

# Does Price Matter? Price and Non-Price Competition in the Airline Industry

Philip G. Gayle\*  
Kansas State University

June 21, 2004

## Abstract

This paper studies passengers' choice behavior in air travel. Products are defined as a unique combination of airline and flight itinerary while markets are defined as a directional round-trip air travel between an origin and a destination city. A structural econometric model is used to investigate the relative importance of price (airfare) and non-price product characteristics in explaining passengers' choice of these differentiated products. The results suggest that, on average, prices may not be as important as we think in explaining passengers' choice behavior among alternative products. Non-price characteristics, which may include convenience of flight schedules, frequent flyer programs, the quality of in-flight service, among other things, seem to be much more important in explaining passengers' choice behavior. As such, the results have implications for the focus of antitrust policies in the airline industry when assessing the impact of mergers, alliances, or other business decisions of airlines.

*JEL Classification:* L13, L93, C1, C2

*Keywords:* Discrete Choice, Mixed Logit, Airlines, Hub and Spoke Network, Frequent Flyer Programs

**Acknowledgement:** I thank Dennis Weisman, Thitima Puttitanun, Yongmin Chen, and participants at the 2004 North American Summer Meeting of the Econometric Society, for their invaluable comments. I also benefited from very helpful discussions with Sofia Villas-Boas.

---

\*Department of Economics, 327 Waters Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS, 66506, (785) 532-4581, Fax:(785) 532-6919, email: gaylep@ksu.edu.

# 1 Introduction.

Probably two of the most important developments in the U.S. airline industry following deregulation in 1978, were the airlines' move to hub-and-spoke networks and their increased sophistication in pricing and marketing their products [Borenstien(2004)]. The hub-and-spoke network has the effect of increasing the dominance of a few airlines in markets where these airlines have hubs in big cities [see Borenstein (1992)]. A hub network allows airlines to offer change-of-plane service between airports for which the hub is a convenient intermediate stop. As such, strategically establishing hubs in various cities constitutes one aspect of non-price competition that exists between airlines. Sophistication in marketing practices such as frequent flyer programs and travel agent commission override programs<sup>1</sup> are other examples of non-price aspects of competition that serves to increase an airline's dominance.

Despite the numerous non-price aspects of competition among airlines, the focus of policy makers is often on the potential price effects that various business decisions of airlines may have. Examples of airline business decisions that often concern policy makers include mergers and code share alliances among airlines. One of the main objectives of this paper is to emphasize the importance of controlling for the non-price aspects of competition among airlines' when assessing the price effects of business strategies of these airlines. In fact, the relative importance that policy makers place on the price effects of proposed or actual business strategies of airlines may even be in question.

It is well known that in industries where products are not homogenous, competition among firms is not restricted to price.<sup>2</sup> In fact, the non-price characteristics of products may be just as important as price, if not more so, in explaining consumers' choice of particular products. As suggested above, the airline industry is

---

<sup>1</sup>Frequent flyer programs normally involve passengers' ability to use accumulated miles traveled on an airline to qualify for discounts on tickets while travel agent commission override programs involve arrangements where agents are rewarded for directing a high proportion of their bookings to the airline.

<sup>2</sup>See the chapter on product differentiation in Tirole (1988). In the tenth printing of the text, the relevant discussion is found in chapter 7.

one example of a differentiated product industry where firms compete on various non-price characteristics of the products offered. For example, in addition to the frequent flyer programs and the travel agent commission override programs mentioned above, airlines may offer multiple itineraries<sup>3</sup> within a given market, and various promotional activities<sup>4</sup> designed to steal customers from competitors. A frequent flyer program is an example of loyalty-inducing marketing device that is intended to reduce consumer's sensitivity to price. Empirical studies by Nako (1992), Prousaloglou and Koppelman (1995), and Suzuki et al. (2003) have shown that frequent flyer programs significantly affect travelers' choice of airlines. In the face of the non-price product characteristics that may influence consumers' choice of a product, which then drives the multidimensional nature of competition in the airline industry, one may wonder how important price is as a strategic variable for airlines.

