32%	17%
Having a bike	10%	8%	13%	15%	9%	11%	19%	4%	-	6%	11%	2%	-	5%	7%	6%	-	12%	24%	6%	7%	29%	9%	15%
Safer/less traffic	11%	8%	4%	-	-	7%	19%	-	31%	8%	22%	16%	14%	14%	-	9%	14%	8%	12%	6%	15%	-	9%	4%
More/better bike parks/racks and security	8%	5%	4%	15%	3%	11%	-	8%	6%	3%	-	4%	9%	2%	11%	6%	-	-	21%	11%	7%	7%	5%	2%
Less hills	3%	4%	4%	23%	-	7%	-	8%	6%	3%	22%	6%	-	2%	4%	3%	-	-	-	-	-	-	9%	2%
Better route	1%	3%	-	-	-	4%	-	-	-	17%	-	2%	-	-	-	3%	-	-	-	-	-	7%	-	2%
Would never cycle to this campus	3%	4%	8%	-	-	-	6%	4%	-	6%	-	2%	-	7%	-	6%	14%	4%	-	6%	7%	-	-	4%
No suggestions	36%	29%	42%	23%	66%	26%	44%	20%	31%	19%	33%	18%	23%	25%	32%	46%	43%	48%	21%	39%	37%	36%	27%	30%

Note: Due to rounding, the percentages may not total to 100%.

Green highlighting indicates a statistically significantly high share of positive/low share of negative responses when compared to results from the previous round of surveying Red highlighting indicates low positive/high negative responses