



**HAL**  
open science

# Governance of shared automated electric vehicle in the urban transport system: insight from a willingness-to-use survey and Norwegian cultural context

Wale Arowolo, Magnus Larsson, Isabelle Nicolai

## ► To cite this version:

Wale Arowolo, Magnus Larsson, Isabelle Nicolai. Governance of shared automated electric vehicle in the urban transport system: insight from a willingness-to-use survey and Norwegian cultural context: Governance of shared automated electric vehicle in the urban transport system: insight from a willingness-to-use survey and Norwegian cultural context. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 2024, 24, pp.101040. 10.1016/j.trip.2024.101040 . hal-04116484

**HAL Id: hal-04116484**

**<https://centralesupelec.hal.science/hal-04116484>**

Submitted on 20 Feb 2024

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# **Governance of automated vehicle in the urban transport system: insight from a willingness-to-use survey and Norwegian cultural context.**

Wale Arowolo<sup>a1</sup>, Magnus Larsson<sup>b</sup>, Isabelle Nicolai<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Sustainable Economy Research Group, Department of Industrial Engineering, CentraleSupélec (Paris Saclay University), 3 Rue Joliot Curie, 91190 Gif-sur-Yvette, France.

<sup>b</sup> Ruter, Dronningens gate 40 0154, Oslo, Norway

October 2023

## **Abstract**

Automated vehicles (AV) can increase safety, reduce congestion, and provide environmental benefits to the urban transport system. Nonetheless, AV's governance in the urban transport system is challenging. This paper proposes a novel interdisciplinary methodology and contributes to the governance debate from the 'policy' and 'polity' dimensions. We attempt to draw insight from the Norwegian cultural context and a willingness to use AV survey in Oslo, Norway. We then attempt to provide insight into the workable governance approach for AV deployment in the Oslo region, Norway. Our result suggests that less than half of the people in the Oslo region are willing to use AV. Based on our analytical insight, we argue that a workable governance approach for AV that will allay fears of privacy loss while making people feel safe and secure, manage uncertainty, pessimism about technological innovation, and embrace time-honoured Norwegian traditions should be considered to support the deployment of AV in Norway.

**Keywords:** AV, governance, informal institution, willingness-to-use, urban transport system

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author: adewale.arowolo@centralesupelec.fr

## 1. Introduction

Automated vehicle (AV) represents a potentially disruptive yet beneficial change to the transportation system with the potential to improve vehicle safety, reduce emissions and congestion, facilitate efficient use of travel time, and change travel behaviour (Fagnant and Kockelman, 2015; Singh et al., 2023; Nikitas et al., 2021; Oldbury and Isaksson, 2021). Promoters of AV argue that removing people from the steering wheel will logically result in a vastly reduced number of accidents (Cohen et al., 2020). AV can provide different services, such as on-demand ride services within a fixed route with fixed stops, a fixed route with on-demand stops, or door-to-door on-demand services. AV can provide unimodal or multimodal door-to-door trips (Nemoto et al., 2021).

AV can potentially have positive and negative impacts on the urban transport system. On one hand, AV can reduce vehicle ownership, fleet size requirements, parking demand, labour costs, and cold-start emissions, thereby contributing to safety, congestion reduction and environmental sustainability (Singh et al., 2023; Othman, 2021; Haugland, 2020). On the other hand, if not carefully managed, AV may have adverse environmental impacts such as sprawling land use, increased vehicle miles travelled associated with congestion, and increased travel time consequences (Nikitas et al., 2021; Etzioni et al., 2020; Freemark et al., 2020). Besides the potential positive and negative impacts, the integration of AV in urban transport system is confronted with governance challenges. One of the critical governance challenges is designing the 'right' spatiotemporal context-dependent governance structure for AV in the urban transport ecosystem. Designing and managing the governance structure is essential for realising the potential benefits of AVs and mitigating the risks (Cohen et al., 2020). This paper attempts to contribute to the governance of AV in the urban transport system debate. Governance is a broad concept, and understanding governance depends on the analytical viewpoint. Governance can be in the 'political' dimension (the actor constellation - range of actors involved in the process of policymaking), 'policy' dimension (political steering - the nature and character of steering instruments in use) and 'polity' dimension (the institutional landscape - in which the actors operate based on a system of rules that shape their actions) (Treib et al., 2005). Institutions are the humanly devised constraints that structure political, economic, and social interactions. Institutions consist of both informal constraints and formal rules in an interdependent manner and consequent political and economic organisations (North, 1991; Schipp et al., 2022; Hrelja et al., 2017).

Informal institutions are not explicitly formulated and written down but internalised in community members' hearts and souls; informal institutions change slowly and are not subject to economic calculative behaviour. Individual economic actors, or groups of actors in collective action, are rarely able to purposefully (re)design informal institutions (Correlje et al., 2014). Institutions are also formal and informal norms and rules shaping human interactions and social exchanges. Institutions share with culture the ability to shape individual and collective preferences and attitudes (Kaasa and Andriani, 2022). Informal institutions cannot be fully understood without considering culture, and understanding culture presumes insight into institutions. Culture consists of the unwritten rules of the social game. Culture is the collective mind programming that distinguishes the members of a group of people from others (Hofstede, 2005). Culture is the rich complex of meanings, beliefs, practices, symbols, norms, and values prevalent in a society (Schwartz, 2006). It is impossible to fully understand the governance of urban transport without analysing informal institutional variables. Legal or formal institutions

that do not have strong 'informal' support are unsupported legislative declarations rather than real institutions. This does not mean legal rules are unimportant but become important by incorporating them in informal institutions (Hodgson, 2006). Culture matters because it affects attitude, behaviour, and choices, providing an indicative road map to distinguish between proper and improper behaviour in a society (Kaasa and Andriani, 2022). Culture is a primary factor influencing the adoption or acceptance of new technologies and innovation (Yun et al., 2021; Syahrivar et al., 2021).

The process of institutional change is overwhelmingly incremental because the network externalities that arise from a given institutional matrix of formal rules, informal constraints, and enforcement characteristics will typically bias costs and benefits in favour of choices consistent with the existing governance framework (North, 1994). Thus, appropriate governance frameworks to align public and private interests are required to capture the potential benefits, minimise costs, and support the integration of AV in the urban transport system (Docherty et al., 2018). As AVs exemplify radical and disruptive technologies which require informed governance regimes, there is a risk that without appropriate governance regimes, the potential benefits of AV may be lost (Cunneen et al., 2022; Narayanan et al., 2020).

The willingness to use AV is the strength of people's intention to use AV (Keszey, 2020). The willingness to use AV is impacted by culture in a society and can be supported by a workable context-specific governance approach. This paper attempts to contribute to the governance debate to increase willingness to use AV from the 'polity' (focusing on informal institutions from the cultural viewpoint using the Hofstede 6D model) and the 'policy' dimension (the steering instrument a government can use to support AV) adapting the framework developed in Audouin and Finger (2019). Hofstede's 6-D model describes a culture in six dimensions: Power Distance, Individualism, Tough/Tender, Uncertainty Avoidance, Long-Term/Short-term Orientation, and Indulgence. Audouin and Finger (2019) describe five methods of political steering: governing by doing, governing by enabling, laissez-faire, self-governing and governing by authority. Using the Oslo region of Norway as a case study, we conduct and draw insights from a willingness to use survey and frameworks of Hofstede's 6D model and governance (Audouin and Finger, 2019). We attempt to answer the following questions:

- How does Norwegian culture impact the willingness to use AV in Norway?
- What is the workable governance approach to support AV deployment in Norway?

This paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 is the literature review. Section 3 is the methodology. Section 4 presents our results. Section 5 discusses our results. Section 6 is the conclusion.

## **2. Literature Review**

This section presents three streams of related literature to our research: i. AV integration in the urban transport system ii. The willingness to use AV iii. Governance of AV in the urban transport system.

### **2.1 AV integration in the urban transport system**

AV is perceived as a disruptive innovation: a new technology with characteristics that are initially unfamiliar to producers and consumers, which may require a major evolution of institutions and infrastructures with the potential to disrupt market structures and lead to behavioural changes (Mackay and Meltcafe, 2002). AV could reduce crashes, ease

congestion, improve fuel economy, reduce parking needs, bring mobility to those unable to drive, and dramatically change the nature of travel (Fagnant and Kockelman, 2015; Yun et al., 2021). AV could also increase productivity as commuters can work instead of driving (Mira Bonnardel, 2021). Huber et al. (2022) found that if many passengers regularly use AVs, they have significant advantages over personal vehicles from an environmental viewpoint. AV could play a specific complementary role, such as for the first mile, last mile, micro-transit<sup>2</sup> commute or off-peak operation instead of regular buses in a mobility system (Nikitas et al., 2021). AV could be deployed as automated minibuses to transport up to fifteen passengers, offering on-demand, door-to-door services. AV could be combined and connected with other means of transport to provide commuters with optimised travel time, costs, and environmental impact (Fournier et al., 2022). AV's diffusion and potential impact on the urban transport system could depend on its technical product capabilities, environmental and economic performance, and social acceptance (Korbee et al., 2022).