Knowing potential passengers' relative valuation of various product characteristics must be at the heart of formulating effective business strategies. Acquiring this information is confounded by the fact that passengers are heterogeneous, that is, each passenger is likely to have a different valuation for each product characteristic. As such, explicitly modeling potential passengers' decision-making process is crucial in any attempt to estimate the relative importance of price in the multidimensional nature of competition between airlines. Thanks to recent advances in econometric estimation of demand for differentiated products, [Berry, Levinsohn, and Pakes (1995) popularly referred to as BLP, Berry(1994), Nevo(2000)] consumer heterogeneity can explicitly be incorporated in a structural econometric model of consumer decision-making process. To the best of my knowledge, except for Berry, Carnall, and Spiller (1997) (henceforth BCS) and Berry (1990), there has not been any other attempt to explicitly model passengers' heterogeneity within a discrete choice econometric model of demand for air travel. One crucial difference between the model in this paper and the models in BCS and Berry (1990) is that here, consumers' heterogeneity (variation

---

<sup>3</sup>Multiple times of departures and arrivals combined with variations in intermediate stops.

<sup>4</sup>Advanced purchase of tickets, stopover deals, etc.

in taste) is allowed to vary with demographic information (such as income and age) drawn from each market,<sup>5</sup> while in BCS, heterogeneity solely depends on an assumed parametric distribution of taste.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The empirical model is presented in section 2. There, I discuss how passengers' heterogeneity is modeled, which has implications for estimating the model. Section 3 discusses the estimation strategy along with my identifying assumptions. I discuss characteristics of the data in section 4 and results are presented and discussed in section 5. Even though the analysis in this paper focuses on a sample of U.S. domestic air travel markets, the research methodology can easily be extended to international air travel. Concluding remarks are made in section 6.

## 2 The Model.

In the model, a market is defined as a directional round-trip air travel between an origin and a destination city. The assumption that markets are directional implies that a round-trip air travel from Atlanta to Dallas is a distinct market than round-trip air travel from Dallas to Atlanta. This allows characteristics of origin city to affect demand [see BCS]. In what follows, markets are indexed by  $t$ .

A flight itinerary is defined as a specific sequence of airport stops in traveling from the origin to destination city. Products are defined as a unique combination of airline and flight itinerary.<sup>6</sup> For example, three separate products are (1) a non-stop round trip from Atlanta to Dallas on Delta Airlines, (2) a round trip from Atlanta to Dallas with one stop in Albuquerque on Delta Airlines, and (3) a non-stop round trip from Atlanta to Dallas on American Airlines. Note that all three products are in the same market. The airline-specific component of the product definition is intended

---

<sup>5</sup>See Nevo(2000) for more on this approach.

<sup>6</sup>Even though it is possible to further distinguish products by using a unique combination of price, airline, and flight itinerary as in BCS, I chose to use only airline and flight itinerary. The reason is that observed product market shares, which I define subsequently, will be extremely small if products are defined too narrowly. The empirical model becomes difficult to fit when product market shares are extremely small.

to capture the fact that airlines differ in the services they offer. Airline services may differ along several dimensions. For example, frequent flyer programs and the quality of in-flight service often differ across airlines.

Let consumer  $i$  choose among  $J$  different products offered in market  $t$  by competing airlines. The indirect utility that consumer  $i$  gets from consuming a product in market  $t$  is given by

$$U_{ijt} = d_j + x_{jt}\beta_i - \alpha_i p_{jt} + \Delta\xi_{jt} + \varepsilon_{ijt} \quad (1)$$

where  $d_j$  are product fixed effects capturing characteristics of the products that are the same across markets,  $x_{jt}$  is a vector of observed product characteristics,  $\beta_i$  is a vector of consumer taste parameters (assumed random) for different product characteristics,  $p_{jt}$  is the price of product  $j$ ,  $\alpha_i$  represents the marginal utility of price,  $\Delta\xi_{jt}$  are differences in unobserved (by the econometrician) product characteristics since  $d_j$  is included in equation(1), and  $\varepsilon_{ijt}$  represents the random component of utility that is assumed independent and identically distributed across consumers, products and markets. The product characteristics captured by  $d_j$  may include, but not restricted to, the quality of in-flight service, and frequent flyer programs offered by each airline.  $\Delta\xi_{jt}$  is defined as differences in unobserved product characteristics because  $\Delta\xi_{jt} = \xi_{jt} - \xi_j$ , where  $\xi_{jt}$  represents unobserved product characteristics of product  $j$  in market  $t$ , and  $\xi_j$  represents the portion of the unobserved product characteristics of product  $j$  that is the same across all markets. By including  $d_j$  in the model, I have basically controlled for  $\xi_j$  [see Nevo(2000), Villas-Boas(2003)].<sup>7</sup>

Note that  $\beta_i$  and  $\alpha_i$  are individual-specific, implying that consumers have different tastes for each product characteristic. For example, consumers may differ on their preference for a particular flight itinerary which may involve multiple stops. The difference in preference may depend on the consumers' age, opportunity cost of time (income), and other unobservable (by the econometrician) taste components. Following Nevo(2000), I assume that individual characteristics consist of two com-

---

<sup>7</sup> $d_j$  is captured by a set of airline dummies. The implications of including these dummies in the model will become clearer in the estimation section where I discuss instrumental variables.

ponents: demographics, which I refer to as *observed*, and additional characteristics, which I refer to as *unobserved*, denoted  $D_i$  and  $v_i$  respectively. As I discuss further in the data section, the data used in the estimation does not have consumer level information, which means that neither component of the individual characteristics ( $D_i$  or  $v_i$ ) is directly observed in the choice data set. As explained in Nevo (2000), even though we may not observe individual data, we know something about the distribution of demographics in each market. However, we know nothing about the distribution of  $v_i$ , and must therefore make assumptions about its distribution as in the famous BLP model.

Formally, I specify that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i \\ \beta_i \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix} + \Gamma D_i + \Sigma v_i \quad (2)$$

where  $D_i$  is a  $m$ -dimensional column vector of demographic variables, while  $v_i$  is a  $k$ -dimensional column vector that captures unobserved consumer characteristics,  $\Gamma$  is a  $k \times m$  matrix of parameters that measure how taste characteristics vary with demographics, and  $\Sigma$  is a  $k \times k$  diagonal matrix, where elements on the main diagonal are parameters.  $k$  corresponds to the number of random taste parameters (or equivalently the row dimension of  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i \\ \beta_i \end{pmatrix}$ ), while  $m$  corresponds to the number of demographic variables. I assume that  $v_i$  has a standard multivariate normal distribution,  $N(0, I)$ , while  $D_i$  has an empirical distribution,  $\widehat{F}(D)$ , from the demographic data. Thus the diagonal elements in  $\Sigma$  represent the standard deviations of the random taste parameters,  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i \\ \beta_i \end{pmatrix}$ .<sup>8</sup>

To complete the specification of the demand system, I introduce an *outside* good called good zero, allowing for the possibility that consumer  $i$  may not purchase one of the  $J$  products considered in the empirical model. This implies that the outside good may include alternatives to air travel to get from the origin city to the destination

---

<sup>8</sup>Demographic variables in  $D_i$  are expressed in deviations from their respective means. Thus the mean of each variable in  $D_i$  is zero. Since the mean of  $v_i$  is also a zero vector based on the assumption that  $v_i \sim N(0, I)$ , then the mean of  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i \\ \beta_i \end{pmatrix}$  is  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}$  and its variance is equal to the square of the elements on the main diagonal of  $\Sigma$ .

city and back. These alternatives may include motor vehicle or train. As usual, the mean utility level of the outside good,  $\delta_{0t}$ , is normalized to be a constant and equal to zero, while the mean utility level of each of the  $J$  products,  $\delta_{jt}$ , is given by

$$\delta_{jt} = d_j + x_{jt}\beta - \alpha p_{jt} + \Delta\xi_{jt} \quad (3)$$

Let  $\theta = (\Gamma, \Sigma)$  be a vector of non-linear parameters. Further, let

$$\mu_{ijt}(x_{jt}, p_{jt}, \nu_i, D_i; \theta) = [-p_{jt}, x_{jt}] (\Gamma D_i + \Sigma \nu_i) \quad (4)$$

Using equations (1) to (4) allows me to express the indirect utility from consuming product  $j$  as

$$U_{ijt} = \delta_{jt} + \mu_{ijt} + \varepsilon_{ijt} \quad (5)$$

where  $\mu_{ijt} + \varepsilon_{ijt}$  is a mean zero, heteroskedastic deviation from the mean utility that captures the effects of the random coefficients.

I assume that consumers purchase one unit of the product that gives the highest utility. Based on the above, the vector  $(\nu_i, D_i, \varepsilon_{i0t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{iJt})$  describes the attributes of a consumer. Formally, the set of individual attributes that lead to the choice of product  $j$  can be written as

$$A_{jt} = \{(\nu_i, D_i, \varepsilon_{i0t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{iJt}) | U_{ijt} \geq U_{ilt} \forall l = 0, 1, \dots, J\}$$

Thus  $A_{jt}$  represents the set of consumers who choose product  $j$  in market  $t$ . Recall that a product is defined as an itinerary-airline combination. For example, if product  $j$  is a round-trip from Atlanta to Dallas with one stop in Albuquerque on Delta Airlines, then  $A_{jt}$  defines the set of consumers choosing this itinerary-airline combination rather than any other itinerary-airline combination in the Atlanta to Dallas market. Formally, I can define the *predicted* (by the model) market share of product  $j$  as

$$\begin{aligned} s_{jt}(x_{jt}, p_{jt}; \alpha, \beta, \theta) &= \int_{A_{jt}} dF(v, D, \varepsilon) \\ &= \int_{A_{jt}} dF(v) d\widehat{F}(D) dF(\varepsilon) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $F(\cdot)$  denotes the population distribution functions and  $F(v, D, \varepsilon) = F(v) \widehat{F}(D) F(\varepsilon)$  is due to assumed independence of  $\nu$ ,  $D$ , and  $\varepsilon$ . If we assume that both  $D$  and  $\nu$  are fixed, thus implying that consumer heterogeneity enters only through the random shock, and  $\varepsilon_{ijt}$  is independent and identically distributed (*i.i.d.*) with an extreme value type I density, then equation (6) becomes

$$s_{jt}(x_{jt}, p_{jt}; \alpha, \beta) = \frac{e^{\delta_{jt}}}{e^{\delta_{0t}} + \sum_{l=1}^J e^{\delta_{lt}}} = \frac{e^{\delta_{jt}}}{1 + \sum_{l=1}^J e^{\delta_{lt}}} \quad (7)$$

which is the standard multinomial logit model. If we relax the assumption that both  $D$  and  $\nu$  are fixed, while still assuming that  $\varepsilon_{ijt}$  is *i.i.d.* type I extreme value, equation (6) becomes

$$s_{jt}(x_{jt}, p_{jt}; \alpha, \beta, \theta) = \int \frac{e^{\delta_{jt} + \mu_{ijt}}}{1 + \sum_{l=1}^J e^{\delta_{lt} + \mu_{ilt}}} d\widehat{F}(D) dF(\nu) \quad (8)$$

Equation (8) corresponds to the random coefficients (or mixed logit) model that I use in this paper. As is well known in the empirical industrial organization literature, there is no closed form solution for equation (8) and thus it must be approximated numerically using random draws from  $\widehat{F}(D)$  and  $F(\nu)$ .

Recall that  $s_{jt}(x_{jt}, p_{jt}; \alpha, \beta, \theta)$  in equation (8) is the *predicted* market share of product  $j$  and therefore is not observed. Given a market size of measure  $M$ , which I assume to be the size of the population in the origin city, *observed* market shares of product  $j$  in market  $t$  is  $\mathbb{S}_{jt} = \frac{q_j}{M}$ , where  $q_j$  is the actual number of travel tickets sold for a particular itinerary-airline combination called product  $j$ . The observed market share for each product is computed analogously. The estimation strategy involves choosing values of  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\theta$  to minimize the distance between the predicted,  $s_{jt}$ , and observed,  $\mathbb{S}_{jt}$ , market shares.

### 3 Estimation.

I use Nevo's (2000) simulation based Generalized Methods of Moments (GMM) estimation algorithm. First, to numerically approximate equation (8), I took random

draws from  $\widehat{F}(D)$  and  $F(\nu)$ , where  $\widehat{F}(D)$  is the empirical distribution of demographic variables (income and age) in the origin city, and  $F(\nu)$  is the multivariate standard normal distribution. For example, a draw from  $\widehat{F}(D)$  for one individual (individual  $i$ ) can be represented by the vector  $D_i = (D_{i1}, D_{i2})'$ , where  $D_{i1}$  is individual  $i$ 's income and  $D_{i2}$  is individual  $i$ 's age. Similarly, a draw from  $F(\nu)$  for the same individual can be represented by the  $k$ -dimensional vector  $\nu_i = (\nu_i^1, \dots, \nu_i^k)'$  where each of the  $k$  elements in  $\nu_i$  represents individual  $i$ 's taste parameter for the corresponding product characteristic. Let  $ns$  represent the number of individuals sampled in each market. The predicted product market share given in equation (8) can be approximated by

$$\begin{aligned} s_{jt} &= \frac{1}{ns} \sum_{i=1}^{ns} s_{ijt} = \frac{1}{ns} \sum_{i=1}^{ns} \frac{e^{\delta_{jt} + \mu_{ijt}}}{1 + \sum_{l=1}^J e^{\delta_{lt} + \mu_{ilt}}} \\ &= \frac{1}{ns} \sum_{i=1}^{ns} \frac{e^{\delta_{jt} + [-p_{jt}, x_{jt}]'(\Gamma D_i + \Sigma \nu_i)}}{1 + \sum_{l=1}^J e^{\delta_{lt} + [-p_{lt}, x_{lt}]'(\Gamma D_i + \Sigma \nu_i)}} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Recall that  $\delta_{jt}$  is a linear function in the parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  (see equation(3)), while  $\theta = (\Gamma, \Sigma)$ . As discussed above, the estimation strategy involves choosing parameter values  $(\widehat{\alpha}, \widehat{\beta}$  and  $\widehat{\theta})$  that minimizes the distance between predicted and observed product market shares. For a detailed description of the estimation algorithm, see Nevo (2000). In searching for the global minimum of the GMM objective function, I start by using the Newton method with an analytic gradient. I then use the parameter values obtained from the Newton method as starting values in the more robust Nelder-Mead (1965) simplex search method. Using both search methods helps ensure that results are robust.

### 3.1 Instruments

If we assume that airlines take into account all the non-price characteristics ( $x_{jt}$  and  $\Delta \xi_{jt}$ ) of their products before setting prices, then prices will depend on  $\Delta \xi_{jt}$ . In other words, components of  $\Delta \xi_{jt}$  such as convenient flight schedules, various marketing and promotional activities, all of which are market-specific and unobservable to me (but observable to consumers and airlines), are likely to influence prices. Not having data

on  $\Delta\xi_{jt}$  implies that it is part of the error term in the demand model. As such, the estimated coefficient on price will be inconsistent if appropriate instruments are not found for prices. As is well known in econometrics, valid instruments must satisfy two requirements. First, instruments must be uncorrelated with the residual, and second, they must be correlated with the endogenous variable. In other words, valid instruments must be uncorrelated with  $\Delta\xi_{jt}$  but correlated with  $p_{jt}$ . I employ two sets of instruments in estimation which I describe below.

The first set of instruments that I use is described and used in Nevo (2000) and first introduced by Hausman et al.(1994) and Hausman (1996). This set of instruments is an attempt to exploit the panel structure of the data. Since I observe prices charged by each airline in a cross section of markets, the identifying assumption made is that, controlling for the component of the service that is constant across markets (embodied in airline dummies), the market specific valuations of the products,  $\Delta\xi_{jt} = \xi_{jt} - \xi_j$ , are independent across markets. This implies that  $\Delta\xi_{jt}$  is uncorrelated with prices in markets other than market  $t$ . If we couple this with the idea that prices charged by an airline across markets have a common cost component that may be specific to the airline, then each airlines' prices ought to be correlated across markets. The upshot of these arguments is that prices charged by an airline in different markets can serve as instruments for each other. The common cost component in an airline's prices could result from providing a similar general quality of service across all the markets it serves. Of course, prices are also influenced by market-specific factors, such as the level of competition in a particular market, implying that in equilibrium, an airline's prices should not be identical across markets. In summary, I use average prices charged by an airline in other markets to instrument for its prices in each market.

The second set of instruments I use is described in Villas-Boas (2003). Since input prices are marginal cost shifters, they are also valid instruments for prices of final products. The problem in using input prices as instruments in these discrete choice models is that input prices do not vary across brands of the product, while

final goods prices vary across brands. For example, in applying the model to the yogurt market [see Villas-Boas (2003)], the price of sugar, an input for yogurt, is the same across all brands of yogurt. Similarly, in the case of the market for air travel, the price per gallon of fuel is the same whether the product is a round trip non-stop flight from Atlanta to Dallas on Delta or a round trip non-stop flight from Atlanta to Dallas on American Airlines. Notwithstanding that input prices are the same across brands of differentiated products, Villas-Boas argued that a change in input prices may affect different brands in different ways since brands may differ in their relative use of inputs. Thus Villas-Boas recommend using as instruments, the interaction between input prices and brand dummies. This allows input prices to affect the final price of each brand differently. Following Villas-Boas (2003), I use the interaction of fuel prices with airline dummies as instruments for final ticket prices. Similar to Villas-Boas's argument, the idea is that a change in fuel price may affect each airline differently, one reason being that airlines may offer different flight itineraries in a market that require different amounts of fuel to service each itinerary. For example, it is reasonable to assume that an itinerary for a non-stop flight from Atlanta to Dallas requires different amounts of fuel compared to an itinerary from Atlanta to Dallas with one stop in Albuquerque.

## 4 Data.

Data on the airline industry is drawn from the Origin and Destination Survey (DB1B), which is a 10% sample of airline tickets from reporting carriers. The U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics publishes this database along with other transportation data via its TranStats web site.<sup>9</sup> The DB1B database includes such items as passengers, fares, and distances for each directional market, as well as information about whether the market was domestic or international. Distances flown vary within a market because itineraries may involve multiple connecting flights to get from the

---

<sup>9</sup>For detail on air travel data published by U.S. Bureau of Transportation go to <http://transtats.bts.gov/>

origin to the destination city. A market may therefore comprise several distinct routes or segments. As such, the data I use contains directional markets rather than non-stop routes or segments of a market. For this research, I focus on the U.S. domestic market in the first quarter of 2002.

As an example, let me describe three distinct observations (products) actually contained in the data set. One of the fifteen round-trip markets considered is the Atlanta to Dallas market. Three observations in this market are, (1) a non-stop flight on American Airlines, (2) a non-stop flight on Delta Airlines, and (3) an itinerary with one stop in Houston on Continental Airlines. Over the review period, 2273 passengers bought product (1) at an average price of \$233.29.<sup>10</sup> However, for the said review period, 5572 passengers bought product (2) at an average price of \$252.49. The distance associated with products (1) and (2) is 732 miles. For product (3), 43 passengers bought this product over the review period at an average price of \$163.10. The distance associated with the third product is 913 miles, since passengers were routed through Houston. For the three products described above, Atlanta is a hub for Delta but not for American or Continental. There are two points worthy of mention here, (1) the hub product (product 2) seems to be the most popular among passengers even though it is relatively more expensive than the other two products, (2) the product with one stop is significantly cheaper than the non-stop products.

Summary statistics for the entire sample of air travel data are presented in table 1. The first column lists the fifteen markets considered, while the second column gives the number of observations (products) in each market. In the third column, I report the percentage of products in the sample for which the origin airport is a hub.

---

<sup>10</sup>Since each passenger may pay a different price/fare for a given itinerary-airline combination for various reasons (advanced purchase of ticket, weekend stay over days etc.), I use the average price paid for a given itinerary-airline combination over the review period.

**Table 1**  
**Summary Statistics**

| Market                      | Observations <sup>a</sup><br>N=1462 | Hub <sup>b</sup><br>(%) | Mean<br>Price<br>(\$) | Min<br>Price<br>(\$) | Max<br>Price<br>(\$) | Mean<br>Distance<br>(Miles) | Min<br>Distance<br>(Miles) | Max<br>Distance<br>(Miles) |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Atlanta - Dallas            | 111                                 | 33.33                   | 278.74                | 0                    | 785                  | 1112.54                     | 731                        | 1870                       |
| Atlanta - Newark            | 78                                  | 25.64                   | 259.85                | 0                    | 805                  | 1107.03                     | 745                        | 1646                       |
| Atlanta - Los Angeles       | 181                                 | 30.94                   | 361.82                | 0                    | 2101                 | 2491.46                     | 1946                       | 4158                       |
| Atlanta - Salt Lake City    | 160                                 | 35.00                   | 333.92                | 0                    | 1480                 | 2271.18                     | 1589                       | 3763                       |
| Cincinnati - Atlanta        | 57                                  | 24.56                   | 299.20                | 5                    | 651                  | 687.44                      | 373                        | 1105                       |
| Cincinnati - Los Angeles    | 62                                  | 32.26                   | 291.75                | 0                    | 1251                 | 2349.42                     | 1900                       | 3383                       |
| Cincinnati - Salt Lake City | 90                                  | 34.44                   | 337.36                | 0                    | 1654                 | 2068.91                     | 1449                       | 3175                       |
| Dallas - Atlanta            | 137                                 | 31.39                   | 303.92                | 0                    | 1131                 | 1179.53                     | 731                        | 1973                       |
| Dallas - Cincinnati         | 57                                  | 29.82                   | 357.62                | 0                    | 1183                 | 1373.18                     | 812                        | 2432                       |
| Dallas - Newark             | 63                                  | 19.05                   | 399.55                | 0                    | 1622                 | 1646.92                     | 1372                       | 2956                       |
| Houston - Cleveland         | 76                                  | 19.74                   | 252.14                | 0                    | 1538                 | 1441.79                     | 1091                       | 2442                       |
| Houston - Newark            | 109                                 | 28.44                   | 390.03                | 0                    | 1280                 | 1718.24                     | 1400                       | 3142                       |
| Minneapolis - Atlanta       | 55                                  | 3.64                    | 240.33                | 0                    | 838                  | 1364.84                     | 906                        | 2096                       |
| Salt Lake City - Atlanta    | 151                                 | 31.13                   | 364.26                | 0                    | 1301                 | 2293.79                     | 1589                       | 4684                       |
| