12th Annual Conference of the International Association for the History of Transport, Traffic and Mobility (T²M), Philadelphia, September 18-21, 2014.

Bus Stop, Platform, Departure Gate: A comparative assessment of transport environments concerning the interrelations of speed and waiting.

Panel: The Dialectics of Speed: Fastness, Slowness, Waiting

Robin Kellermann
Technical University Berlin

Abstract

Waiting in transport has often been discarded as a banal and detested niche of passengers' time perception, moreover, as the "neglected Achilles heel of modernity" (Bissell 2007, 277). However, focusing on waiting in mobility reveals a hidden face of transport and unveils a most significant aspect of modern transportation experiences in which speed and waiting are closely interrelated.
This paper aims to examine these interrelations of speed and waiting by an investigation of its spatial and material interchanges. Tracing the 'temporal region' of waiting to the most prominent touch points of fastness and slowness, a comparative phenomenological inspection of three different waiting environments (bus stop, train platform and airport departure gate) shall provide three suggestions regarding the relational dimension of speed and waiting. The paper finally concludes with some general thoughts on how the future of waiting could look like if it was acknowledged and accommodated as an integral "twin" of mobility (Hanson 2010: 6). Rather than its avoidance, a constructive appraisal of waiting might become a principle of a "post-rush mobility" paradigm, which recognizes waiting as an integral and yet activating part of mobility.

I. Introduction: The significance of waiting in mobilities

Mobility, speed and acceleration are, for good reasons, considered most substantial parameters for describing the evolution of modern societies (Lash and Urry, 1994; Borscheid, 2004; Rosa, 2005). From the early 19th century, mass mobility and accelerated transportation most prominently represented the modern devotion to revolutionize and overcome – socially and physically – the restraining space-time trajectories of previous centuries. However, despite a two-hundred-year journey of radically changing physical velocities and socio-economic temporalities (Virilio, 1977; Elias, 1984; Conrad, 1999), the experience of *waiting* as temporal stasis seems to have remained a sheer inevitable constant and a fundamental reality of any modern transport practice. However, regardless of its ubiquity and relevance for everyday passengers' experiences, waiting remains "a temporal region hardly mapped and badly documented" (Schweizer 2008, 1). Rather than conceptualizing waiting as an inherent and interrelated element of mobility beyond traditional perceptions as simply "a dead period of stasis or stilling" (Bissell 2007, 277), most examinations aim to find ways to mitigate or eliminate this elusive and yet highly relevant phenomenon (Vozyanov, 2014). Thus, regardless of its fundamental relevance for transport's explicit time-sensitivity, waiting seems to have been treated as a stepchild or even "the neglected Achilles heel of modernity" (Bissell 2007, 277), and amazingly we know very little about its natures, interrelations and historical negotiations (Vozyanov, 2014). Social sciences as well as planning and transport studies – driven subtly by the societal order of productivism and (time) efficiency – have largely overlooked or discarded the phenomenon as a trivial and unproductive collateral damage or simply as a "disutility" (van Hagen 2011, 11). The only examinations we find about waiting arise from marketing, psychological and health studies. While the first intended to improve the service quality of (also transport-related)

waiting environments (Taylor, 1994; Baker and Cameron, 1996; Pruyn and Smidts, 1998; Sauter-Servaes and Rammler, 2002; van Hagen et al., 2009), psychological and health studies focused mostly on waiting patients in hospitals (Yates 1987; Thompson et al. 1996). Philosophical works have also devoted significant efforts to engaging with the complex phenomenon of waiting (Gasparini, 1995; Köhler, 2007; Schweizer, 2008). With very few exceptions, waiting has been investigated rather implicitly in empirical or quantitative analyses, such as – for instance – in the study of passengers' behaviors in public transport or phenomenological examinations of structures and formations of waiting in service situations (Mann, 1969; Larson, 1988; Maister, 1985; Moran, 2004; Fuller 2007). However, explicit historical treatments of waiting remain "extraordinarily rare" (Vozyanov 2014:71). Fortunately, since the mid-2000s we are witnessing a slightly advancing attention on the topic within the "new mobilities paradigm" (Sheller and Urry 2006; Urry 2007) that – inter alia – encourages an understanding of mobility as social and relational, thus including considerations of stationary immobility, stillness and waiting. As a result, this often overlooked mobility practice, has received wider attention, but it is still marginal compared to its relevance (Paris 2001; van Hagen 2011).

Altogether, the mainstream rationale of waiting still implies that "as speed is of essence, a wait is considered lost time" (van Hagen 2011, 5), thus we are still palpably lacking examinations of the social, spatial and technological implications of waiting in the mobility context. However, since modern mobility and transportation cannot be described sufficiently without taking into account the relation of fastness and slowness, or – more explicitly – the complex temporal region of waiting, this situation appears to be problematic. The primacy of the *mobile* "as the more desirable relation to the world" (Bissell 2007, 278) will not allow to understand the entire nature of mobility.

Against this background, this paper aims to investigate the practice of waiting at its most prominent material interchanges with the appearance of speed. Focusing on waiting in transport reveals not only a hidden and yet significant face of transport, but also the very core of time-space interrelations in which the traditionally favored concept of speed is integrated. By examining and comparing three different waiting environments of three different transport modes (bus stop, train platform, airport gate) with a phenomenological approach, this paper will come up with three theses on the interrelations of speed and waiting. The non-representative selection of waiting environments – concentrating on the wait *before* boarding a vehicle – shall illustrate how waiting is foremost materially and technologically 'embedded' and 'negotiated' in different transport modes. The observations culminate in an outlook of how waiting – understood as a problematic and yet integral part of modern mobility – might look like in the future.

II. Comparative assessment of waiting environments

The main rationale of the following chapter is to enlarge the perspective of waiting with the help of a comparative assessment of three contemporary waiting environments. Beyond traditional depreciations of waiting as a banal, boring and vain condition of human being, these sketchy comparisons of structure, materiality or use of technologies illustrate how the speed level affiliated to the respective transport mode shapes the waiting environment in terms of material, technological and social arrangements, and thus dramatically shapes the waiting experience. In this vein, waiting is not just a dead container but is produced by a complex relation of the anticipated speed and acceleration level.

The bus stop

Figure 1 - Inner city bus stop in Berlin, Source: Robin Kellermann

Structure, Appearance, Materiality

Inner city bus stops provide a roughly defined waiting area for an anticipated short-haul transportation. At least in most urban areas they include a small-sized, half-open and roofed waiting shelter, which however is almost fully exposed to current weather conditions and the surrounding urban environment. Mostly such bus shelters offer very limited seating facilities on plastic or metal seat shells, arranged in a row of 3-6 seats. Their appearance is of a simple, pragmatic, functional and sometimes improvised kind. They are designed as short-term halt containers that provide only a very limited set of infrastructures. At bus stops, the traffic flows are bi-directional, as departing and arriving passengers share the same space. The main (intended) waiting mode is standing. Regarding materiality, bus stops and shelters provide a low range of “hard” materials, mainly metal and glass elements.

Use of technologies

Bus stops and shelters comprise a relatively low use of technologies. Timetables, stop signs and the shelter itself are low-tech facilities assembled in an already existing streetscape. In recent years the low-tech appearance has however been enhanced by more advanced technologies (notably ICT) such as digital live traffic information systems or modifiable advertisement boards. As contemporary bus shelters developed to advertisement boards, they sometimes comprise a non-transparent sidewall in the direction of driving and a transparent sidewall on the opposite side in order to see the bus approaching. In contrast to similar structures, bus stops do not feature signals or announcements.

Duration of the wait

The material and technological configuration of bus stops determine them as spaces for a short-term wait of approximately 5-10 min in average.

Social representation

Bus stops and shelters do not comprise facilities devoted to perform socially distinguishing modes of waiting (e.g. waiting in lounges or at priority lanes). Based on their material and technological constitution, they facilitate ‘equalizing’ rather than socially distinctive modes of waiting.

The train platform

Figure 2 – Platform in München-Pasing, Source: Robin Kellermann

Structure, Appearance, Materiality

Train platforms provide a clearly defined large-scale waiting area for transportation to local, regional or international destinations. As raised structures between rail tracks, they are enormous in length but narrow in breadth, thus reflecting the shape and directionality of the train itself. In their center, platforms are at least partly roofed, but due to their half-open structure, they are however exposed to weather conditions. As bus stops, most platforms provide only a very limited amount of seating facilities, which, compared to a train's actual capacity, indicate that standing may be the main (intended or requested) waiting mode. Their appearance is of technical, artificial and yet strongly organized character. Compared to bus stops, the isolation of platforms from the surrounding environment lets the waiting passenger already find himself within a technological system rather than within the urban fabric. Analogue to bus stops, traffic flows at platforms are bi-directional, as departing and arriving passengers share the same space. Regarding materiality, platforms provide a low range of "hard" materials used, mainly flagstone, metal and glass elements.

Use of technologies

Platforms reflect an advanced use of technologies; moreover, they are a technological artefact itself. Clocks, (digital) displays, announcements, guidelines on the ground, CCTV, drainage, vending machines, illumination and live traffic information systems as well as the adjacent rail-related infrastructure of signals, tracks and overhead contact lines frame the experience of waiting as within a rail-specific "machine ensemble" (Schivelbusch, 1987).

Duration of the wait

The material and technological configuration of train platforms determine them as spaces for short-term and medium-term wait of typically about 5-15 minutes.

Social representation

In contrast to the train station's interior, platforms do not comprise facilities devoted to perform socially distinguished modes of waiting (e.g. in lounges or priority zones). Due to an 'equalizing' material and technological configuration, they do not aim to facilitate distinguishing social representations.

The Airport Gate

Figure 3 – Departure gate at San Diego Airport, Source: pgal.com

Structure, Appearance, Materiality

Departure gates provide a clearly defined mid-scale waiting area before boarding an airplane with long-haul destinations of far more than 1.000 km on average (CAA, 2011). Apart from the airport's main flows and connecting corridors, gates are enclosed structures within the self-contained airport building, which is independent from external weather conditions. Though gates, like platforms and bus stops, may of course vary in design and interior, most of them intend to provide the appearance of a lounge, a lobby or even a living room, including a suggestion of comfortable privacy and classiness. Moreover, it is the only point in the airport where the passenger clearly comes to a halt and may receive visual reference to the actual means of transport. In this sense, airplanes might be considered departure gate extensions. Compared to the rest of the airport, departure gates are relatively quiet, less artificial and less transitory. Regarding materiality, the use of "soft" materials such as carpets, padded or leather seats and their combination with "hard" materials such as glass, metal or plastics, is in sharp contrast to bus stops or train platforms. Gates provide a multitude of seating facilities, which indicate that sitting is the main (intended or requested) waiting mode. Also in contrast to waiting areas of other means of transport, passenger flows are one-directional, as these places are used exclusively when waiting *for* departure.

Use of technologies

Departure gates reflect a sophisticated use of technologies. Waiting in airports is embedded in (or enabled by) a high-tech structure with an omnipresence of screens, computer-supported check-in counters, signs, digital clocks, air-conditioning, power-outlets, charging points, CCTV, illumination, vending machines and a distinguished application of vocal announcements. Additionally, aircraft-related infrastructures such as boarding bridges or tanker trucks appear - though outside the waiting area - in sight of the waiting passenger, resembling the notion of being inside a "machine ensemble".

Duration of the wait

The material and technological configuration of departure gates determine them as spaces for medium and long-term wait of about 30-60 minutes.

Social representation

Departure gates strongly promote social distinction in form of how passengers are waiting. Priority lines or 'speedy-boarding' zones perform special treatments of certain passenger groups, affecting the wait and depicting waiting at airports as a means of social distinction.

Table 1 - Comparative assessment of three waiting environments

	BUS STOP	TRAIN PLATFORM	AIRPORT DEPARTURE GATE
STRUCTURE, APPEARANCE & MATERIALITY	Small-scale roofed structure with shelter	Large-scaled raised structure above and in-between tracks, narrow strip, partly roofed	Mid-scale sub-structure apart from the airport's connecting corridors
	Half-open structure exposed to weather conditions	Half-open structure exposed to weather conditions	Enclosed within the airport building, autonomous of weather conditions
	Appearance of pragmatism and functionality	Appearance of artificial and technological functionalism with a "machine ensemble"	Appearance of a lobby or lounge, suggestion of privacy and less artificiality
	Use of few different "hard" materials (glass, plastic, metal)	Use of few of different "hard materials" (glass, plastic, metal)	Use of a multitude of "hard" and "soft" materials: carpets, leather seats etc.
	Very few seating facilities (3-6 seats) in row	Low amount of seating facilities	High amount of seating facilities
	Bi-directional flows (boarding and de-boarding share same space)	Bi-directional flows (boarding and de-boarding share same space)	One-directional flows (only boarding for departure)
USE OF TECHNOLOGIES	Low use of technologies: time table, digital live traffic information, no announcements	Medium use of technologies: Clocks, displays, announcements, vending machines, illumination	High use of technologies: Omnipresence of screens, signs, digital clocks and vocal announcements, air-conditioning, WLAN, illumination, counters
APPROXIMATE DURATION OF THE WAIT	Short (5-10min)	Short to medium wait (5 - 15min)	Long to very long → 2h rule for international flights
SOCIAL REPRESENTATION	Not facilitated	Not facilitated	Facilitated by priority lines/ areas, 'speedy-boarding' counters etc.
MAIN WAITING MODE	Standing	Standing	Sitting

III. Observations and correlations

The selective (and certainly incomplete) phenomenological comparisons of three different waiting environments might appear self-evident, but they reveal important observations of how the elusive phenomenon of waiting before boarding is contemporarily integrated and handled in different transport systems. Moreover, these comparative observations may allow inductive and more theoretical assumptions regarding the question of how speed and waiting – considered a negative spillover of any transportation – are interrelated.

The main principle of the fastness-stasis interrelation to be highlighted in this paper is that speed is a huge organizational problem. Against this background, the level of speed performed by the affiliated transport system impacts pre-boarding waiting environments in terms of its material and technological configurations, and thus dramatically affects the waiting experience. Following this principle, waiting needs to be considered far more than just a collateral damage of transport, but as a unique *formation* caused by the anticipated acceleration level following the wait. As different levels of speed demand different levels of control and prearrangements, the anticipated speed of the transport system is the decisive factor for shaping modus, environment and experience of the waiting passenger. More precisely, based on the above comparative assessments, the level of speed shapes the experience of waiting in the following three proportions:

1. *Level of waiting time duration*

Firstly, the speed level of each transport system correlates with the duration of the waiting time. Evidently, waiting for a bus makes up just for a little fraction of waiting for boarding an airplane. While the slowness of busses and trains obviously creates spaces for a rather short-term wait of approximately 5-15 minutes on average, the relative fastness of airplanes – and the affiliated need for increased pre-process arrangements – generates much longer waiting times. In short, speed is admired but rising speeds bear a rising organizational and time-consuming problems. In this sense, differing speed levels demand different levels of *pre-conditioning* the waiting passenger in terms of intermediate (control) steps, guidance, and technological organization. In other words, the faster the passenger is physically moved, the more he has to wait to actually get there, which brings to mind Paul Virilio's notion of "dromological laws" according to which increases in speed increase the potential of gridlocks (Virilio, 1977). On the other way around, the duration of waiting times can thus be considered an indicator and analytical subject for the organizational complexities of each transport mode. However, this opens up the paradox that only if the wait is relatively long, the waiting environment appears to be well equipped and comfortable.

2. *Level of formality and informality of the wait*

Secondly, the speed level of the respective means of transport influences the level of formalization of the wait. When e.g. comparing bus stops with airports (as the two most opposed related speed levels), waiting passengers at usual bus stops face a rather limited set of conventions. In the absence of a multitude of waiting facilities, they are, on the one hand, more or less 'left alone', but therefore

rather free to move or to position themselves. Besides just finding a roughly defined waiting area, which often overlaps with other areas and becomes indistinct within the surrounding urban fabric, passengers do not find many restricting facilities that might discipline or control them to stop, stay or to come to a halt. As a result, compared to a departure gate in an airport, waiting at a bus stop appears to be by far more *informal*. In contrast, waiting at a departure gate of an airport appears to be rather formalized by a multitude of waiting facilities such as a plurality of seats, couches, screens to look at or announcements that remind passengers to do (or to undo) certain activities. As Robert Harley argues, beyond their comfortable function, such facilities could also be considered to be pushed to wait and to be still: "Everywhere in Junkspace [Rem Koolhaas' notion of an airport's spatial character] there are seating arrangements, ranges of modular chairs, even couches, as if the experience Junkspace offers its consumers is significantly more exhausting than previous spatial sensations" (Harley 2011, 40). Gillian Fuller even considers the functional significance of temporal stillness as a precondition to organize globalized mobility: "From the packaging of clothes in fixed containers to strapping your belt – tight and low – stillness and all its requisite activities, technologies and behaviours are fundamental to the 'flow' architectures that organize the motion of the globalizing multitudes of today" (Fuller 2008, 63). In this respect, departure gates implicitly *discipline* the waiting passenger to stop and rest, while ironically he soon is supposed to be accelerated to high-speed. Thus, waiting areas in airports – due to the affiliated speed level of airplanes – appear as formalized conditional spaces of control, while waiting areas at bus stops appear rather unconventional, low-controlled spaces of relatively self-organized and liminal character. This speed-related difference also applies to the potential of performing different social representations through waiting. While bus stops or train platforms do not facilitate different representational waiting spaces due to their rather 'equalizing' material and technological configurations, departure gates promote social distinction in form of priority lines or 'speedy-boarding', which affects the wait and – with rising speed level – depicts waiting as a means of social distinction.

3. Level of information density and use of technologies

A third dimension in which the affiliated speed level of the transport system becomes a pivotal factor for shaping waiting environment and experience appears in the level of information density and the use of technologies. Based on the above brief phenomenological assessments, it becomes obvious that the higher the speed of the transport system, the more the waiting passenger receives assistance (and orders) through information systems and technological offers. As the average bus stop supports the waiting passenger only with a low-tech shelter and a timetable, train platforms and departure gates provide technologies that are by far more advanced. Train platforms comprise a multitude of technologies ranging from digital clock displays, vocal announcements or warning signs to vending and ticket machines. Airport departure gates provide an even more sophisticated technological asset, including air-conditioning, CCTV, provision of charging points for electronic devices or wireless local area network (WLAN). Culminating in the concept of "Delaytainment", which aims to relieve the problem of delayed flights with the help of entertainment and additional services at airports in the aftermath of 9/11 (Sauter-Servaes & Rammler, 2002), the disparities of different modal waiting experiences from the perspective of its technological embedding become evident. In short, the increased speed of trains and airplanes (compared to busses), again, demands for different technological organization and thus different information densities. In this sense, faster transport modes demand a more *moderated waiting*, while slower transport modes reflect for less assistance through information and technology offers. However, currently there may be assimilation tendencies throughout the three modes regarding the implementation of live traffic information systems, which definitely affects the level of formalization of the wait, but generally speaking, waiting for a bus is

apparently far less 'moderated' and technologically accompanied than with faster means of transport. While e.g. waiting for delayed trains or airplanes is subject to vocal announcements and regular timetable updates, waiting for a delayed bus in most cases may receive almost no 'moderation' but individual self-organization as well as a cognitive exercise. Said so, it is not only the level of speed but also the transport means' technological sophistication that prompts and induces different 'waiting trajectories'.

IV. Outlook – The future of waiting?

Waiting in transport is a fact. Despite ongoing efforts to eliminate waiting, it will most likely remain an immanent and unavoidable constituent of any movement and transportation; moreover, "mobility's twin" (Hanson 2010, 6). Consequently, waiting must be considered a fundamental condition of modernity, just as speed or *tempo*. However, what might the future of waiting in transport look like? The following two scenarios shall highlight possible trajectories of how waiting in transport might negotiated and aim to spark a discussion about this elusive and yet significant temporal region.

In war with waiting: the great 'tec fix'

Against the background of increasing globalization, international integration and urbanization, the world will face ever-growing volumes in global, regional and local transportation. As a result, time spent waiting *in* and waiting *for* transportation considerably increases. Therefore, the concept of high-speed is more strongly in demand than in previous years. As proved historically, higher speeds dramatically increase the organizational and technological requirements, and thus, again, increase waiting times to new extremes. As a reply to face these constraints, transport operators and policy makers declare a 'war against waiting'. Huge efforts are made to 'fight' increased waiting times at airports and stations through application of high-tech measures. Therefore, massive use of ICT is combined with psychological 'coping strategies' to allow passengers to better manage their time spent in context of transportation. 'Innovation through total avoidance of waiting' is the powerful and yet illusionary mantra of both policy makers and the transport industry. Though to some extent successful, these massive engagements finally result in a drastically increased time-sensitivity among waiting passengers, which let them feel a wait of five minutes as a wait of thirty minutes ten years ago. Thus, even the reduction of waiting time stills feels as problematic as it used to be. However, the high spending for avoiding waiting against the background of an excessive societal logic of time efficiency result in a more polarized transport world of those who can achieve to pay to wait less and those who are strongly exposed to it. Finally, the idea to eliminate waiting – as an immanent condition of modernity – by extensive technological fixes will increase unrest and finally will lead to changing mobility behaviors towards a more pragmatic concept of mobility and time-use.

"Post-rush-mobility": Constructive appraisal of waiting and renunciation of the high-speed concept

When extrapolating the above findings, one could assume that on the one hand, in the future we might move faster due to technological progress, but, keeping in mind the higher organizational constraints, this might come at the expense of increased waiting times before being transported. In this vein, we might experience a further approximation of waiting time and travel time for short-haul destinations, which could result in a diminishing marginal utility of speed. The traditional 'speed-promise' of safeguarding travel time savings with the help of higher velocities might erode against

the necessity to wait ever longer. Even if more efficient uses of technology and passenger behaviors have reduced waiting times, geopolitical events like 9/11 have regularly been experienced as key moments for a restitution and manifestation of waiting. As more of such 'rebound events' might appear in the future, altogether the perceptions of illusionary high-speed mobility might become more pragmatic in nature and finally less attractive. The negative implications of increased waiting times might force an ultimate renunciation of the long-admired high-speed approach and a conceptual shift beyond traditional speed-obsessed transport paradigms. Instead, we might experience the triumph of slower modes of transport that take longer, but are more reliable, cheaper, eco-friendly, and, as shown above, include less waiting prior to be moved. In this respect, the renaissance of trams and bicycles might illustrate that these developments have already started. Rather than avoiding waiting, its constructive appraisal might become a principle on how to negotiate the dialectics of speed in the 21st century. Among new perceptions about the use of time in transport, waiting will not be considered any longer a dead period, but bears a new quality of productive relaxation. As a result, the unavoidable fact of waiting in transport will generate a 'harmonic tension' and induces the need for developing innovative waiting environments that better accommodate and accept waiting as an integral and yet activating part of mobility rather than discarding or overlooking it. Consequently, newly designed waiting spaces could reflect an improved acknowledgement of the waiting passenger among transport planners and policy makers, forming the sense of the 21st century paradigm of "post-rush-mobility".

V. Conclusion

Waiting in the transport context has often been discarded as a banal and ignorable niche of passengers' time perception, moreover, as a stepchild of modernity. However, as presented in this paper, waiting needs to be considered far more than just a collateral damage or an unbeloved spinoff of mobility, but as a unique *formation* caused by the anticipated acceleration level following the wait. As different levels of speed demand different levels of control and prearrangements, the anticipated speed of the transport system is the decisive factor for shaping modus, environment and experience of the waiting passenger. Therefore, this paper presented suggestions focusing the relational dimension of speed and waiting with the help of a brief comparative examination of three different waiting environments (bus stop, train platform and airport departure gate) from a phenomenological perspective. As a major observation from these assessments, it is the speed level and the technological sophistication of the affiliated transport means that prompts and induces very different waiting landscapes and thus profiles the experience of waiting in the following three proportions. Firstly, rising speed levels nurture longer waiting times in the sense of increasing needs for *pre-conditioning* the waiting passenger in intermediate (control) steps, guidance, and technological organization. Secondly, rising speed levels increase the formalization of the wait in terms of further disciplining the waiting passenger in a set of 'moorings' (Urry, 2007), such as seat shells, couches, screens or dedicated zones. Thirdly, rising speed levels become a pivotal factor for shaping the use of technologies to be found in waiting spaces. The faster the transport mode is supposed to physically move the waiting passenger, the more technological assistance he receives through information systems and supplementary technological offers prior to his journey. In this sense, faster transport modes seem to demand a more *moderated waiting*, while slower transport modes reflect for less assistance through information and technology offers.

Waiting for buses, trains or airplanes inclose a clear analogy of space and time constraints. Since the passenger faces a strictly determined place of departure at a determined time, he is forced to deal within these limitations. However, despite this overarching analogy, the physical form and

arrangement of waiting areas strongly differ. Indeed, different transport systems entail different passenger capacities and thus cause the need for different organizations of waiting spaces. However, questions regarding these different technological or spatial waiting trajectories cannot be answered with the transport means' different capacities, clientele or fares alone. From a more general point of view, rising speed levels commensurate with rising organizational problems, which – illustrated best by a comparison of bus stops and airport departure gates – finally impose very different needs to "host" the waiting passenger. In a sum, the speed level of the bus or the airplane becomes the organizational reference shaping the wait and induces a range of different 'waiting trajectories'. Regarding the *dialectic* of speed and waiting, this raises interesting questions about how the waiting mode might influence the experience of speed or if waiting is just rather downstream of speed.

Focusing on waiting in mobility reveals a hidden face of transport and unveils a blind spot of mobility studies. A better understanding of this unpopular and yet elusive phenomenon might contribute to the debate about a conceptual shift beyond traditional speed-obsessed transport paradigms. As waiting in transport is a merely unavoidable fact, this paper finally presented two scenarios of how the future of waiting might look like, drawing possible paths from eliminating waiting through illusionary technological fixes to accommodating waiting as a constructive appraisal and the base for a "post-rush mobility" of the 21st century.

References

Baker, J., and Cameron, M. (1996). "The effects of the service environment on affect and consumer perception of waiting time: An integrative review and research propositions", in *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 24(4), 338-349.

Bissell, D. (2007). "Animating Suspensation: Waiting for Mobilities", in *Mobilities* 2(2), 277-298.

Borscheid, P. (2004). *Das Tempo-Virus.* Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

CAA – UK Civil Aviation Authority (2011) http://www.caa.co.uk/docs/80/airline_data/2011Annual/Table_0_1_6_All_Services_2011.pdf (retrieved 13th August 2014).

Conrad, P. (1999). Modern Times and Modern Places. How Life and Art were Transformed in a Century of Revolution, Innovation, Radical Change. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Elias, N. (1984). Über die Zeit. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Fuller, G. (2007). "The queue project: informationalising bodies and bits", in Semiotic Review of Books, 16(3), 1-5.

Fuller, G. (2008). ">store>forward>:architectures of a future tense", in Aeromobilities: Theory and Method, S. Cwerner, S. Kesselring and J. Urry eds., London: Routledge, 63-75.

Gasparini, G. (1995). "On Waiting", in Time & Society, 4(1), 29-45.

Harley, R. (2011). "Airportals. The functional significance of stillness in the Junkspace of airports", in Stillness in a Mobile World, D. Bissell and G. Fuller eds., Milton Park: Routledge, 38-50.

Köhler, A. (2007). Lange Weile. Über das Warten. Leipzig. Insel.

Larson, C. (1988). "There is more to a line than it's Wait", in *Technology Review*, 91, 60-62.

Lash, S., and Urry, J. (1994). *Economies of Signs and Space.* London: Sage.

Maister, D. (1985). "The psychology of waiting lines", in *The Service Encounter* , J. A. Czepiel, M. R. Solomon, and F. Surprenant eds., Lexington: Lexington Books, 113-124.

Mann, L. (1969). "Queue Culture: The Waiting Line as a Social System", in *American Journal of Sociology*, 75(3), 340-354.

Moran, J. (2004). "November in Berlin: the End of the Everyday", in *History Workshop Journal*, 57, 216-234.

Paris, R. (2001). "Warten auf Amtsfluren", in *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 53(4), 705-733.

Pruyn, A., and Smidts, A. (1998). "Effects of waiting on the satisfaction with the service: Beyond objective time measures", in *International Journal of Research in Marketing,* 15(4), 321-334.

Rosa, H. (2005). *Beschleunigung: Die Veränderung der Zeitstrukturen in der Moderne.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Sauter-Servaes, T., and Rammler, S. (2002). *Delaytainment an Flughäfen: die Notwendigkeit eines Verspätungsservices und erste Gestaltungsideen,* Berlin: Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin.

Sheller, M., and Urry, J. (2006). "The new mobilities paradigm", in *Environment and Planning A,* 38(2), 207-226.

Schivelbusch, W. (1987). *The Railway Journey: The Industrialization of Time and Space in the 19th Century.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schweizer, H. (2008). *On Waiting.* London: Routledge.

Taylor, S. (1994). "Waiting for Service: The Relationship Between Delays and Evaluations of Service", in *Journal of Marketing* 58(2), 56-69.

Thompson, D. A., Yarnold, P. R., Williams, D. R., and Adams, S. L. (1996). "Effects of actual waiting time, perceived waiting time, information delivery, and expressive quality on patient satisfaction in the emergency department", in *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 28(6), 657-665.

Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

van Hagen, M. (2011). *Waiting experience at train stations.* Delft: Eburon.

van Hagen, M., Pruyn, A., Galetzka, M., and Kramer, J. (2009). *Waiting is becoming fun! The influence of advertaising and infotainment on the waiting experince*. Retrieved from http://imi.aau.dk/~09ml382/DVD/References/dutch_railways.pdf accessed April 15th, 2014.

Vozyanov, A. (2014). "Approaches to Waiting in Mobility Studies: Utilization, Conceptualization, Historicizing", in *Mobility in History*, 5, 64-73.

Virilio, P. (1977). *Vitesse et Politique. Essai de dromologie*, Paris: Galilée

Yates, J. (1987). *Why are we waiting? An analysis of hospital waiting lists.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.