Several recent studies have shown the impact of AV integration in the urban transport system. Fournier et al. (2020) simulated the impacts of AV adoption in Berlin and Stuttgart (Germany). The authors found that AV fleet could lower negative externalities and generate cost benefits for commuters. Bansal and Kockelman (2017) simulated a long-term AV fleet evolution for 30 years to forecast the United States adoption levels of AV under different technology prices, willingness to pay (WTP) and regulatory scenarios. The authors found that rapid reduction in technology costs, rise in people's WTP and supporting policies are required to promote AV adoption. Singh et al. (2023) found that AV could pose additional challenges, such as increased waiting time and the associated inconvenience(s), increased vehicle miles travelled, and could increase congestion due to empty miles. A study in Oslo, Norway, to understand the impact of integrating AV in urban transport shows that in a scenario where all the existing ICEV users switch to AV, there will be drastic traffic reduction in Oslo as about 7% of the current vehicle fleet will be required to meet transport demand during the peak period (Ruter, 2019). Related studies show similar results, such as the OECD International Transport Forum's Lisbon study (3%), Helsinki (4%), Dublin (2%), Auckland (7%) and Stuttgart (7%) (ITF, 2016; Helsinki (2017), Dublin (2018), Auckland (2017), Friedrich et al., 2018). The results illustrate that AV integration in the urban transport system could significantly reduce internal combustion engine vehicles (ICEVs) use, air pollution, accidents, noise, and congestion externalities. Nonetheless, integrating AV would require new transport infrastructure and governance structure.

## 2.2 The willingness to use AV

We discuss in this subsection the willingness to use AV literature.

Regarding the share of the population willing to use AV, Zmud et al. (2016) found that half of their respondents are willing to use self-driving vehicles. Sener et al. (2019) found that around half of their survey respondents in different cities are willing to use self-driving vehicles. Wang et al. (2020) found that a significant fraction of the population is not ready to use AV and is generally reluctant to use AV ridesharing. Panagiotopoulos and Dimitrakopoulos (2018) found that nearly two-thirds of their survey respondents consider they will be late adopters of AV technology. With respect to privacy concerns, Zmud et al. (2016) found that the more concerned a person was about data privacy issues, the less likely their intent to use self-driving

---

<sup>2</sup> Micro-transit commute means a trip to particular locations such as city centres, central business districts, university campuses, airports, shopping malls, and hospitals.

vehicles. Ljubi and Groznik (2023) found that privacy concerns and perceived safety significantly affect general concerns about the willingness to use AV. Wintersberger et al. (2019) found reduced willingness to use AV due to extreme concern about AV technology.

Regarding the age of respondents willing to use AV, Krueger et al. (2016) found that young people between 18-65 years of age and people with multimodal travel patterns may be more willing to use AV. The respondents between 65 and 84 years old are less likely to use AV. The authors also found that service attributes including travel time, waiting time and fares are significant determinants of AV adoption. Regarding safety concerns, Schoettle and Sivak (2014) found that people expressed high safety and efficiency concerns about AV while being optimistic about the benefits. Howard et al. (2014) found that people are willing to use AVs for the potential safety benefits, convenience, and the opportunity for multitasking while en route. Haboucha et al. (2017) found high hesitation towards automated vehicle adoption. Othman et al. (2021) found that people have high safety concerns about AVs, and the fear of AVs could increase if accident reports increase. Regarding other concerns besides safety and privacy issues, Howard et al. (2014) found that individuals were most concerned about liability, technology costs, and losing vehicle control.

Furthermore, other scholars found diverse findings: Payre et al. (2014) found that the willingness to use AVs differed from one driving environment to another and is linked to contextual acceptability. Kyriakidis et al. (2015) found diverse public opinion on the willingness to use AV in their cross-country survey. Liljamo et al. (2018) found that people willing to use AV are most likely early adopters. Hofbauer et al. (2023) found that users with lower anxiety and increased self-confidence were more open toward AVs. Othman et al. (2021) argue that AV faces an ethical dilemma, for example, in a crash situation that could influence public acceptance of AV, and previous experience with AVs impacts its acceptance. Syahrivar et al. (2021) found that the more positive the attitude toward AV, the higher the willingness to use AV.

In sum, the results of the willingness to use AV in the literature seem heterogeneous. The results are demographically diverse, context-specific, and a function of the researchers' data and adopted methodology.

### 2.3 Governance of AV in the urban transport system

This sub-section reviews the literature on the governance of AV in the two dimensions applied in this paper: i. steering instruments (policy) and ii. institutional properties (polity) (Treib et al., 2007).

#### 2.3.1 'Policy' dimension of the governance of AV

Tan and Taeihagh (2021) identified a four-stage governance process as the mechanism involved in deploying AVs: knowledge and persuasion, planning and decision-making, implementation, and evaluation. The authors proposed a no-response strategy, prevention-oriented (avert), control-oriented (regulation), tolerance-oriented (reform), and adaptation-oriented (manage policy uncertainty) approach for AV governance. The authors recommend creating an ecosystem that promotes trials and pilots for adopting novel and disruptive technologies and strengthening and developing policy capacity to embrace novel and disruptive technologies. Li et al. (2019) reviewed policy formulation to accelerate the deployment of AV and manage potential uncertainties. The authors proposed three potential methods of formulating AV policy: (i.) backcasting (looking backwards from the desired future),

(ii.) dynamic adaptive (structured approach for designing dynamic, robust plans), and (iii.) policy transfer method (knowledge of policies at a time and place is used to develop policies at another time and place. The authors argue that research to manage future uncertainties of AV in public transport is necessary. Building upon and combining the works of Bulkeley and Kern (2006) and the multi-level perspective (Geels, 2002), Audouin and Finger (2019) proposed five governance frameworks (governing by doing, governing by enabling, laissez-faire, self-governing and governing by authority) for AV integrated in Mobility-as-a-Service (MaaS) governance in the urban transport system. Mladenović et al. (2020) proposed a comparative analysis framework for governance based on the assumed roles of the technology, identified domains and mechanisms of governance, and the assumed actors responsible for steering the development process. The authors found similarities in pro-automation values and context-specific differences outside the domain of traditional transport policy instruments in three European countries.

### 2.3.2 'Polity' dimension of the governance of AV

Hansson (2020) found that existing regulatory standards, industry self-regulation and international policies and conventions influence regulatory design to form new regulatory standards and shape AV regulatory governance in Sweden and Norway. The author also found that Norway shows a significantly higher level of adjustment flexibility in its regulation than Sweden. Asquer and Krachkovskaya (2021) argue that existing regulatory institutions affect the regulatory response to emerging technologies and are responsible for different trajectories of regulatory development across countries. The authors conclude that policymakers and regulators should appraise the impact of existing regulations on the development of emerging technologies and adjust regulations while anticipating their consequences on further technological developments. Hrelja et al. (2017) argue that informal institutions are important to manage the interfaces between regional and local authorities in Swedish public transport planning. Hrelja et al. (2017) and Rye et al. (2018) found that informal institutions could complement formal institutions to facilitate coordination and achieve effective governance in the European public transport context. Schippl et al. (2022) argue that governance strategies that aim to tap the potential of AVs in supporting sustainable urban mobility should explicitly consider institutional dynamics based on the development of new technical options with changing regulations or policies and 'informal' factors such as routinised practices, societal perceptions, or beliefs of what is 'normal'. Haugland and Skjølsvold (2020) argue that pilot projects produce an understanding of AV's relationship with general traffic and shape the institutional understanding of AV regulation in Norway.

## 2.4 Contribution of our paper

The original contribution of our paper to the literature is as follows:

- We propose a novel interdisciplinary methodology to analyse the governance of AV in the urban transport system. We combine insights from informal institutions from the cultural viewpoint (polity dimension of governance), quantitative willingness to use survey, and steering instruments from the policy dimension of governance.
- We contribute to a broad (public) understanding of the governance of AV innovation to support policymaking.
- We provide context-specific knowledge for academics, policymakers/analysts, and other stakeholders to understand AV governance issues in the urban transport system.

In the next section, we will discuss the adopted methodology in this paper to answer our research questions.

### 3. Methodology

Our novel methodology combines insights from a willingness to use AV survey, informal institutions, and governance.

#### 3.1 Willingness to use survey.

'Opinion' (a market research and analysis company) and 'Norstat' (a data collection company) conducted the willingness to use survey for Ruter (the Oslo region's public transport authority in Norway). 'Norstat' collaborated with 'Data Factory AS' for Oslo inhabitants' phone numbers and names. Registered people with mobile phone numbers on the 'Data Factory AS' database have an equal chance of being asked to participate in a survey. The questionnaires were designed based on the following determinants: (i) personal technology innovativeness<sup>3</sup>, (ii) perceived usefulness/benefit, (iii) safety perception (perceived safety and perceived risk) and (iv) price perception. The determinants are among the empirically proven significant determinants of willingness to use AV in the literature (see Keszey et al., 2020). The respondents were asked questions on their attitude to technology adoption, willingness to share a vehicle with strangers if it results in a lower price for the journey, perception of self-driving vehicles as a solution to meet their future transport needs, and perception of safety and security of self-driving vehicles to gain insight into their willingness to use AV. The 5-point Likert scale was used from 'totally disagree' to 'totally agree'.

The respondents were contacted on their mobile phone numbers for the interview. The survey was conducted for all citizens over 15 years old in the Oslo region (old Akershus county (Viken), Groruddalen and Ovrig) from Tuesday to Saturday every week in September 2022. The survey was conducted from 16:30 to 21:30 on weekdays (Tuesday to Thursday), 16:30 to 20:30 on Fridays, and 13:00 to 18:00 on Saturdays. There were 1,738 respondents: Groruddalen (615), Viken County (604), and Ovrig (519).

The oldest respondent is 89 years, and the youngest is 15 years, a range of 74 years. The average age of the respondents is 45 years, the median is 44 years, and the mode is 43 years. Based on data from Statistics Norway for 2022 (see Appendix B), the respondents' age is within the average age range of 47.2 years and 47.8 years in the Oslo and Viken counties, respectively (Statistics Norway, 2023). Among the respondents, 49.8% were male, and 50.2% were female. The Oslo municipality is 49.6% male and 50.4% female, and Viken County is 50.1% male and 49.9% female in 2022 (Statistics Norway, 2023). Therefore, our data is representative of the Oslo region's population in terms of age, gender and the inhabitants that are likely to use AV.

#### 3.2 Informal Institution (Norwegian cultural dimension)

Geert Hofstede conducted one of the most comprehensive studies of national cultures with survey data about people's values in more than 50 countries worldwide for IBM corporation. From one country to another, the results represented almost perfectly matched samples: the results were similar in all aspects except nationality, which made the effect of nationality differences in their answers stand out clearly. The IBM study on different international populations and by different scholars has been replicated and extended for 76 countries over

---

<sup>3</sup> Personal technology innovativeness is the willingness of a person to try out a new technology.



the years (Hofstede Insight, 2023). The detailed methodology is described in Hofstede's book (Hofstede, 2005).

We draw insight from Hofstede's 6-D model (Table 1) to discuss Norwegian culture. In Hofstede's 6-D model, culture is described in six dimensions: Power Distance, Individualism, Tough/Tender, Uncertainty Avoidance, Long-Term/ Short Term Orientation, and Indulgence.

<b>Hofstede 6D Model</b>	<b>Description</b>
Power distance	The extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organisations within a country expect and accept that power is distributed unequally.
Individualism	The degree of interdependence a society maintains among its members
Tough/Tender <sup>4</sup>	Explains people's motivation in a culture, wanting to be the best (tough culture). A tough culture is a society driven by competition, achievement, and success (for example, winner/best in the field). The motivation in a tender culture is to like what you do. Quality of life is a sign of success; standing out from the crowd is not admirable.
Long-Term Orientation (LTO)/ Short-Term Orientation (STO)	Describes how every society maintains some links with its history while dealing with present and future challenges. LTO means fostering values towards future rewards. STO means fostering values related to the past and present, particularly respect for tradition and fulfilling social obligations.
Uncertainty Avoidance	The extent to which the members of a culture feel threatened by ambiguous or unknown situations and have created beliefs and institutions that try to avoid ambiguous or unknown situations. The feeling is, among other things, expressed through nervous stress and a need for predictability: a need for written and unwritten rules.
Indulgence	Explains the extent to which people try to control their desires and impulses. Relatively weak control is called 'Indulgence'. Relatively strong control is called 'Restraint'.

Table 1: Description of Hofstede's dimensions. Source: Hofstede (2005); Hofstede Insight (2023).

A description of each dimension in Hofstede's 6-D model has been applied in different fields to explain the influence of culture on technological innovation (Berghe et al., 2020). Hofstede's model has been used extensively during recent decades in the theoretical and empirical literature in different social science fields. Hofstede's model can be regarded as a grounded approach for describing culture (Kaasa and Andriani, 2022). In this paper, we apply Hofstede's 6D Model description for Norwegian culture (Table 2). We use the cultural dimensions for Norway from the Hofstede 6D model as indicators to discuss the willingness to use AV in Norway.

---

<sup>4</sup> Tough/Tender culture is also called Masculine/Feminine culture.

<b>Hofstede's cultural dimensions (Indicators)</b>	<b>Norwegian Culture</b>
Power distance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management facilitates and empowers equal rights decentralised power, people expect to be consulted, control is disliked.</li> <li>• Direct, participative, and consensus-oriented communication</li> </ul>
Individualism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personal opinions are valued and expressed.</li> <li>• Communication is explicit.</li> <li>• The right to privacy is important and respected.</li> <li>• Leaders focus on the management of individuals.</li> </ul>
Uncertainty Avoidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate uncertainty avoidance</li> <li>• Moderate structure and planning are required</li> </ul>
Tender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Levelling with others, consensus, cooperation, and sympathy for the underdog</li> <li>• Taking care of the environment and societal solidarity is considered important.</li> <li>• Incentives are favoured.</li> <li>• Interaction through dialogue and 'growing insight' is valued.</li> <li>• The focus is on well-being.</li> <li>• Decision-making is achieved by involving people.</li> </ul>
Short-term orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong concern for establishing the absolute truth.</li> <li>• Normative in thinking with great respect for traditions.</li> <li>• Prefers to maintain time-honoured traditions and norms.</li> <li>• Views societal change with suspicion</li> </ul>
Indulgence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderate restraint</li> <li>• Moderate perception that social norms restrain actions</li> </ul>

Table 2: Hofstede's cultural indicators. Source: Hofstede (2005), Hofstede Insight (2023)

3.3 Governance (policy dimension)

Governance in the policy dimension refers to the 'mode of political steering' to distinguish policies according to the steering/policy instruments that a government can use to achieve particular policy goals and certain societal outcomes (Treib et al., 2005). Building upon the framework proposed by Bulkeley and Kern (2006) on public authorities' governing approaches for governing cities and climate change and the works of (Etzkowitz, 2008) from innovation studies, Audouin and Finger (2019) proposed five governance approaches for governing the development of MaaS in public transport: i. Governing by authority: employing traditional top-down mechanisms to govern. ii. governing by enabling: facilitating and encouraging actions with non-public actors through partnerships and incentives development iii. governing by doing: public authorities take care of the entire service production and delivery and avoid collaborating with private actors. iv Self-governing: governing by 'showing the way', and v. laissez-faire: public authorities allow the network of actors to reach a stable state without getting involved. We adopt the framework of Ardouin and Finger (2019) to develop the corresponding actions in developing AV for the five governance approaches (Table 3).

Table 3: Governance approaches for AV

Governance approach	Corresponding actions in the development of AV
Governing by authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop specific legislation/regulations enforcing the development of AV in a top-down fashion.</li> <li>• Procure AV with a third party through traditional tender mechanisms.</li> </ul>
Governing by enabling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiate public-private partnerships.</li> <li>• Define vision with strong quantitative objectives.</li> <li>• Provide funding.</li> <li>• Influence negotiations in favour of AV</li> <li>• Leverage AV opponents using horizontal network governance.</li> </ul>
Governing by doing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop AV solutions in-house in a closed manner.</li> <li>• Minimise collaboration with third parties</li> </ul>
Self-governing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide all government employees with an AV solution to show the example for other citizens to follow.</li> </ul>
Governing by laissez-faire	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refrain from getting involved in the development of AV.</li> <li>• Adopt a wait-and-see approach.</li> </ul>

Source: Adopted from Audouin and Finger (2019)

Figure 1 shows the schematic representation of our methodology discussed in sections 3.1 to 3.3. We focus on informal institutions and culture from the ‘polity’ dimension of governance. Then, we analyse informal institutions from the cultural viewpoint vis-à-vis the quantitative willingness to use AV survey. Then, we draw insight on the appropriate governance approach from the ‘policy’ dimension of governance.




Figure 1: Schematic diagram of the methodological framework

## 4. Results

### 4.1 Willingness to use AV.

We discuss the results of the four questions of the willingness-to-use AV in Norway: i. Attitude to new technology ii. Willingness to share a vehicle with strangers if it results in a lower price for the journey iii. Believe that self-driving vehicles can solve many of the transport needs of the future. iv. Believe that self-driving vehicle is safe and secure. See Appendix A for the full results.

#### 4.1.1 Attitude to new technology

A total of 1587 respondents out of 1738 (91.3%) answered the question on their attitude to new technology. 739 respondents like new technology and are willing to adopt new technology before most people (figure 2). We categorise the 739 respondents as those willing to use AV. The other respondents are either sceptical, late adopters or undecided/uninformed. Since AV is a new technology, we do not include the sceptical, potential late adopters and the undecided or uninformed respondents that responded (I do not know) as willing to use AV.




Figure 2: Attitude to new technology

#### 4.1.2 Willingness to share a vehicle with strangers.

A total of 1587 respondents out of 1738 answered the question on their willingness to share a vehicle with strangers if it results in a lower price for the journey. 472 respondents are partially or totally willing to share a vehicle with strangers (Figure 3). We categorise the 472

respondents as willing to use AV since AV will be integrated in public transport. We categorise those who partially or totally disagree with sharing AV as unwilling to use AV. We assume the undecided or uninformed respondents that answered (I do not know) are unwilling to use AV.




Figure 3: Willingness to share AV

4.1.3 Self-driving vehicle to meet future transport needs.

A total of 1587 respondents out of 1738 answered the question on their perception that self-driving vehicle can meet their future transport needs. 649 respondents partially or totally agree that self-driving vehicle' can meet their future transport needs (Figure 4). We categorise the 649 respondents as willing to use AV. We categorise those who partially or totally disagree that self-driving vehicle' can meet their future transport needs as unwilling to use AV since their response suggests that the respondents do not consider AV as relevant for the future of transportation. We assume the undecided or uninformed respondents that answered (I do not know) are unwilling to use AV.




Figure 4: AV to meet future transport need

#### 4.1.4 Safety and Security

A total of 1587 respondents out of 1738 answered this question. 441 respondents partially or totally agree that self-driving vehicles are safe and secure (Figure 5). We categorise the 441 respondents as willing to use AV. We categorise the respondents who partially or totally disagree that self-driving vehicles are safe and secure as unwilling to use AV since their response suggests they consider AV unsafe and insecure. We assume the undecided or uninformed respondents that answered (I do not know) are unwilling to use AV.




Figure 5: Safety and security

In sum, we assume that 27 out of every 100 respondents partly or totally believe AV is safe and secure, 41 out of every 100 believe that AV can meet their future transport needs, 30 out of every 100 respondents partially or completely agree to share AV and 46 out of every 100 respondents like new technology and are willing to be among the early adopters. It is worth noting that each question may have a different weight on the final willingness to use AV for people. For instance, the believe that AV is safe and secure may lead to a higher or lower willingness to use AV than agreeing to share AV with strangers or the believe that AV can meet future transport needs. However, we are unable to model this possible reality in this paper. Therefore, we simplify, using the average of the four indicators. We assume that, on average, 36 out of every 100 people are partly or totally willing to use AV (Figure 6).




Figure 6: Willingness to use AV in Oslo Region, Norway


**5. Discussion**

*5.1 Insights from the Norwegian cultural indicators vis-à-vis the willingness to use AV survey and workable governance framework.*

The colour codes (see Figure 7) indicate the cultural indicators and the governance approach links. ‘Green’ indicates the Norwegian cultural indicators linked to the ‘governing by enabling’ approach. Governing by enabling entails collaborative, cooperative interactions among stakeholders to build consensus and could also be facilitated by incentives. Therefore, we link the power distance, individualism (except ‘the right to privacy’) and the tough/tender indicators to governing by enabling. We link individualism (‘right to privacy is important’) and short-term orientation indicators (in purple) to ‘governing-by-doing’. Developing AV solutions in-house in a closed manner and minimising collaboration with third parties could help protect people’s privacy, and reduce suspicion of tradition, norms and societal change.

We link uncertainty avoidance and restraint indicators (in blue) to the self-governing approach. Self-governing entails governing by 'showing the way'—for example, providing government employees with an AV solution to show citizens examples to follow. Self-governing could help manage uncertainty avoidance and restraint as people could feel less threatened by unknown situations and control their lack of desire for AV- for example, when government employees are using AVs. 'Government by authority' (in black) and 'governing by laissez-faire' (in pink) do not seem to be appropriate governance approaches based on the Norwegian cultural indicators.





1  
2

Figure 7: Analysis of Norwegian cultural indicators and governance in the 'policy' dimension.

1 Then, we focus on governing by doing, self-governing and governing by enabling for further  
2 analysis (see Table 4).

3 In the Norwegian culture, the right to people's privacy is important, and Norwegians expect  
4 their privacy to be respected. If AV threatens privacy, Norwegians could be reluctant to adopt  
5 AV. We assume from the willingness to use survey results that 27 out of 100 Norwegians totally  
6 or partially believe that AV is safe and secure. Relative to the Norwegian culture, the survey  
7 result could have reflected privacy concerns and a need for safety in commuting without a  
8 driver or commuting without human security as possible reasons for the high level of concern  
9 about the safety and security of AV and, consequently, reduced willingness to use AV.  
10 Therefore, we could relate the individualism indicator 'right to privacy is important' in the  
11 Norwegian culture to the low perception of safety and security of AV. In this context, 'governing  
12 by doing' could be a workable governance approach to facilitate the deployment of AV. The  
13 government can develop solutions in-house in a closed manner and minimise collaboration  
14 with third parties (for example, private sector institutions), which could make people feel their  
15 right to privacy is respected. However, that could depend on the level of trust Norwegians have  
16 in their government. The debate on institutional trust is beyond the scope of this paper. Figure  
17 7 shows the analyses of the Norwegian cultural indicators vis-à-vis the governance  
18 approaches.

19

20 Norway is a normative or low short-term oriented society that prefers to maintain time-  
21 honoured traditions and norms while viewing societal change with suspicion. People in such  
22 societies are strongly concerned with establishing absolute truth, normative thinking, and great  
23 respect for traditions. Extreme respect for tradition may impede innovation and cause the  
24 abandonment of novel ideas (Hofstede, 2005). Since Norwegians may be pessimistic about  
25 AV, their willingness to use the technology may be low. We could relate the short-term  
26 orientation indicators of the Norwegian culture to the low perception of safety and security.  
27 'Governing by doing' could help increase the perception of safety and security and the  
28 pessimistic view on societal change and its impact on Norwegian traditions and norms.

29

30 Uncertainty avoidance in the Norwegian culture could impact AV adoption since the technology  
31 is new and its impact is not fully understood. As an emerging technology, the potential  
32 deployment of automated vehicles in cities is attributed with significant uncertainties and  
33 anticipated consequences requiring responsible governance of innovation processes  
34 (Mladenović et al., 2020). The higher the uncertainty avoidance in a culture, the lower the  
35 willingness to adopt new technologies (such as AV) or to share AV with strangers. The  
36 combination of moderate 'uncertainty avoidance' and 'restraint' with indicators such as the  
37 need for moderate structure and planning, and moderate perception that social norms restrain  
38 actions coupled with the Norwegian culture's short-term orientation indicators (discussed  
39 above) could have reflected in the survey result. From the willingness to use survey results,  
40 we assume that 41 out of 100 Norwegians totally or partially believe that AV can meet future  
41 transport needs. We also assume that less than half (46 out of 100 Norwegians) like new  
42 technology and are willing to be among the early adopters. Only 30 out of 100 Norwegians  
43 partially or totally agree to share AV with strangers, suggesting some 'restraint'. Based on the  
44 insight from the combination of short-term orientation, moderate uncertainty avoidance and  
45 restraint indicators and the willingness to use AV, we could suggest combining 'governing by  
46 doing' and 'self-governing' approaches to promote AV in Norway. For example, government  
47 institutions and civil servants could be the early adopters as an example for other citizens.  
48

1 The Norwegian culture is tender, which means the softer aspects of culture are valued and  
2 encouraged. The cultural indicators include levelling with others, consensus decision-making,  
3 cooperation, taking care of the environment, societal solidarity, incentivisation and interaction  
4 through dialogue. Also, the related power distance indicators, such as decentralised power,  
5 consensus-oriented communication, and facilitating management, are closely related.  
6 Although the 'tender' and 'power distance' indicators may not directly relate to the willingness  
7 to use AV, they could serve as enablers to promote AV in Norway. In this context, 'governing  
8 by enabling' could be a workable governance approach with features such as initiating public-  
9 private partnerships, providing funding, influencing negotiations to favour AV, and leveraging  
10 AV opponents using horizontal network governance.

11  
12 Based on the short-term orientation, privacy loss and the combination of moderate uncertainty  
13 avoidance and restraint concerns that appear influential on the survey results, we suggest  
14 combining governing by doing, self-governing and features of governing by enabling (see  
15 Table 5). Nonetheless, governing by doing features such as minimising collaboration with third  
16 parties may appear to conflict with some governing by enabling features such as initiating  
17 public-private interactions. Therefore, the features should be carefully combined. For example,  
18 the AV pilot stage could focus more on governing by doing and self-governing and some  
19 features of governing by enabling, like funding provision (incentivisation). Then, as AV  
20 awareness and acceptance increase, a 'governing by enabling' approach could be fully  
21 adopted in relation to Norway's tender, power distance and individualism cultural indicators.  
22 'Governing by enabling' could promote end-user acceptance and awareness of AV's  
23 environmental benefits based on Norway's tender cultural indicator. In sum, adopting a  
24 governance approach that addresses the high short-term orientation, low power distance, high  
25 individualism, tender culture, moderate 'restraint' and uncertainty avoidance indicators could  
26 help increase the willingness to use AV.

Cultural dimension	Norwegian Cultural Indicators	Impact of cultural indicators on the willingness to use AV	Proposed workable governance approach to mitigate willingness to use barriers based on the Norwegian cultural context
High individualism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The right to privacy is important and respected.</li> </ul>	Privacy loss concerns could reflect the low perception of the safety and security of AV and the willingness to share AV with strangers in public transport. → Reduce willingness to use AV.	<p>‘Governing by doing’ could help increase the perception of safety and security and increase willingness to use AV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing AV projects in-house in a closed manner could increase the perception that the government is thorough to ensure that all safety and security concerns are addressed.</li> <li>Minimising collaboration with third parties could help allay the fear of unnecessary private data exposure to many third parties (such as private sector institutions) or corporate entities.</li> </ul>
High short-term orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong concern for establishing the truth.</li> <li>Normative thinking with great respect for traditions.</li> <li>Preference to maintain time-honoured traditions and norms.</li> <li>Viewing societal change with suspicion.</li> </ul>	Lack of full understanding of AV, disruption of traditional public transport paradigm, and suspicion of societal change could reflect a relatively low interest in new technology, willingness to be early adopters, and believe that AV can meet future transport needs → Reduce willingness to use AV.	<p>‘Governing by doing’ could help address the challenges with the traditional Norwegian culture and pessimistic view of societal change:</p> <p>Developing AV projects in-house in a closed manner with minimum collaboration with third parties could help address the perception of change in tradition, societal norms, and public transport disruption.</p>
Moderate uncertainty avoidance  Moderate restraint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Moderate structure and planning are required.</li> <li>Moderate perception that</li> </ul>	Due to uncertainty concerns, citizens should be assured that AV is carefully planned and structured. The perception that social norms restrain actions could affect the willingness to use AV since the innovation is new and its impact is not fully understood. The indicators could also reflect on the willingness to share AV	Combining governing by doing and self-governing by: Developing solutions in-house in a closed manner, minimising collaboration with third parties, and providing all government employees with an AV solution could allay uncertainty fears and ‘restraint’ constraints. Combining the governance approaches

	social norms restrain actions	with strangers in public transport → Reduce willingness to use AV.	could serve as a springboard to promote AV, increase awareness, encourage sharing with strangers, and integrating AV in the public transport system.
Tender Culture Power Distance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Levelling with others, consensus, cooperation</li> <li>• Taking care of the environment and societal solidarity.</li> <li>• Incentivisation</li> <li>• Dialogue.</li> <li>• Decision-making is achieved by involving people.</li> <li>• consensus-oriented communication</li> <li>• Management facilitates and empowers.</li> <li>• Decentralised power</li> </ul>	These indicators could serve as enablers to increase awareness and willingness to use AV.	<p>'Governing by enabling' actions appear to align with the 'tender' and 'power distance' Norwegian cultural indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiating public-private partnerships → Levelling with others, consensus, cooperation, dialogue, consensus-oriented communication, and decision-making.</li> <li>• Providing funding → Incentivisation.</li> <li>• Influencing negotiations in favour of AV → Incentivisation, societal solidarity.</li> <li>• Leveraging AV opponents using horizontal network governance → Decentralised power, dialogue, management facilitates and empowers and consensus-oriented communication.</li> </ul>

Table 4: Summary of Norwegian cultural dimensions, indicators, and proposed governance framework

1  
2

<p>Governance approaches to support AV deployment in Norway</p>	<p>‘Governing by doing’, ‘self-governing’ and ‘governing by enabling’.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop an AV solution in-house in a closed manner.</li> <li>• Minimise collaboration with third parties.</li> <li>• Provide government employees with an AV solution to show citizens examples to follow.</li> <li>• Provide funding.</li> <li>• Initiate public-private interactions.</li> <li>• Define vision with strong quantitative objectives.</li> <li>• Influence negotiations in favour of AV</li> <li>• Leverage AV opponents using horizontal network governance.</li> </ul>
---	--

1 Table 5: Proposed governance approaches to support AV deployment in Norway

2  
3 **6. Conclusions**

4 This paper attempts to provide insight into the governance of AV integrated in the Norwegian  
5 urban transport system using insight from the Norwegian cultural context and willingness-to-  
6 use survey. We analyse informal institutions from the cultural viewpoint using the Hofstede 6D  
7 model vis-à-vis a quantitative willingness to use AV survey. Then, we combine insight from the  
8 cultural indicators and survey to draw insight on the appropriate governance approaches from  
9 the ‘policy’ dimension of governance to promote AV deployment and increase the willingness  
10 to use AV in Norway.

11  
12 The survey result suggests that less than half of Norwegians are willing to use AV in the Oslo  
13 region. We assume that, on average, 36 out of every 100 respondents to the survey are either  
14 partly or totally willing to use AV. We then suggest that a workable governance approach for  
15 AV integration in the Norwegian public transport system should allay fears of privacy concerns  
16 (high individualism) while making people feel safe and secure, allay uncertainty fears, manage  
17 pessimism to technological innovation (high short-term orientation), regard time-honoured  
18 traditions and address the moderate ‘uncertainty avoidance’ and ‘restraint’ indicators. Also, the  
19 cultural indicators should align with the Norwegian culture’s ‘tender’ and ‘power distance’  
20 indicators, such as consensus, cooperation, societal solidarity, incentivisation, dialogue,  
21 facilitating management and decentralised power. Therefore, we argue that ‘governing by  
22 doing’, ‘self-governing’ and ‘governing by enabling’ should be combined to increase the  
23 willingness to use and promote AV deployment in Norway. We also argue that, although  
24 ‘governing by doing’ features such as minimising collaboration with third parties may seem to  
25 conflict with ‘governing by enabling’ features, they could be systematically combined. Control-  
26 related ‘governing by authority’ (traditional top-down mechanisms to govern) and ‘no-control’  
27 governing by laissez-faire may not be suitable for promoting AV in Norway.

28  
29 We contribute to the literature in three distinct ways. First, we propose a novel interdisciplinary  
30 methodology combining insights from the Norwegian culture and willingness to use AV to  
31 understand the governance of AV in the Norwegian urban transport system (a context-specific  
32 institutional environment). Second, we provide insight into the appropriate governance  
33 approach to support AV deployment in Norway. Third, we provide context-specific knowledge  
34 for stakeholders to understand AV governance issues in the urban transport system.

## 6.1 Limitations and Future Research

A limitation of this research is that our assumptions, such as the classification of the undecided or uninformed respondents as unwilling to use AV, may overestimate or underestimate the result of the willingness to use survey, thus impacting our results. Although we do not anticipate that the relatively low number of undecided/uninformed respondents could significantly impact our results and analysis, caution is still needed. Furthermore, the preferences of people change over time. Therefore, it could be argued that respondents who partially or totally agree in September 2022 may disagree later and be unwilling to use self-driving vehicles. Therefore, we suggest an occasional repeat of the survey. Nonetheless, these limitations should be considered when using our findings for decision-making. Further research could be tailored in this direction to understand the best methodology. We also did not delve into the debate on institutional trust. For example, to what extent do Norwegians trust the country's parliament, legal system, law enforcement agents and politicians vis-à-vis the suggested governance approach(es)? The debate on institutional trust is beyond the scope of this paper. Further research is also required to analyse the actors' constellation in the policymaking process. Finally, multi-criteria qualitative and quantitative research and analyses combining culture, governance approaches and quantitative surveys for AV deployment in the urban transport systems in different European spatiotemporal contexts warrant further study.

## Acknowledgement

This research received funding from the Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101077587 (The ULTIMO project). We thank Olivier Massol and Emma Jagu Schippers for their helpful comments on the first draft of this paper. We thank two peer reviewers for their insightful comments that helped to improve the quality of this paper.

## Reference

- Asquer Alberto and Krachkovskaya Inna (2021). Uncertainty, institutions, and regulatory responses to emerging technologies. *Regulation & Governance* (2021) 15, 1111–1127
- Auckland (2017), Shared Mobility Simulations for Auckland, International Transport Forum, OECD, 2017. Retrieved from <https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/shared-mobility-simulations-auckland.pdf>.
- Audouin Maxime and Finger Matthias (2019). Empower or Thwart? Insights from Vienna and Helsinki regarding the role of public authorities in developing MaaS schemes. *Transportation Research Procedia* 41 (2019) 6–16
- Bansal Prateek and Kara M. Kockelman (2017). Forecasting Americans' long-term adoption of connected and autonomous vehicle technologies. *Transportation Research Part A* 95 (2017) 49–63
- Berghe Wouter Van den, Michael Schachner, Veronica Sgarra, Nicola Christie (2020). The association between national culture, road safety performance and support for policy measures. *IATSS Research* 44 (2020) 197–211
- Bulkeley Harriet and Kern Kristine (2006). Local government and the governing of climate change in Germany and the UK. *Urban Studies*, 43(12), 2237–2259.
- Cohen Tom, Jack Stilgoe, Sally Stares, Nihan Akyelken, Clemence Cavoli, Jennie Day, Janet Dickinson, Vaike Fors, Debbie Hopkins, Glenn Lyons, Noortje Marres, Jonathan Newman, Louise Reardon, Neil Sipe, Chris Tennant, Zia Wadud, Edward Wigley (2020). A constructive role for social science in the development of automated vehicles. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives* 6 (2020) 100133
- Correlje Aad, John Groenewegen, Rolf Kunneke and Daniel Scholten (2014). "Design for Values in Economics" *Handbook of ethics, values, and technological design*; Springer Science.

1 Cunneen Martin, Martin Mullins, Finbarr Murphy, Darren Shannon, Irini Furxhi, and Cian Ryan (2020).  
2 Autonomous Vehicles and Avoiding the Trolley (Dilemma): Vehicle Perception, Classification, and the  
3 Challenges of Framing Decision Ethics, Cybernetics, and Systems, 51:1, 59-80.  
4  
5 Docherty Iain, Greg Marsden, Jillian Anable (2018). The governance of smart mobility. *Transportation  
6 Research Part A* 115 (2018) 114–125  
7  
8 Dublin (2018), Shared Mobility Simulations for Dublin, International Transport Forum, OECD, 2018.  
9 Retrieved from <https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/shared-mobility-simulations-dublin.pdf>  
10  
11 Etzioni Shelly, Jamil Hamadneh, Arnór B. Elvarsson, Domokos Esztergár-Kiss, Milena Djukanovic,  
12 Stelios N. Neophytou, Jaka Sodnik, Amalia Polydoropoulou, Ioannis Tsouros, Cristina Pronello, Nikolas  
13 Thomopoulos and Yoram Shiftan (2020). Modelling Cross-National Differences in Automated Vehicle  
14 Acceptance. *Sustainability* 2020, 12, 9765  
15  
16 Etzkowitz Henry (2008). *The triple helix: university-industry-government innovation in action*.  
17 Routledge, 2008.  
18  
19 Fagnant Daniel and Kockelman Kara (2015). Preparing a nation for autonomous vehicles: opportunities,  
20 barriers, and policy recommendations. *Transportation Research Part A* 77 (2015) 167–181  
21  
22 Fournier Guy, Michael Thalhofer, Philippe Chrétien, Adrian Boos, Dorien Korbee, Ines Jaroudi, Eliane  
23 Nemoto, Gabriele Naderer, Dimitri Konstantas, Tobias Viere (2022). System innovation in transport with  
24 automated minibuses and ITS: the citizen-centric approach of AVENUE. *Transportation Research  
25 Procedia* 00 (2022) 000–000  
26  
27 Fournier Guy, Boos Adrian, Wörner Ralf, Jaroudi, Ines, Morozova Inna, and Nemoto, Eliane Hemoto  
28 (2020). 'Substituting individual mobility by mobility on demand using autonomous vehicles – a  
29 sustainable assessment simulation of Berlin and Stuttgart'. *International Journal of Automotive  
30 Technology and Management*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp.369–407.  
31  
32 Freemark Yonah, Anne Hudson, Jinhua Zhao (2020). Policies for Autonomy: How American Cities  
33 envision regulating automated vehicles. *Urban Science* 2020, 4, 55  
34  
35 Friedrich Markus, Maximilian Hartl, and Christoph Magg (2018). A modelling approach for matching  
36 ridesharing trips within macroscopic travel demand models. *Transportation*, Springer, vol. 45(6), pages  
37 1639-1653, November 2018.  
38  
39 Geels Frank (2002). Technological transitions as evolutionary reconfiguration processes: a multi-level  
40 perspective and a case-study. *Research Policy* 31 (2002) 1257–1274  
41  
42 Haboucha Chana J., Ishaq Robert, Shiftan Yoram (2017). User preferences regarding autonomous  
43 vehicles. *Transportation Research Part C. Emerging Technologies* 2017, 78, 37–49.  
44  
45 Hansson Lisa (2013). Hybrid steering cultures in the governance of public transport: A successful way  
46 to meet demands? *Research in Transportation Economics* 39 (2013) 175-184  
47  
48 Hansson Lisa (2020). Regulatory governance in emerging technologies: The case of autonomous  
49 vehicles in Sweden and Norway. *Research in Transportation Economics* 83 (2020) 100967  
50  
51 Haugland Bård Torvetjønn (2020). Changing oil: self-driving vehicles and the Norwegian state.  
52 *Humanities and Social Science Communications* (2020) 7:180. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-020-00667-9>  
53  
54 Haugland Bård Torvetjønn, and Tomas Moe Skjølvold (2020) Promise of the obsolete: expectations  
55 for and experiments with self-driving vehicles in Norway, *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*,  
56 16:1, 37-47, DOI: 10.1080/15487733.2020.1765677  
57  
58 Helsinki (2017), Shared Mobility Simulations for Helsinki, International Transport Forum, OECD, 2017.  
59 Retrieved from <https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/shared-mobility-simulations-helsinki.pdf>.  
60  
61 Hirschhorn Fabio, Didier van de Velde, Wijnand Veeneman, Ernst ten Heuvelhof (2020), The  
62 governance of attractive public transport: Informal institutions, institutional entrepreneurs, and problem-  
63 solving know-how in Oslo and Amsterdam. *Research in Transportation Economics* 83 (2020) 100829  
64  
65 Hodgson Geoffrey (2006). What are Institutions? *Journal of Economic Issues*, Vol. 40, No. 1, pp. 1-25,  
66 March 2006.  
67  
68



1 Hofbauer Franziska, Fischer Peter, Hudecek, Matthias (2023). Identification of user groups of  
2 autonomous shuttle buses: A latent profile analysis. Retrieved from <https://osf.io/t4y9d/>. Assessed  
3 May 29, 2023  
4

5 Hofstede Gert and Gert Jan Hofstede (2005). *Cultures and organisations: Software of the mind*. Second  
6 Edition, McGraw Hill Publishing 2005  
7

8 Hofstede Insight (2023). Cultural dimensions values for Norway. Retrieved from [https://www.hofstede-  
10 insights.com/country-comparison/norway/](https://www.hofstede-<br/>
9 insights.com/country-comparison/norway/). Assessed 15.2.2023.

11 Howard Daniel and Dai Danielle (2014). Public perceptions of self-driving cars: The case of Berkeley,  
12 California. Transportation Research Board 93rd Annual Meeting, Washington, DC, USA, January 2014;  
13 Volume 14. No. 4502.  
14

15 Hrelja Robert, Jason Monios, Tom Rye, Karolina Isaksson, and Christina Scholten (2017). The interplay  
16 of formal and informal institutions between local and regional authorities when creating well-functioning  
17 public transport systems. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation* 2017, vol. 11, No. 8, 611–  
18 622.  
19

20 Huber Dominik, Tobias Viere, Eliane Horschutz Nemoto, Ines Jaroudi, Dorien Korbee, Guy Fournier  
21 (2021). Climate and environmental impacts of automated minibuses in future public transportation.  
22 *Transportation Research Part D* 102 (2022) 103160  
23

24 ITF(2016). *Shared Mobility. Innovation for liveable cities* International Transport Forum, OECD, 2016.  
25 Retrieved from <https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/shared-mobility-liveable-cities.pdf>.  
26

27 Keszey Tamara (2020). Behavioural intention to use autonomous vehicles: Systematic review and  
28 empirical extension. *Transportation Research Part C* 119 (2020) 102732  
29

30 Korbee Dorien, Gabriele Naderer, Guy Fournier (2022). The potential of automated minibuses in the  
31 socio-technical transformation of the transport system. *Transportation Research Procedia* 00 (2022)  
32 000–000  
33

34 Kaasa Anneli and Andriani Luca (2022). Determinants of institutional trust: the role of cultural context.  
35 *Journal of Institutional Economics* (2022), 18, 45–65 Cambridge University Press  
36

37 Krueger Rico, Rashidi H. Taha, John M. Rose (2016). Preferences for shared autonomous vehicles.  
38 *Transportation Research Part C Emerging Technologies* 2016, 69, 343–355  
39

40 Kyriakidis Miltos, Happee Riender, de Winter Joost (2015). Public opinion on automated driving: Results  
41 of an international questionnaire among 5000 respondents. *Transportation Research Part F. Traffic  
42 Psychology and Behaviour* 2015, 32, 127-140.  
43

44 Li Shunxi, Pang-Chieh Sui, Jinsheng Xiao, Richard Chahine (2019). Policy formulation for highly  
45 automated vehicles: Emerging importance, research frontiers and insights. *Transportation Research  
46 Part A* 124 (2019) 573–586  
47

48 Liljamo Timo, Liimatainen Heikki, Pöllänen Markus (2018). Attitudes and concerns on automated  
49 vehicles. *Transportation Research Part F. Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 2018, 59, 24-44.  
50

51 Ljubi Klara and Ales Groznik (2023). The role played by social factors and privacy concerns in  
52 autonomous vehicle adoption. *Transport Policy* 132 (2023) 1–15  
53

54 Mackay Marisa Maio and Metcalfe Mike (2002). Multiple Methods Forecasts for Discontinuous  
55 Innovations. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 69, 221–232.  
56

57 Mladenović Milos, Stead Dominic, Milakis Dimitris, Pangbourne Kate, Givoni Moshe (2020).  
58 Governance cultures and sociotechnical imaginaries of self-driving vehicle technology: Comparative  
59 analysis of Finland, UK, and Germany. In D. Milakis, N. Thomopoulos, & B. van Wee (Eds.), *Policy  
60 Implications of Autonomous Vehicles*. *Advances in Transport Policy and Planning*. Volume 5, 2020,  
61 Pages 235-262  
62

63 Mira Bonnardel Sylvie (2021). 'Robomobility for collective transport: a prospective user-centric view'.  
64 *International Journal of Automotive Technology and Management*, Vol. 21, Nos. 1/2, pp.99–120.  
65

66 Narayanan Santhanakrishnan, Emmanouil Chaniotakis, Constantinos Antoniou (2020). Shared  
67 autonomous vehicle services: A comprehensive review. *Transportation Research Part C* 111 (2020)  
68 255–293  
69

1 Nemoto Eliane Horschutz, Roukaya Issaoui, Dorien Korbee, Ines Jaroudi, Guy Fournier (2021). How to  
2 measure the impacts of shared automated electric vehicles on urban mobility. *Transportation Research*  
3 *Part D* 93 (2021) 102766  
4

5 Nikitas Alexandros, Nikolas Thomopoulos, Dimitris Milakis (2021). The Environmental and Resource  
6 Dimensions of Automated Transport: A Nexus for Enabling Vehicle Automation to Support Sustainable  
7 Urban Mobility. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, Vol. 46:167-192  
8

9 North Douglass (1991). *Institutions*, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 5 (1), 97-112  
10

11 North Douglass (1994). Institutional change: a framework of analysis. *Social Rules*, 189-201  
12

13 Oldbury Kelsey, Karolina Isaksson (2021). Governance arrangements shaping driverless shuttles in  
14 public transport: The case of Barkarbystaden, Stockholm. *Cities* 113 (2021) 103146  
15

16 Othman Kareem (2021). Public acceptance and perception of autonomous vehicles: a comprehensive  
17 review. *AI and Ethics* (2021) 1: 355-387  
18

19 Panagiotopoulos Ilias and Dimitrakopoulos George (2018). An empirical investigation on consumers'  
20 intentions towards autonomous driving. *Transportation Research Part C. Emerging Technologies* 2018,  
21 95, 773–784.  
22

23 Payre William, Cestac Julien, Delhomme Patricia (2014). Intention to use a fully automated car: Attitudes  
24 and a priori acceptability. *Transportation Research Part F. Traffic Psychology and Behaviour* 2014, 27,  
25 252–263.  
26

27 Ruter (2019). *The Oslo Study: How autonomous cars may change transport in cities report?* Ruter, 2019  
28

29 Rye Tom, Jason Monios, Robert Hrelja, Karolina Isaksson (2018). The relationship between formal and  
30 informal institutions for governance of public transport. *Journal of Transport Geography* 69 (2018) 196–  
31 206  
32

33 Schippl Jens, Bernhard Truffer, Torsten Fleischer (2022). Potential impacts of institutional dynamics on  
34 the development of automated vehicles: Towards sustainable mobility? *Transportation Research*  
35 *Interdisciplinary Perspectives* 14 (2022) 100587  
36

37 Schwartz Shalom (2006). *A theory of cultural value orientations: explication and applications.*  
38 *Comparative Sociology*, Volume 5, issue 2-3, Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, 2006.  
39

40 Sener N. Ipek, Zmud Johanna, Williams Thomas (2019). Measures of baseline intent to use automated  
41 vehicles: A case study of Texas cities. *Transportation Research Part F. Traffic Psychology and*  
42 *Behaviour*. 2019, 62, 66–77.  
43

44 Syahrivar Jhanghiz, Tamás Gyulavári, Melinda Jászberényi, Katalin Ásványi, László Kökény, Chairy  
45 Chairy (2021). Surrendering personal control to automation: Appalling or appealing? *Transportation*  
46 *Research Part F* 80 (2021) 90–103  
47

48 Singh Harprinderjot, Mohammadreza Kaviani-pour, Mehrnaz Ghamami, Ali Zockaie (2023). Adoption of  
49 autonomous and electric vehicles in private and shared mobility systems. *Transportation Research Part*  
50 *D* 115 (2023) 103561  
51

52 Schoettle Brandon and Michael Sivak (2014). Public opinion about self-driving vehicles in China, India,  
53 Japan, the US, the UK, and Australia. The University of Michigan Transportation Research Institute,  
54 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-2150, USA  
55

56 Sun Shanshan, Yiik Diew Wong, Xiaodong Liu, Andreas Rau (2020). Exploration of an integrated  
57 automated public transportation system. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives* 8  
58 (2020) 100275  
59

60 Tan Si Ying and Taeihagh Araz (2021). Adaptive governance of autonomous vehicles: Accelerating the  
61 adoption of disruptive technologies in Singapore. *Government Information Quarterly* 38 (2021) 101546  
62

63 Treib Oliver, Holger Bähr and Gerda Falkner (2005). Modes of Governance: A note towards conceptual  
64 clarification. *European Governance Papers (EUROGOV) No.N-05-02*. Retrieved from  
65 <http://www.connex-network.org/eurogov/pdf/egp-newgov-N-05-02.pdf>.  
66

67 Treib Oliver, Holger Bähr and Gerda Falkner (2007). Modes of governance: Towards a conceptual  
68 clarification, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 14:1, 1-20.  
69

1 Statistics Norway (2023). Oslo and Viken county's population by age, contents, and year (2022).  
 2 Retrieved from <https://www.ssb.no/en/statbank/table/07459/tableViewLayout1/> Assessed 30th April,  
 3 2023  
 4  
 5 Wang Sicheng, Jiang Zhiqui, Noland B. Robert, Mondschein S. Andrew (2020). Attitudes towards  
 6 privately-owned and shared autonomous vehicles. Transport Research Part F, Traffic Psychology and  
 7 Behaviour 2020, 72, 297–306.  
 8  
 9 Wintersberger Sophie, Azmat Muhammad, Kummer Sebastian (2019). Are We Ready to Ride  
 10 Autonomous Vehicles? A Pilot Study on Austrian Consumers' Perspective. Logistics 2019, 3, 20.  
 11  
 12 Yun Yongdeok, Oh Hyungseok, Myung Rohae (2021). Statistical Modelling of Cultural Differences in  
 13 Adopting Autonomous Vehicles. Applied Science 2021, 11, 9030.  
 14  
 15 Zmud Johanna, Sener N. Ipek., Wagner Jason (2016). Self-driving vehicles: Determinants of adoption  
 16 and conditions of usage. Transportation Research Records 2565 (1), 57–64  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20

**APPENDIX A**

		<b>Age</b>			
		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	15.00	6	.3	.3	.3
	16.00	14	.8	.8	1.2
	17.00	34	2.0	2.0	3.1
	18.00	11	.6	.6	3.7
	19.00	14	.8	.8	4.5
	20.00	17	1.0	1.0	5.5
	21.00	36	2.1	2.1	7.6
	22.00	30	1.7	1.7	9.3
	23.00	23	1.3	1.3	10.6
	24.00	28	1.6	1.6	12.3
	25.00	35	2.0	2.0	14.3
	26.00	25	1.4	1.4	15.7
	27.00	44	2.5	2.5	18.2
	28.00	45	2.6	2.6	20.8
	29.00	38	2.2	2.2	23.0
	30.00	37	2.1	2.1	25.1
	31.00	20	1.2	1.2	26.3
	32.00	34	2.0	2.0	28.3
	33.00	23	1.3	1.3	29.6
	34.00	26	1.5	1.5	31.1
35.00	26	1.5	1.5	32.6	
36.00	31	1.8	1.8	34.3	
37.00	21	1.2	1.2	35.6	
38.00	31	1.8	1.8	37.3	
39.00	28	1.6	1.6	39.0	
40.00	41	2.4	2.4	41.3	

41.00	31	1.8	1.8	43.1
42.00	54	3.1	3.1	46.2
43.00	49	2.8	2.8	49.0
44.00	46	2.6	2.6	51.7
45.00	32	1.8	1.8	53.5
46.00	23	1.3	1.3	54.8
47.00	25	1.4	1.4	56.3
48.00	29	1.7	1.7	57.9
49.00	26	1.5	1.5	59.4
50.00	40	2.3	2.3	61.7
51.00	21	1.2	1.2	62.9
52.00	31	1.8	1.8	64.7
53.00	38	2.2	2.2	66.9
54.00	32	1.8	1.8	68.8
55.00	23	1.3	1.3	70.1
56.00	21	1.2	1.2	71.3
57.00	25	1.4	1.4	72.7
58.00	26	1.5	1.5	74.2
59.00	31	1.8	1.8	76.0
60.00	24	1.4	1.4	77.4
61.00	18	1.0	1.0	78.4
62.00	15	.9	.9	79.3
63.00	13	.7	.7	80.0
64.00	15	.9	.9	80.9
65.00	21	1.2	1.2	82.1
66.00	8	.5	.5	82.6
67.00	24	1.4	1.4	83.9
68.00	21	1.2	1.2	85.2
69.00	23	1.3	1.3	86.5
70.00	22	1.3	1.3	87.7
71.00	13	.7	.7	88.5
72.00	26	1.5	1.5	90.0
73.00	18	1.0	1.0	91.0
74.00	21	1.2	1.2	92.2
75.00	18	1.0	1.0	93.3
76.00	23	1.3	1.3	94.6
77.00	15	.9	.9	95.5
78.00	9	.5	.5	96.0
79.00	10	.6	.6	96.5
80.00	10	.6	.6	97.1
81.00	6	.3	.3	97.5
82.00	10	.6	.6	98.0

	83.00	8	.5	.5	98.5
	84.00	10	.6	.6	99.1
	85.00	4	.2	.2	99.3
	86.00	4	.2	.2	99.5
	87.00	5	.3	.3	99.8
	88.00	2	.1	.1	99.9
	89.00	1	.1	.1	100.0
	Total	1738	100.0	100.0	

### Statistics

#### Age

Mean	45.4406
Median	44.0000
Mode	43.00
Range	74.00
Minimum	15.00
Maximum	89.00

#### Respondents Age\_group

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	15-20 years	96	5.5	5.5	5.5
	21-30 years	341	19.6	19.6	25.1
	31-40 years	281	16.2	16.2	41.3
	41-50 years	355	20.4	20.4	61.7
	51-66 years	362	20.8	20.8	82.6
	67+ years	303	17.4	17.4	100.0
	Total	1738	100.0	100.0	

#### Gender

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Men	865	49.8	49.8	49.8
	Women	873	50.2	50.2	100.0
	Total	1738	100.0	100.0	

#### Attitude\_to\_new\_technology

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	I am sceptical of new technology and only use it when I have to	84	4.8	5.3	5.3
	I am among the last in my circle to adopt new technology	105	6.0	6.6	11.9

	I usually use new technology when most people I know do	635	36.5	40.0	51.9
	I like new technology and adopt it before most people I know	532	30.6	33.5	85.4
	I love new technology and am among the first to try it out	207	11.9	13.0	98.5
	I do not know	24	1.4	1.5	100.0
	Total	1587	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	151	8.7		
Total		1738	100.0		

1

### Willingness\_to\_share

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Completely disagree	623	35.8	39.3	39.3
	Partly disagree	178	10.2	11.2	50.5
	Neither	231	13.3	14.6	65.0
	Partially agree	176	10.1	11.1	76.1
	Totally Agree	296	17.0	18.7	94.8
	I do not know	83	4.8	5.2	100.0
	Total	1587	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	151	8.7		
Total		1738	100.0		

2  
3

### meet\_future\_transport\_need

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Completely disagree	284	16.3	17.9	17.9
	Partly disagree	199	11.4	12.5	30.4
	Neither	334	19.2	21.0	51.5
	Partially agree	285	16.4	18.0	69.4
	Totally Agree	364	20.9	22.9	92.4
	I do not know	121	7.0	7.6	100.0
	Total	1587	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	151	8.7		
Total		1738	100.0		

4

### safety\_security

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
--	--	-----------	----------	---------------	--------------------

Valid	Completely disagree	334	19.2	21.0	21.0
	Partly disagree	281	16.2	17.7	38.8
	Neither	372	21.4	23.4	62.2
	Partially agree	247	14.2	15.6	77.8
	Totally Agree	194	11.2	12.2	90.0
	I do not know	159	9.1	10.0	100.0
	Total	1587	91.3	100.0	
Missing	System	151	8.7		
Total		1738	100.0		

1

### Pilot\_Area

		Frequency	Per cent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Groruddalen	615	35.4	35.4	35.4
	Øvrige Oslo	519	29.9	29.9	65.2
	Viken	604	34.8	34.8	100.0
	Total	1738	100.0	100.0	

2

1  
2  
3  
4

**APPENDIX B**

**Oslo and Viken county's populations by age**

Oslo	
Age (Years)	Persons (2022)
15	65084
16	63569
17	63883
18	63617
19	62594
20	64047
21	67017
22	67331
23	67167
24	69348
25	71799
26	72197
27	72765
28	74004
29	75908
30	77414
31	78769
32	77915
33	77460
34	74627
35	74251
36	73064
37	71980
38	71645
39	71997
40	70417
41	71289
42	70123
43	69654
44	67823
45	69294
46	71237
47	74016
48	74010
49	76370
50	76310
51	75342
52	76661
53	75808
54	73613
55	72952
56	71623
57	70150
58	67122
59	65278

Viken	
Age (years)	Persons (2022)
15	16248
16	15791
17	15969
18	15709
19	14971
20	14241
21	14003
22	13690
23	13204
24	13434
25	13513
26	13651
27	13688
28	14427
29	14854
30	15470
31	16264
32	16595
33	16770
34	16753
35	16713
36	16922
37	16885
38	17161
39	17232
40	16997
41	17395
42	17265
43	17473
44	16990
45	17271
46	17970
47	18959
48	18559
49	19343
50	19172
51	18822
52	19033
53	19169
54	18156
55	18220
56	17806
57	17321
58	16374
59	15973



60	63952
61	62955
62	62648
63	61739
64	59971
65	60231
66	58280
67	56640
68	55469
69	54233
70	51263
71	51615
72	50984
73	50936
74	51168
75	51886
76	45092
77	42313
78	36469
79	32602
80	27388
81	27069
82	24869
83	22633
84	20014
85	17911
86	15563
87	13996
88	12558
89	11734
90	9974
91	8659
92	6836
93	5545
94	4300
95	3465
96	2571
97	1879
98	1220
99	800
100	527
101	341
102	183
103	92
104	64
105	102

60	15380
61	15140
62	14865
63	14616
64	14215
65	14055
66	13309
67	13098
68	12714
69	12169
70	11577
71	11805
72	11876
73	11928
74	12263
75	12885
76	10895
77	10443
78	8524
79	7537
80	6266
81	6358
82	5801
83	5340
84	4837
85	4132
86	3489
87	3134
88	2800
89	2586
90	2266
91	1963
92	1475
93	1185
94	906
95	753
96	560
97	367
98	251
99	156
100	98
101	63
102	37
103	17
104	8
105	14

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

1  
2

**Oslo and Viken county's populations by gender**

Oslo county	
Age	Male
15 years	3382
16 years	3340
17 years	3294
18 years	3319
19 years	3243
20 years	3461
21 years	3994
22 years	4482
23 years	4694
24 years	5254
25 years	6069
26 years	6912
27 years	7349
28 years	7405
29 years	7720
30 years	7796
31 years	7859
32 years	7772
33 years	7474
34 years	6965
35 years	6756
36 years	6477
37 years	6127
38 years	5933
39 years	5830
40 years	5504
41 years	5519
42 years	5200
43 years	5143
44 years	4935
45 years	4976
46 years	4943
47 years	4911
48 years	4743
49 years	4754
50 years	4678
51 years	4564
52 years	4347
53 years	4315
54 years	4119
55 years	4131
56 years	3983

Viken county	
Age	Male
15 years	8431
16 years	8135
17 years	8224
18 years	8018
19 years	7785
20 years	7620
21 years	7451
22 years	7239
23 years	6861
24 years	7130
25 years	7053
26 years	7088
27 years	7077
28 years	7449
29 years	7602
30 years	7902
31 years	8215
32 years	8351
33 years	8405
34 years	8453
35 years	8509
36 years	8599
37 years	8537
38 years	8719
39 years	8694
40 years	8553
41 years	8858
42 years	8756
43 years	8833
44 years	8618
45 years	8932
46 years	9159
47 years	9613
48 years	9496
49 years	9848
50 years	9759
51 years	9565
52 years	9733
53 years	9783
54 years	9207
55 years	9380
56 years	9093

57 years	3904
58 years	3747
59 years	3566
60 years	3385
61 years	3433
62 years	3209
63 years	3037
64 years	2962
65 years	2800
66 years	2710
67 years	2596
68 years	2439
69 years	2305
70 years	2276
71 years	2171
72 years	2198
73 years	2214
74 years	2200
75 years	2318
76 years	1883
77 years	1872
78 years	1565
79 years	1229
80 years	992
81 years	1036
82 years	929
83 years	813
84 years	658
85 years	592
86 years	475
87 years	426
88 years	410
89 years	359
90 years	292
91 years	256
92 years	208
93 years	161
94 years	112
95 years	100
96 years	81
97 years	50
98 years	35
99 years	21
100 years	10
101 years	11
102 years	7

57 years	8862
58 years	8288
59 years	8112
60 years	7907
61 years	7716
62 years	7577
63 years	7425
64 years	7073
65 years	7050
66 years	6677
67 years	6408
68 years	6124
69 years	5941
70 years	5663
71 years	5809
72 years	5766
73 years	5765
74 years	5892
75 years	6138
76 years	5102
77 years	4920
78 years	3992
79 years	3462
80 years	2799
81 years	2856
82 years	2569
83 years	2279
84 years	2039
85 years	1695
86 years	1400
87 years	1200
88 years	1081
89 years	992
90 years	781
91 years	676
92 years	495
93 years	404
94 years	277
95 years	222
96 years	167
97 years	88
98 years	63
99 years	39
100 years	14
101 years	10
102 years	9

103 years	2
104 years	2
105 years or older	18

103 years	4
104 years	1
105 years or older	3

Age	Female
15 years	3417
16 years	3295
17 years	3242
18 years	3207
19 years	3501
20 years	3976
21 years	4504
22 years	4769
23 years	5258
24 years	6076
25 years	7123
26 years	7583
27 years	7760
28 years	8040
29 years	8093
30 years	7954
31 years	7951
32 years	7463
33 years	7119
34 years	6578
35 years	6275
36 years	5745
37 years	5692
38 years	5264
39 years	5142
40 years	5074
41 years	5112
42 years	4844
43 years	4582
44 years	4481
45 years	4447
46 years	4515
47 years	4520
48 years	4344
49 years	4400
50 years	4326
51 years	4166
52 years	4240
53 years	3964
54 years	3895
55 years	3840

Age	Female
15 years	7817
16 years	7656
17 years	7745
18 years	7691
19 years	7186
20 years	6621
21 years	6552
22 years	6451
23 years	6343
24 years	6304
25 years	6460
26 years	6563
27 years	6611
28 years	6978
29 years	7252
30 years	7568
31 years	8049
32 years	8244
33 years	8365
34 years	8300
35 years	8204
36 years	8323
37 years	8348
38 years	8442
39 years	8538
40 years	8444
41 years	8537
42 years	8509
43 years	8640
44 years	8372
45 years	8339
46 years	8811
47 years	9346
48 years	9063
49 years	9495
50 years	9413
51 years	9257
52 years	9300
53 years	9386
54 years	8949
55 years	8840

56 years	3832
57 years	3741
58 years	3547
59 years	3401
60 years	3290
61 years	3253
62 years	3136
63 years	3213
64 years	3060
65 years	2938
66 years	2751
67 years	2774
68 years	2644
69 years	2585
70 years	2482
71 years	2475
72 years	2384
73 years	2370
74 years	2398
75 years	2537
76 years	2279
77 years	2078
78 years	1788
79 years	1583
80 years	1250
81 years	1324
82 years	1314
83 years	1123
84 years	1040
85 years	927
86 years	910
87 years	767
88 years	751
89 years	707
90 years	655
91 years	630
92 years	490
93 years	376
94 years	310
95 years	269
96 years	227
97 years	178
98 years	120
99 years	77
100 years	54
101 years	43
102 years	20
103 years	11
104 years	10
105 years or older	34

56 years	8713
57 years	8459
58 years	8086
59 years	7861
60 years	7473
61 years	7424
62 years	7288
63 years	7191
64 years	7142
65 years	7005
66 years	6632
67 years	6690
68 years	6590
69 years	6228
70 years	5914
71 years	5996
72 years	6110
73 years	6163
74 years	6371
75 years	6747
76 years	5793
77 years	5523
78 years	4532
79 years	4075
80 years	3467
81 years	3502
82 years	3232
83 years	3061
84 years	2798
85 years	2437
86 years	2089
87 years	1934
88 years	1719
89 years	1594
90 years	1485
91 years	1287
92 years	980
93 years	781
94 years	629
95 years	531
96 years	393
97 years	279
98 years	188
99 years	117
100 years	84
101 years	53
102 years	28
103 years	13
104 years	7
105 years or older	11