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Abstract

The question that was chosen to be the focus of this essay was “To what extent are the spheres of influence of malls in Kiev affected by their accessibility?” The proposed hypothesis stated that the higher the level of accessibility the larger the sphere of influence of the mall would be. The essay considers three malls in Kiev, Ukraine and analyses the relationship between their spheres of influence and accessibility level.

The three malls chosen for this observation were Gulliver, Ocean Plaza and Terminal. In order to quantitatively establish the accessibility of each of these malls, an original composite indicator was created, taking into account three major accessibility factors: number of parking spots, number of bus lines reaching the mall and number of metro lines within 500 meters of the mall. Due to people’s unwillingness to share information of where they live, the sphere of influence in this observation was represented in the number of visitors that each mall received through the main entrance, throughout 30 minutes. The results of both data sets were presented in a graph and analyzed, exploring numerous reasons for the results that were obtained.

The conclusion found that the original hypothesis was not entirely true. Although accessibility may affect a mall’s sphere of influence to a certain extent, there are other factors that may also contribute to a larger or smaller sphere of influence, including size, location and goods and services offered by the mall.
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Introduction

Kiev is the capital of Ukraine and, as seen on Map 1, is located in the north of the country. It is the most economically developed region of Ukraine with approximately 2.8 million citizens¹ and, like most other large cities, offers a wide variety of services such as malls, museums, restaurants and movie theatres. With so many services available to the population, it is important for the business to be able to reach its threshold population in order to be successful. A threshold population is defined to be “the minimum number of people required to support a particular good, shop or office”.²

There are many factors that may influence the service’s success or failure and one of those factors is its sphere of influence, which is a component of the Urban Environments topic of IB Geography. It can be defined as “the area that is served by a settlement, for a particular function”³. This means that the sphere of influence shows the maximum distance people are willing to travel from their homes to reach a particular service, such as a store or movie theatre. The larger the sphere of influence, the more people will visit it, spend money there and thus make the service more successful. The sphere of influence can be affected by several different factors including the distance from the Central Business District, the size, the services it offers, and its accessibility.

An important theory linked to the sphere of influence is Reilly’s law of retail gravitation, which states that: “Two centers attract trade from intermediate places in direct proportion to the size of the centers and in inverse proportion to the square of the distances

---


from the two centers to the intermediate place.”4 However, this law makes assumptions that people shop in a logical way and will travel to the center that is nearest to them. This is not always the case - people may be willing to travel further distances in order to, for example, obtain slightly different services or goods. There are other factors that may affect the popularity of a mall and accessibility is one of them. The ease of access to a mall is an important factor that people consider (e.g. bus and metro stations nearby, number of parking spots available) when choosing which mall to visit. Kiev’s public transportation system is less advanced (see Figure 1 on page 9) than in some of its Western neighbors’ capitals, however its citizens still rely heavily on public transport to move around. Therefore, I became interested in finding out how accessibility of a service, such as a shopping center, influences the service’s sphere of influence.

For this research paper I will be focusing on the question: “to what extent is the sphere of influence of a mall affected by its accessibility?” In an attempt to answer this question I will examine the difference in the sphere of influence of three malls: “Terminal”, “Ocean Plaza” and “Gulliver”, shown on Map 2, in Kiev Ukraine, and their accessibility. It is an important aspect to consider when planning on opening a service, because it enables insight into a factor that could have an effect on the potential success of the business or service.

It is important to note that the sphere of influence in this observation will not be measured by the distance people travel to reach the mall, as people are unwilling to tell strangers where they live. Instead, the number of people entering the mall in the span of 30 minutes will be counted.

Accessibility of these malls will be assessed on the number of metro and bus lines that reach the mall and the number of parking spots available at the three malls. My hypothesis is

---

that the easier the access to the mall, such as more bus numbers and metro lines that reach the
mall and more parking spaces, the more people will be able to access it from various parts of
the city, drawing a larger number of people and therefore the mall will have a larger sphere of
influence.

Map 1: Map of Ukraine

Methodology

(Accessed Sept. 18, 2014)
1. Sphere of influence

Due to the fact that people are not keen on giving information about where they live, especially to strangers, it would be difficult to figure out the sphere of influence based on how far people travel to a mall. Instead, I will count how many people enter a mall in a certain amount of time and from those results establish the sphere of influence, as technically, a greater sphere influence should mean a greater number of visitors.

More specifically, I will count the number of people that enter the mall through the main entrance in half an hour at noon on two Sundays and one Saturday.

2. Accessibility

This variable will be measured by counting:

1. Number of parking spots provided by the mall
2. Number of bus routes that reach the mall
3. Number of metro lines that reach the mall

I have created an original composite indicator to describe and compare the ease of access of the three malls in a numerical way. The three components listed above will be measured at each mall and each of them will be assessed using separate scales. The higher the number on the scale, the better the access to the mall. The number of points from each component will be added up to give an overall numerical value of the accessibility of the mall.
I have chosen to include the number of parking spots as one of the components of accessibility because it reflects the mall’s ability to accommodate for the people who reach the mall by car. If a mall is unable to provide enough parking space people who prefer to travel by car will be less keen on visiting that mall.

2. Number of bus numbers reaching the mall (including marshrutkas (Figure 1), trolleybuses, buses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No bus lines reach the mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-4 bus lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-10 bus lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11-16 bus lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17-22 bus lines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Number of metro lines present within 500 meters of the mall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No metro lines reach the mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 metro line within 500 meters of the mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 metro lines within 500 meters of the mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 metro lines within 500 meters of the mall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I chose to include the metro and bus factors in this composite indicator, as public transportation in Kiev is very cheap – a metro ride is 2UAH, while bus fares range from 1.50 to 4UAH a ticket. Therefore, the majority of citizens choose to travel using public transport, thus the presence of a metro station and bus stops near a mall could greatly affect its popularity.

---


4. Overall ease of access of mall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points added up from the three criteria</th>
<th>Level of Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>Low accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-8</td>
<td>Medium accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>High accessibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
See Appendix for detailed city map
Data Collection - Accessibility

This data was collected using both primary and secondary sources. I counted the number of bus numbers that stop at the stations near the malls as well as the number of metro lines reachable within 500 meters of the malls. The number of parking spots was taken from secondary sources, mainly the malls’ websites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mall</th>
<th>Number of parking spots</th>
<th>Number of bus routes that reach the mall</th>
<th>Number of metro lines that reach the mall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Plaza</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulliver</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Terminal

The mall can be found in grid F2 on Map 2. This shopping center is located on the left side of the river, on the boarders of the city, approximately 25km away from Kiev’s central business district which is situated on the right bank. It is situated quite close to one of Kiev’s main roads, leading to the center of the city. This feature may prove to be an important factor in accessibility. Terminal’s location, far from the center, allows for a large area and therefore a vast amount of goods and services to be offered. It occupies over 70 000 square meters and, apart from 27 stores and a supermarket\(^8\), includes an ice rink, a bowling alley, a cinema, a fitness center and a karting center\(^9\).


\(^9\)
As seen on the table above, public transport to the mall is limited to buses, as the center is located 9.2km from the nearest metro station. It does, however, have quite a large parking space of 850 spots (some can be seen in Figure 2). The final result of 7 points represents medium accessibility of the mall.

Ocean Plaza

Ocean Plaza is situated in grid C3 on Map 2. It is located on Gorkovo Street, approximately 5km away from the city’s central business district and is one of Kiev’s newest

---


shopping centers. It is as big as Terminal, also occupying 70 000 square meters\textsuperscript{11}. It offers a variety of services including 197 stores, car wash, travel agencies, an outdoor swimming pool, a karting center and a movie theatre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mall</th>
<th>Number of parking spots</th>
<th>Number of bus routes that reach the mall</th>
<th>Number of metro lines that reach the mall</th>
<th>Total number of points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Plaza</td>
<td>3000 (5 points)</td>
<td>21 (4 points)</td>
<td>1 (1 points)</td>
<td>10 points = Good Accessibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen on the table above, Ocean Plaza can be reached through 21 different bus routes (Figure 4), one of three metro lines and offers 3000 parking spots\textsuperscript{12} (Figure 3), consequently ranking the mall with high accessibility.


\textsuperscript{13} Mikolajczak, G. (2014) \textit{Ocean Plaza Parking}. 

\textsuperscript{11} Figure 3: Over ground parking in Ocean Plaza
Gulliver can be found in grid C3 on Map 2. It is located on Sportivna Square, approximately 1.8km away from Kiev’s main square Maidan Nezalezhnosti. It holds 130 stores, a supermarket, a swimming pool, 13 restaurants, a bowling center and a movie theatre\(^{15}\).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mall</th>
<th>Number of parking spots</th>
<th>Number of bus routes that reach the mall</th>
<th>Number of metro lines that reach the mall</th>
<th>Total number of points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gulliver</td>
<td>450 (3 points)</td>
<td>5 (2 points)</td>
<td>2 (2 points)</td>
<td>7 points = Adequate accessibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As seen on the table above Gulliver scored “medium accessibility” based on the data collected. The Kiev metro is the most popular mean of public transport\(^6\) and although 2 lines reach the mall, with one station 200 meters from the mall (see Figure 5), the fact that Gulliver provides only 450 parking spots \(^7\) and just 5 bus routes reach the mall may explain why the accessibility can be ranked as medium rather than high.

Predictions

If my initial hypothesis were to be true, based on the results of the assessment of accessibility, it could be assumed that Ocean Plaza would have the highest number of visitors, due to its high accessibility, while Gulliver and Terminal would have approximately the same number of visitors as their accessibility rank is the same.


\(^8\) Mikolajczak, G. (2014) Metro near Gulliver.
Furthermore, as mentioned above, the Kiev metro is the most used and fastest means of public transportation. Taking this into account, it could be predicted that Ocean Plaza and Gulliver would receive the greatest number of visitors, as they are located within 500 meters of at least one metro line, while Terminal, situated over 9km from the nearest metro station, might have a smaller visitor flow.

Map 3 shows the daily ridership of each metro station in Kiev in thousands. The size of the station shown on the map corresponds to the number of passengers it receives daily.  

---

added the locations of Gulliver and Ocean Plaza to the map. Terminal was not added as it is too far from the nearest metro station (Lisova). It can be noted that Gulliver is located near a station that receives approximately 47,000 passengers daily (Plats Sportu/Ploscha L’va Tolstoho), while Ocean Plaza’s station, Lybids’ka, receives about 29,000 – over 38% less than Gulliver. Without further data collection, it could be assumed that Gulliver would see a larger flow of visitors, as it is located near a busier metro station than Ocean Plaza.

**Time and Means of Transport of Visitors**

In order to get more in-depth information about how far people travelled to a certain mall, without explicitly asking about their home address, I surveyed 40 people in each of the malls asking them what means of transport they used to get there and how long it took them.

**Terminal**

![Graph 1: Means of transport used by visitors* of Terminal mall](image)

*based on a survey of 40 visitors

- 65% Bus
- 23% Car
- 12% By foot
As seen on Graph 1, nearly two-thirds of Terminal’s visitors travelled to the mall by car, while 23% got there by foot and only 12% commuted on a bus. This would suggest that Terminal’s position near a major road is convenient for people with cars. Also, the fact that it is situated near a residential area (see Figure 6) could explain why more people travelled to the mall by foot than by buses. Graph 2 suggests that the visitors mostly traveled from nearby places, as the majority of the surveyed people spent only between 1 and 10 minutes commuting to the mall.
Figure 6 – Showing residential areas near Terminal’s parking lot

Gulliver

Graph 3: Means of transport of visitors of Gulliver mall*
*based on a survey of 40 visitors

- 23% by bus
- 47% by car
- 20% by foot
- 10% by metro

Mikolajczak, G. (2014) Terminal parking and residential areas
As seen on Graph 3, the most popular mode of transport to the Gulliver mall was the metro, which could be explained by the fact that there are two metro lines that reach the mall, making it a convenient way of transport to the mall. Also, as seen on Graph 4, the two highest frequencies of time taken to commute to the mall were 1-5 minutes and 11-15 minutes, and there was only 1 person who travelled for more than 30 minutes, suggesting that people did not travel from very far to reach Gulliver, in turn suggesting that the mall does not have a large sphere of influence.
Although the means of communication are more balanced in Ocean Plaza compared to the other malls, the dominant mode of transport were cars, which could be explained by the large number of parking spots that Ocean Plaza offers. Also, the time spent travelling to the mall is similarly more balanced compared to the other malls and there is a higher frequency of visitors who travelled more than 25 minutes to get to the mall, suggesting that its sphere of influence is larger than the two other malls'.
# Data Collection – Sphere of Influence/Popularity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mall</th>
<th>Date of data collection</th>
<th>Number of visitors in 30 min (main entrance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td>Day 1: Sunday, May 25th, 2014</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day 2: Saturday, May 31st, 2014</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day 3: Sunday, June 9th, 2014</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>457.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Plaza</td>
<td>Day 1: Sunday, June 1st, 2014</td>
<td>1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day 2: Saturday, June 8th, 2014</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day 3: Sunday, June 15th, 2014</td>
<td>1210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>1067.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulliver</td>
<td>Day 1: Sunday, July 20th, 2014</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day 2: Saturday, July 26th, 2014</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day 3: Sunday, July 27th, 2014</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>360</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph 7: Comparison of the number of visitors in three malls on three different days over 30 minutes](image)
As seen on Graph 7, Ocean Plaza had the highest number of visitors over 30 minutes on all three days. The same can be said about the constantly lowest visitor numbers at Gulliver and the constant medium numbers at Terminal. This suggests that the obtained results did not happen by chance and similar data would probably be obtained if the investigation were to be carried out again.

**Data Analysis**

![Graph 8: Relationship between the average number of visitors and accessibility of malls in Kiev](image)

As seen on Graph 8, Ocean Plaza, scoring highest on the accessibility scale also had the largest amount of visitors (average of 1068), while the malls that scored less on the accessibility scale in turn received fewer visitors. Accessibility could be correlated to size, meaning that larger malls could cater for more people and therefore have a high popularity. Ocean Plaza has high accessibility and high popularity and is roughly the same size as Terminal. However, it scored higher than Terminal on the accessibility scale, which may suggest that the popularity of a mall may be influenced by accessibility, which supports my initial hypothesis. However, the hypothesis falls short when comparing just the two malls.
with worse access—Terminal and Gulliver. Although both malls scored the same number of points (7) on the accessibility scale Gulliver had significantly fewer visitors than Terminal (and average of 360 as opposed to 478). This is a surprising result, as Terminal is situated on the left side of the river, while Gulliver is located in the center of the city, therefore is technically more accessible to a large portion of the population. Also, while there are no metro lines that reach Terminal, there are two that reach Gulliver. This is a very significant factor because, as mentioned earlier, the metro is the most popular mean of transport in Kiev. However, it cannot be assumed that accessibility and distance from the Central Business Districts are the only factors that affect the popularity of mall. The results that were obtained could have been caused by several different factors.

Firstly, due to the fact that Gulliver is located within the Central Business District, parking spaces are limited, which may be inconvenient for many citizens who travel by car, resulting in lower numbers of visitors than in Ocean Plaza or Terminal. Also, the number of cars in Kiev rose over 600% in 30 years, reaching 1.5million in 2007\(^2\). The Central Business District, where Gulliver is located, is the most congested area of the city, which may potentially repel people from coming to shop at this mall. Also, as mentioned earlier, the size of the mall can influence its number of visitors – the larger the mall the more people it can cater for. Seeing as Terminal is larger than Gulliver it could be possible that it is one of the reasons for the difference in the number of visitors.

Secondly, the reason why Terminal may be a more popular than Gulliver is that it has less competition in the nearby area. It is located in the Desnjans’kyi district on the left bank, far away from the city center, with fewer services available to the citizens. This means that a larger number of people are “limited” to the services and entertainment offered by Terminal,

than those living in Pechers’kyi district that have a larger amount of options to choose from.

Furthermore, according to Christaller’s Theory\textsuperscript{22}, people usually travel the smallest distances possible, to reach a particular service. Assuming that this theory is true, it could provide another explanation as to why Terminal would receive more visitors. There are approximately 364,000 people living in this district, as opposed to 146,800 people living in the Pechers’kyi district\textsuperscript{23} where Gulliver and Ocean Plaza are located, meaning that a larger population would be attracted to that particular mall, rather than travelling further for the same services. Aside from high order goods and services such as clothing and entertainment, Terminal offers low order goods such as food products\textsuperscript{24}. Abiding this theory, people will not travel far to get low order goods, therefore the larger population of the Desnjans’kyi district will choose the closest mall get these products. Terminal, located on the edge of the city, may also attract people from suburbs and nearby towns to get high order goods, such as clothing and electronics.

We could make the assumption that if Ocean Plaza had not been built, Terminal would receive more visitors, as it would provide a lot of entertainment that Gulliver does not, such as a karting center, an ice rink and a fitness center. Such entertainment services require large spaces, usually unavailable in the city center, which would explain why Terminal is situated on the outskirts of the city. These services can be considered high order goods which people are willing to travel further distances for. This could further lead us to believe that if


Terminal had better accessibility, it would draw even more visitors, as it provides some services that the conveniently-located Ocean Plaza does not, such as an ice rink.

Another aspect, which could potentially explain why Terminal received more visitors than Gulliver, is Gulliver's interior. The mall has 8 floors occupied by various shops and services, with the bottom floor containing the most prestigious and expensive stores. This may intimidate and repel some lower-class citizens, before they have the chance to explore the rest of the mall.

**Evaluation**

After the analysis of the obtained results, it is important to note that this observation has its weaknesses, which may have contributed to inaccurate results. Firstly, the observation considered only three different malls in Kiev. If more malls were studied, the analysis would most probably give a more accurate and in-depth answer to the research question, as it would provide more evidence to support or oppose the hypothesis.

Furthermore, it should be noted that data was collected only at the main entrance of each mall, therefore did not include the underground parking lot entrances in Ocean Plaza or Gulliver (there is no underground parking in Terminal). This could mean that the number of visitors in Ocean Plaza would have been a lot higher, as it was observed that the parking lots were almost completely filled up each day that data was collected. This cannot be said for Gulliver, as very few cars were parked in the underground parking lot on each day of data collection. This would suggest that if the number of visitors entering from the parking lot was also counted, the result would increase insignificantly.

Furthermore, the flow of visitors was only counted for half an hour each time. This could have resulted in inaccurate representations of the mall's actual number of visitors. To limit this error, data could be collected for longer periods of time and several times per day.
Additionally, the method could have been further improved by selecting malls that are similar in size, to limit the potential difference in visitor numbers due to the mall’s capacity. Although Ocean Plaza and Terminal are approximately the same size, Gulliver is significantly smaller. Due to this fact it is hard to establish the real extent of a mall’s relationship between accessibility and sphere of influence.

Lastly, the composite scale I came up with for the purpose of evaluating the accessibility of each mall is completely subject to my own perception of the importance of the factors that were included. If someone else did this investigation, the indicators could consider different factors of accessibility or awarded a different amount of points for each of them, resulting in a different assessment of the overall accessibility of the mall.

On the other hand, the method had its strengths as well. Firstly, the three malls all offer similar services and entertainment, which would be mean that people visit the three malls for similar purposes, allowing analysis of the relationship between accessibility and sphere of influence.

Secondly, the data of visitor numbers was collected at the same time and one Saturday and two Sundays for each mall. This limited the variation between the flow of visitors on other, perhaps less or more busy days of the week, as all malls were investigated on the weekends.

Thirdly, the assessment of the accessibility was done using a composite indicator. This allowed for a better-rounded evaluation as opposed to using a single indicator to assess the accessibility.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it may be said that accessibility of a mall may affect its sphere of influence, as seen by the example of Ocean Plaza, but this does not necessarily have to be
true in all cases, as suggested by the results of Terminal and Gulliver. As seen in the case of Ocean Plaza, its high accessibility correlated with its high visitor numbers. However, as seen in the case of Gulliver, medium accessibility did not necessarily affect its sphere of influence as much as perhaps its size or offered services had, as it received less visitors than Terminal, which has the same accessibility level. Therefore it should be recognized that the sphere of influence of malls is affected by accessibility to a certain extent, as it may also be influenced by a variety of other factors including size, location and offered goods.
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