

# **Modeling the intra-destination travel behavior of tourists**

Bartosz Bursa, MEng

Innsbruck, April 2020

Dissertation

eingereicht an der Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck, Fakultät für  
Technische Wissenschaften zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades

Doktor der Technischen Wissenschaften



First evaluator: Univ.-Prof. Dipl.-Ing. Dr. techn. Markus Mailer, University  
of Innsbruck, Department of Infrastructure, Unit of  
Intelligent Transport Systems

Second evaluator: Univ.-Prof. Dr.-Ing. Martin Fellendorf, Graz University of  
Technology, Institute of Highway Engineering and  
Transport Planning



Principal advisor: Univ.-Prof. Dipl.-Ing. Dr. techn. Markus Mailer, University  
of Innsbruck, Department of Infrastructure, Unit of  
Intelligent Transport Systems

Co-advisor: Prof. Dr.-Ing. Kay W. Axhausen, ETH Zurich, Institute for  
Transport Planning and Systems



# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is *Markus Mailer* who came up with the idea of looking specifically at the intra-destination movements of tourists. Seemingly uninteresting at the beginning, the topic turned out to be deeply intriguing, offering a great potential of underexplored research niches located at the crossroads of transportation, travel behavior, tourism, leisure and vacation studies. He has always had a good intuition and helped me avoid mistakes (though not all!) and blind alleys of the research. He also cared about optimal working conditions that allowed me to make constant progress during the course of the doctoral studies. I am very grateful for funding the participation in numerous conferences and subsidizing the courses on Discrete Choice at the EPFL in Lausanne and at the University of Leeds, which opened my eyes to where I am on the personal development axis and what still is to be done.

I truly appreciate *Kay Axhausen* allowing me to work with him and his team during my short stays at the IVT on ETH in Zürich. These visits were always extremely productive, resulted in huge progress in my work and the discussion we had were always an intellectual pleasure. It never ceases to amaze me how broad his knowledge is. He is *the Renaissance Man* in transportation. Chapeau bas! I am also thankful to Felix Becker who always offered advice to me, whenever I had doubts concerning modelling in R.

I am grateful to *Martin Fellendorf* for undertaking the role of the second evaluator. I hope we'll have more occasions to work together in the future.

Furthermore, I would like to thank my working colleagues in Innsbruck for friendly atmosphere over the last four years. Special thanks goes to *Stephan Tischler* for introducing me in the world of backcountry skiing and for these few tours that we made together. Hoping for more!

*Emma Komarek* receives my thanks for her laborious work on questionnaire digitalization and data cleaning.

The biggest appreciation deserves my beloved girlfriend *Patrycja* who suffered at least as much as I did and survived even more. She took the responsibility of the graphic design of the PAPI questionnaires and was always at hand with her creativity and excellent graphic design skills. She was a steadfast supporter in the tough time and a peaceful soul alleviating the unnecessary stress, rush and chaos I used to notoriously produce. Your dedication in the last months was worth one's weight in gold.

Me working on this thesis was surely not the only thing bothering my *mum* during the past four years. I would not have reached this level of education, had she not strived for better chances for me as a single parent many years ago. Thank you for that.

This endeavor is also for my *grandma*, who passed away last winter, for keeping her fingers crossed for me all her life.

It has been intensive time – hectic, exhausting and formidable but also challenging, stimulating and rewarding. The pandemics that swept over the world in the spring of 2020 right at the moment of finishing the thesis, the precariousness of working in the academia and the entire scientific world evolving uncontrollably in different directions did not make it easier either. Fortunately, living in Innsbruck compensates for these hardships with interest. I have never really expected that I could live in the Alps, even though, as someone who loves mountaineering, climbing, cycling, etc., it has always been running through my mind. I can still remember the moment I came across the job posting of the University in Innsbruck and the discussions we had at home before taking the bold decision to jump ship and leave London.

All in all, given that I embarked upon this scientific journey having only vague idea of how the academia works, being unaware of research methods and even having very mediocre knowledge about statistics, the sole fact that I reached the finish line, can be called a lifetime accomplishment.



# ABSTRACT

In the face of a continuous increase in tourism demand in the Alpine countries, the associated traffic volumes, and the resulting negative externalities as well as social and environmental costs, there is an urgent need to design policies capable of managing tourist traffic efficiently and to invest in transport systems and infrastructure wisely, given the limited financial, spatial and environmental resources. Unfortunately, while there is a considerable research interest in long-distance travel and arrival/departure patterns of tourists, research on tourist mobility during the stay at the destination is almost non-existent. This prevents policy-makers from making informed decisions backed by scientific evidence. The dissertation attempts to fill this research gap and shed an “analytical” light on travel patterns of tourists at the destinations.

In the first instance, the transportation and tourism literature is researched and synthesized in order to identify factors that might be potentially influential on tourist decisions. The overview of the state of research on the three elementary choice components in travel behavior, destination, mode and route choice, the theory of joint decisions and the impact of weather serves as a basis for the design of a multipart bespoke travel-activity survey. A field report from the survey conducted in 2018 and 2019 in three tourist regions in the Austrian province of Tyrol is provided.

Following the descriptive analysis of the survey data highlighting differences between the summer and winter seasons, the thesis employs econometric models of choice for the analysis of tourist transport mode decisions. Based on the trips and activities of the respondents, and supplemented by data from external sources, Multinomial and Nested Logit specifications are used to find the impactful factors and measure their effect size within the collected sample.

Next, the proposed choice models are used to calculate values of the indicators for policy measures. Elasticities with respect to changes in travel time and travel cost are estimated for all alternatives. Furthermore, the Value of Travel Time Savings (VTTS) of tourist visitors are calculated for travel by car and on transit. Both the elasticities and VTTS of tourists are compared to values of local residents reported in Austrian and international studies.

Finally, the thesis recapitulates the findings and discusses their implications for science, economy and policy. It summarizes the performance of the models developed and provides clear recommendations for their application, taking into account the limitations at all stages of the research. In addition, new gaps in science are identified and further tasks are formulated that could advance the research on tourist mobility beyond the scope of this thesis.



# KURZFASSUNG

Angesichts der ständig steigenden touristischen Nachfrage in den Alpenländern, des damit verbundenen Verkehrsaufkommens und der daraus resultierenden negativen Externalitäten sowie der sozialen und ökologischen Kosten ist es dringend notwendig, eine Verkehrspolitik zu entwerfen, die in der Lage ist, den Tourismusverkehr effizient zu steuern und in Anbetracht der begrenzten finanziellen, räumlichen und ökologischen Ressourcen umsichtig in die Verkehrssysteme und die Infrastruktur zu investieren. Während es ein deutliches Forschungsinteresse an Fernreisen und Ankunfts-/Abreisemustern von Touristen gibt, sind Forschungsarbeiten zur touristischen Mobilität während des Aufenthalts in der Urlaubsdestination leider so gut wie nicht vorhanden. Dies erschwert es den politischen Entscheidungsträgern, fundierte Entscheidungen zu treffen, die durch wissenschaftliche Erkenntnisse gestützt sind. Die vorliegende Dissertation versucht, diese Forschungslücke zu schließen und ein "analytisches" Licht auf das Reiseverhalten von Touristen am Reiseziel zu werfen.

Zunächst wird dazu der Stand des Wissens in der Verkehrs- und Tourismusliteratur recherchiert und zusammengefasst, um Faktoren zu identifizieren, die potenziell Einfluss auf Mobilitätsentscheidungen von Touristen haben könnten. Der Überblick über den Forschungsstand in den drei elementaren Wahlkomponenten im Reiseverhalten, der Ziel-, Verkehrsmittel- und Routenwahl sowie der Theorie der gemeinsamen Entscheidungen und den Auswirkungen des Wetters dient als Grundlage für die Gestaltung einer mehrteiligen, maßgeschneiderten Befragung zum Verkehrsverhalten. Weiteres wird über die durchgeführte Feldforschung basierend auf einer Umfrage, die in den Jahren 2018 und 2019 in drei Tourismusregionen im österreichischen Bundesland Tirol durchgeführt wurde, berichtet.

Nach der deskriptiven Auswertung der Befragungsdaten, die auch die Unterschiede zwischen Sommer- und Wintersaison hervorhebt, werden in der Dissertation ökonomische Wahlmodelle für die Analyse von Entscheidungen über die Verkehrsmittelwahl von Touristen eingesetzt. Anhand der Wege und Aktivitäten der Befragten, ergänzt durch Daten aus externen Quellen, werden mittels Multinomial- und Nested-Logit-Spezifikationen die Einflussfaktoren ermittelt und deren Effektgröße in der erhobenen Stichprobe geschätzt.

Darauf aufbauend werden die vorgeschlagenen Wahlmodelle zur Berechnung der Indikatorwerte für politische Maßnahmen verwendet. Dabei werden für alle Alternativen Elastizitäten auf Änderungen in der Reisezeit und den Reisekosten geschätzt. Darüber hinaus wird der Wert der Reisezeitersparnis (VTTS) von Touristen für Reisen mit dem Auto und mit dem öffentlichen Verkehr berechnet. Sowohl die

Elastizitäten als auch die VTTS von Touristen werden mit den in österreichischen und internationalen Studien berichteten Werten für die Mobilität der ansässigen Bevölkerung verglichen.

Abschließend fasst die Dissertation die Ergebnisse zusammen und diskutiert ihre Implikationen für Wissenschaft, Wirtschaft und Politik. Sie resümiert die Leistungen der entwickelten Modelle und gibt klare Empfehlungen für ihre Anwendung unter Berücksichtigung der Grenzen aller Forschungsphasen. Zudem werden Lücken in der Wissenschaft identifiziert und weitere Aufgaben formuliert, die die Forschung zur touristischen Mobilität über den Rahmen dieser Arbeit hinaus voranbringen können.

# CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	1
ABSTRACT .....	3
KURZFASSUNG .....	5
CONTENTS.....	7
LIST OF FIGURES .....	11
LIST OF TABLES.....	13
GLOSSARY .....	15
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>17</b>
1.1 Motivation .....	17
1.2 Research objective and research questions.....	18
1.3 Outline.....	18
<b>2 STATE OF RESEARCH ON TRAVEL BEHAVIOR OF TOURISTS .....</b>	<b>21</b>
2.1 Definitions.....	21
2.2 Data collection methods.....	22
2.3 Activity-based travel modeling.....	24
2.4 Discrete Choice Analysis.....	25
2.4.1 Random utility theory .....	26
2.4.2 Modeling approaches .....	26
2.4.3 Discrete choice and tourist travel in large-scale transportation models	27
2.5 Destination choice .....	28
2.5.1 Destination choice in daily travel .....	28
2.5.2 Destination choice on vacation .....	29
2.6 Mode choice .....	31
2.6.1 Mode choice in daily travel .....	31
2.6.2 Mode choice on vacation .....	33
2.7 Route choice .....	34
2.8 Impact of weather .....	35

2.9	Joint decisions .....	37
2.10	Theory of undirected travel .....	39
<b>3</b>	<b>THE SURVEY WORK.....</b>	<b>41</b>
3.1	Travel pattern of a tourist .....	41
3.2	Survey design.....	43
3.2.1	Survey location .....	43
3.2.2	Survey methods .....	45
3.3	Survey instrument .....	46
3.3.1	Personal questions.....	46
3.3.2	Sojourn-related questions .....	47
3.3.3	Activity diary .....	47
3.3.4	Joint travel .....	48
3.4	Survey participation and response burden .....	49
3.5	Complementary datasets .....	50
3.6	Imputation of missing values.....	51
3.7	Descriptive analysis.....	52
3.7.1	Exclusion of responses .....	52
3.7.2	Characteristics of the respondents .....	52
3.7.3	Mode choice of the respondents.....	61
3.7.4	Joint travel .....	66
3.7.5	Impact of weather.....	68
<b>4</b>	<b>THE MODELING WORK.....</b>	<b>71</b>
4.1	Data processing .....	71
4.1.1	Characteristics of the decision-makers and the sojourn .....	71
4.1.2	Attributes of alternatives .....	72
4.1.3	Individual choice set of available modes.....	75
4.1.4	Exclusion of observations.....	77
4.2	Model specification and estimation .....	77
4.3	Multinomial Logit models .....	78
4.3.1	Models with travel time and travel cost .....	80
4.3.2	Models with access, egress and in-vehicle travel time for transit .....	81
4.3.3	Models with service quality variables for transit .....	82
4.3.4	Models with interactions of travel time and cost with sociodemographic- and sojourn-related variables.....	84
4.3.5	Models with hotel-related variables .....	85
4.3.6	Models with company variables .....	86
4.3.7	Models with peak-time variables.....	87
4.3.8	Models with duration of the following activity.....	88
4.3.9	Models with trip purpose .....	89
4.3.10	Models with number of trips .....	90
4.3.11	Models with average duration of activities .....	91
4.3.12	Models with weather-related variables .....	92
4.3.13	Models with tourists' knowledge about arrival and mobility on-site ....	94

4.3.14	Models with sport frequency .....	95
4.3.15	Full models .....	96
4.4	Nested Logit models .....	102
4.5	Cross-Nested Logit models .....	105
4.6	Indicators for policy measures.....	107
4.6.1	Elasticity to changes in attributes of alternatives .....	107
4.6.2	Value of Travel Time Savings (VTTS).....	112
<b>5</b>	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>115</b>
5.1	Contribution and findings .....	115
5.2	Discussion and implications for science, economy and policy .....	117
5.3	Limitations .....	118
<b>6</b>	<b>OUTLOOK AND FUTURE WORK.....</b>	<b>121</b>
6.1	Detailed modes of transport .....	121
6.2	Model for joint trips, tours and household members' daily schedules.....	121
6.3	Model for joint choice of activity, destination and transport mode.....	122
6.4	Model for route choice.....	122
6.5	Model for tourists' budget and time consumption at the destination.....	123
6.6	Tourist self-selection.....	123
6.7	Integration with transport modeling software .....	123
	<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>125</b>
	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>127</b>
<b>A.</b>	<b>APPENDIX.....</b>	<b>147</b>
A.1	PAPI questionnaire .....	147
A.2	CAPI questionnaire .....	156