

## TRANSPORT FINDINGS

# The Dimensions of Loyalty in Public Transit among Older Adults: A Comparative Analysis across Three Canadian Regions

Thiago Carvalho<sup>1</sup>, Ahmed El-Geneidy<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup> Urban Planning, McGill University

Keywords: Public transit, loyalty, satisfaction, quality of life, exploratory factor analysis

<https://doi.org/10.32866/001c.77765>

---

## Findings

---

There is an ongoing debate in public transit literature on how loyalty should be defined. While measures of willingness to recommend and to reuse have become the default, some argue for the addition of other dimensions (i.e., satisfaction and importance). We assess whether a unidimensional factor structure representing loyalty exists within these variables using a sample of senior transit users from three Canadian regions. The results are compared to two- and three-variable structures regarding fit and reliability, including questions on the importance of transit to quality of life as a third dimension to loyalty is recommended while not so for satisfaction.

### 1. Questions

Loyalty in public transit has been studied to curb current trends in loss of public transit ridership. The reasoning is that loyal public transit users are more willing to keep using transit services overtime and more prone to recommend them to others and to attract new riders (Webb 2010). Even so, there is no consensus on the literature on how loyalty to transit should be conceptualized (Carvalho, Romano, and Gadda 2021; van Lierop, Badami, and El-Geneidy 2018). Most scholars examine the construct as a combination of willingness to reuse and to recommend (Minser and Webb 2010). Loyalty has also been addressed as a one-dimensional construct (Sun and Duan 2019) and several other variables have also been considered.

For instance, there is an ongoing debate on the role of satisfaction in loyalty. While some argue that satisfaction is only strongly related to loyalty but not part of the construct itself, others believe that satisfaction should be added as a dimension (Zhao, Webb, and Shah 2014). The rationale is that transit riders would only be willing to reuse and to recommend transit if they are satisfied. Another possible dimension is importance, which refers to the relevance of an object to a person (Zaichkowsky 1985) and is addressed in this paper as the perceived importance of transit to quality of life. It is believed that loyal users are more emotionally involved with the service, which reflects in higher switching costs (Webb 2010). By reviewing the literature, van Lierop et al. (2018) argue that loyalty is defined best when willingness to reuse, willingness to recommend, satisfaction, and importance are included.

We ask the following research questions: (i) is there a single underlying dimension across willingness to reuse, willingness to recommend, satisfaction, and importance to quality of life? (ii) if so, is the 4-variable structure more reliable than the common 2-variable structure (willingness to recommend and

Table 1. Contextual information on population and transit characteristics in Toronto, Montréal, and Vancouver

|  | Greater Toronto | Greater Montréal       | Greater Vancouver      |
|--|-----------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| <i>General characteristics</i>         |                 |                        |                        |
| Population                             | 6,202,225       | 4,291,732              | 2,642,825              |
| Population density per km <sup>2</sup> | 1,050.7         | 919                    | 918                    |
| Median income                          | CAD 39,600      | CAD 40,800             | CAD 40,800             |
| Population over 65 (%)                 | 18.3            | 20.4                   | 19.6                   |
| <i>Transit characteristics</i>         |                 |                        |                        |
| Transit mode share (%)                 | 24.3            | 22.3                   | 20.4                   |
| Number of bus lines                    | 192             | 213                    | 235                    |
| Number of metro lines                  | 4               | 4                      | 3 <sup>a</sup>         |
| Monthly senior transit pass            | CAD 128.15      | CAD 28.25 <sup>b</sup> | CAD 58.60 <sup>c</sup> |
| Reduction from regular fare (%)        | 18%             | 70%                    | 68%                    |

<sup>a</sup>SkyTrain; <sup>b</sup>Free fare starting July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2023; <sup>c</sup>Low-income seniors are eligible for a single yearly fee of CAD 45.00

**Data sources:** StatCan (2021); StatCan (2016); TTC (2023); STM (2023); TransLink (2023)

willingness to reuse) or a combination of the 2-variable structure and satisfaction and importance to quality of life individually? and (iii) are the factor results consistent across different contexts? We select Montréal, Toronto, and Vancouver as our case studies. All regions have similar rates of transit mode share and older adults' population as shown in [Table 1](#).

## 2. Methods

Drawing on data from the 2023 Aging in Place Survey, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) for complete cases of senior transit users from the Greater Montréal (n = 577), the Greater Toronto (n = 408), and the Greater Vancouver (n = 273). Willingness to reuse was measured by “I plan to keep using public transit in my region within the next year”, willingness to recommend by “I would recommend public transit in my region to a friend or family member”, satisfaction by “overall, I am satisfied with the public transit services in my region” and importance to quality of life by “public transit positively impacts my quality of life”. All variables were measured on a 4-point Likert-scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree (neutral not included). The factorability of the samples was ensured by addressing inter-correlation (Pearson correlation > 0.30), the Bartlett test of sphericity, and the measure of sampling adequacy (MSA).

The factor analyses for each combination of variables and region were conducted in R using the psych package. We applied common factor analysis as the extraction method, which is better suited for identifying latent constructs (Hair et al. 2014). The number of factors to extract was defined based on latent root (eigenvalue ≥ 1) and percentage of variance (at least 60%) criteria and varimax was applied as the rotation method. To reduce the influence of non-normality on the results, the correlation matrix was defined using polychoric correlation as it better deals with variables with less than five categories with

Table 2. Descriptive statistics by variable and region

| Category/Measure           | Willingness to reuse          | Willingness to recommend      | Importance to quality of life | Satisfaction                  |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Montreal (n = 577)</b>  |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Strongly agree             | 392 (67.9%)                   | 328 (56.8%)                   | 302 (52.3%)                   | 200 (34.7%)                   |
| Agree                      | 182 (31.5%)                   | 232 (40.2%)                   | 238 (41.2%)                   | 312 (54.1%)                   |
| Disagree                   | 3 (0.5%)                      | 17 (2.9%)                     | 37 (6.4%)                     | 64 (11.1%)                    |
| Strongly disagree          | -                             | -                             | -                             | 1 (0.2%)                      |
| <i>Shapiro-Walker test</i> | 0.798**                       | 0.752**                       | 0.709**                       | 0.632**                       |
| <b>Toronto (n = 409)</b>   |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Strongly agree             | 216 (52.9%)                   | 146 (35.8%)                   | 141 (34.6%)                   | 79 (19.4%)                    |
| Agree                      | 180 (44.1%)                   | 228 (55.9%)                   | 210 (51.5%)                   | 220 (53.9%)                   |
| Disagree                   | 8 (2%)                        | 31 (7.6%)                     | 51 (12.5%)                    | 96 (23.5%)                    |
| Strongly disagree          | 4 (1%)                        | 3 (0.7%)                      | 6 (1.5%)                      | 13 (3.2%)                     |
| <i>Shapiro-Walker test</i> | 0.835**                       | 0.801**                       | 0.763**                       | 0.693**                       |
| <b>Vancouver (n = 282)</b> |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Strongly agree             | 162 (59.3%)                   | 115 (42.1%)                   | 97 (35.5%)                    | 57 (20.9%)                    |
| Agree                      | 107 (39.2%)                   | 139 (50.9%)                   | 140 (51.3%)                   | 155 (56.8%)                   |
| Disagree                   | 4 (1.5%)                      | 19 (7%)                       | 36 (13.2%)                    | 53 (19.4%)                    |
| Strongly disagree          | -                             | -                             | -                             | 8 (2.9%)                      |
| <i>Shapiro-Walker test</i> | 0.830**                       | 0.805**                       | 0.764**                       | 0.673**                       |
| <b>Kruskal-Wallis Test</b> |                               |                               |                               |                               |
| Montreal-Toronto           | $\chi^2 = 14.66^*$ (d.f. = 1) | $\chi^2 = 34.73^*$ (d.f. = 1) | $\chi^2 = 21.97^*$ (d.f. = 1) | $\chi^2 = 37.98^*$ (d.f. = 1) |
| Montreal-Vancouver         | $\chi^2 = 3.34$ (d.f. = 1)    | $\chi^2 = 14.12^*$ (d.f. = 1) | $\chi^2 = 15.60^*$ (d.f. = 1) | $\chi^2 = 24.34^*$ (d.f. = 1) |
| Toronto-Vancouver          | $\chi^2 = 2.18$ (d.f. = 1)    | $\chi^2 = 1.70$ (d.f. = 1)    | $\chi^2 = 0.00$ (d.f. = 1)    | $\chi^2 = 0.26$ (d.f. = 1)    |

\* p-value < 0.01, distribution is significantly different; \*\* p-value ≤ 0.05, data is not normally distributed

asymmetrical distributions (Watkins 2018). Reliability was measured by the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient. Results are compared across regions to assess the consistency of the loyalty construct across regions.

### 3. Findings

Montreal’s seniors are more willing to reuse and to recommend transit, more satisfied, and more likely to perceive a positive impact of transit in their quality of life than seniors from other regions, as demonstrated by pairwise Kruskal-Wallis’s tests (Table 2). Samples from Toronto and Vancouver are not significantly different across all variables.

In the factor analyses (Table 3), for all variable combinations and regions, a one-factor solution was derived indicating the presence of a single construct. Nonetheless, factors including satisfaction for Toronto and Vancouver displayed limited reliability due to either displaying illogical loadings due to negative variance (Heywood case) or by not sufficiently explaining satisfaction (low communality). Consequently, satisfaction would have to be dropped from the analyses in both cases to improve fit. Therefore, the analysis offers limited support for satisfaction as a dimension in the loyalty construct.

Table 3. Results of the factor analysis by combination of variables and region

| Variable/Metric               | (1) Reuse and recommend                      | (1) + Satisfaction                             | (1) + Importance to quality of life            | All variables                                  |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Montreal (n = 577)</b>     |  |  |  |  |
| Willingness to reuse          | 0.925 (0.855)                                | 0.879 (0.773)                                  | 0.928 (0.860)                                  | 0.897 (0.805)                                  |
| Willingness to recommend      | 0.925 (0.855)                                | 0.971 (0.943)                                  | 0.921 (0.848)                                  | 0.936 (0.875)                                  |
| Involvement                   | -  | -  | 0.835 (0.697)                                  | 0.850 (0.723)                                  |
| Satisfaction                  | -  | 0.754 (0.568)                                  | -  | 0.771 (0.595)                                  |
| Variance Explained            | 85.50%                                       | 76.20%   | 80.20%   | 74.90%   |
| Cronbach's Alpha              | 0.822  | 0.811  | 0.844  | 0.854  |
| MSA*                          | 0.500  | 0.680  | 0.720  | 0.800  |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | $\chi^2 = 796.73$<br>(d.f. = 1, p-value = 0) | $\chi^2 = 1,270.92$<br>(d.f. = 3, p-value = 0) | $\chi^2 = 1,116.78$<br>(d.f. = 3, p-value = 0) | $\chi^2 = 1,926.33$<br>(d.f. = 6, p-value = 0) |
| <b>Toronto (n = 409)</b>      |  |  |  |  |
| Willingness to reuse          | 0.876 (0.767)                                | 0.727 (0.529)                                  | 0.850 (0.722)                                  | 0.796 (0.633)                                  |
| Willingness to recommend      | 0.876 (0.767)                                | 1.053 (1.108)**                                | 0.902 (0.813)                                  | 0.937 (0.879)                                  |
| Involvement                   | -  | -  | 0.819 (0.671)                                  | 0.836 (0.699)                                  |
| Satisfaction                  | -  | 0.588 (0.345)***                               | -  | 0.624 (0.390)***                               |
| Variance Explained            | 66.10%                                       | 66.10%   | 73.50%   | 65.00%   |
| Cronbach's Alpha              | 0.500  | 0.600  | 0.710  | 0.760  |
| MSA*                          | 0.755  | 0.721  | 0.808  | 0.797  |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | $\chi^2 = 360.74$<br>(d.f. = 1, p-value = 0) | $\chi^2 = 562.37$<br>(d.f. = 3, p-value = 0)   | $\chi^2 = 718.27$<br>(d.f. = 3, p-value = 0)   | $\chi^2 = 938.66$<br>(d.f. = 6, p-value = 0)   |
| <b>Vancouver (n = 282)</b>    |  |  |  |  |
| Willingness to reuse          | 0.867 (0.752)                                | 0.802 (0.643)                                  | 0.928 (0.861)                                  | 0.850 (0.722)                                  |
| Willingness to recommend      | 0.867 (0.752)                                | 0.936 (0.877)                                  | 0.809 (0.654)                                  | 0.834 (0.696)                                  |
| Involvement                   | -  | -  | 0.784 (0.615)                                  | 0.834 (0.696)                                  |
| Satisfaction                  | -  | 0.637 (0.405)***                               | -  | 0.688 (0.473)***                               |
| Variance Explained            | 64.20%                                       | 64.20%   | 71.00%   | 64.70%   |
| Cronbach's Alpha              | 0.500  | 0.640  | 0.700  | 0.750  |
| MSA*                          | 0.754  | 0.734  | 0.792  | 0.804  |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | $\chi^2 = 233.06$<br>(d.f. = 1, p-value = 0) | $\chi^2 = 360.15$<br>(d.f. = 3, p-value = 0)   | $\chi^2 = 454.11$<br>(d.f. = 3, p-value = 0)   | $\chi^2 = 630.43$<br>(d.f. = 6, p-value = 0)   |

\*Measure of sampling adequacy, \*\*Heywood case, \*\*\*Inadequate levels of communality

The 2-variable and 3-variable combinations with importance to quality-of-life showed adequate fit across all regions. Reliability in terms of Cronbach's alpha scores improved from the 2-variable to 3-variable structure, while retaining similar levels of internal factor consistency (item-to-score and inter-item correlations) across all regions. Moreover, levels of variance explained also improved in Toronto and Vancouver, providing evidence for including importance to quality of life as a third dimension of loyalty across all regions.

In conclusion, the factors do not provide consistent support for satisfaction as part of the loyalty construct. Nonetheless, importance of public transport to quality-of-life is supported as a third dimension to be included in the loyalty construct across all contexts. Montreal was the only location where all four combinations of variables displayed adequate levels of fit, which might be explained by the differences in public transit structure compared to the two other regions. Our findings contribute to the understanding of the dimensions

of loyalty and how to operationalize it in surveys. Future studies can further test our findings by assessing a more diverse range of public transit users and by evaluating discriminant validity by adding more constructs.

---

### *Acknowledgment*

The authors would like to thank Meredith Alousi-Jones for her help in constructing and administering the survey, Merrina Zhang and Isabella Jimenez from the National Research Council of Canada (NRC) for their feedback on the survey construct. Thanks to Daniel Schwartz from McGill IT services for his support in managing the survey. This research was funded by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada grant Towards a better understanding of the determinants and satisfaction of travel among different groups in major Canadian Cities (NSERC RGPIN-2023-03852), the National Research Council Canada's grant Getting Around to Age in Place: Meeting Older Canadians Transport Needs (NRC AiP-023-1), and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council's partnership grant Mobilizing justice: Towards evidence-based transportation equity policy (SSHRC 895-2021-1009).

Submitted: April 14, 2023 AEST, Accepted: June 05, 2023 AEST



This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CCBY-SA-4.0). View this license's legal deed at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0> and legal code at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode> for more information.

## REFERENCES

- Carvalho, Thiago, Cezar Augusto Romano, and Tatiana Maria Cecy Gadda. 2021. "Loyalty and Public Transit: A Quantitative Systematic Review of the Literature." *Transport Reviews* 42 (3): 362–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2021.1991032>.
- Hair, J.F., W.C. Black, B.J. Babin, and R.E. Anderson. 2014. *Multivariate Data Analysis*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Minser, Jason, and Valerie Webb. 2010. "Quantifying the Benefits: Application of Customer Loyalty Modeling in Public Transportation Context." *Transportation Research Record* 2144 (1): 111–20. <https://doi.org/10.3141/2144-13>.
- StatCan. 2016. "Focus on Geography Series, 2016 Census." <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-can-eng.cfm?Lang=Eng&GK=CAN&GC=01&TOPIC=12>.
- . 2021. "Census Profile, 2021 Census." <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/dp-pd/prof/index.cfm?Lang=E>.
- STM. 2023. "Transit Fares." <https://www.stm.info/en/info/fares/transit-fares>.
- Sun, Shichao, and Zhengyu Duan. 2019. "Modeling Passengers' Loyalty to Public Transit in a Two-Dimensional Framework: A Case Study in Xiamen, China." *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 124 (June): 295–309. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2019.04.007>.
- TransLink. 2023. "Pricing and Fare Zones." <https://www.translink.ca/transit-fares/pricing-and-fare-zones>.
- TTC. 2023. "Fares & Passes." <https://www.ttc.ca/en/Fares-and-passes>.
- van Lierop, Dea, Madhav G. Badami, and Ahmed M. El-Geneidy. 2018. "What Influences Satisfaction and Loyalty in Public Transport? A Review of the Literature." *Transport Reviews* 38 (1): 52–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2017.1298683>.
- Watkins, Marley W. 2018. "Exploratory Factor Analysis: A Guide to Best Practice." *Journal of Black Psychology* 44 (3): 219–46. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798418771807>.
- Webb, V. 2010. "Customer Loyalty in the Public Transportation Context." Doctoral Dissertation.
- Zaichkowsky, Judith Lynne. 1985. "Measuring the Involvement Construct." *Journal of Consumer Research* 12 (3): 341. <https://doi.org/10.1086/208520>.
- Zhao, Jinhua, Valerie Webb, and Punit Shah. 2014. "Customer Loyalty Differences Between Captive and Choice Transit Riders." *Transportation Research Record* 2415 (1): 80–88. <https://doi.org/10.3141/2415-09>.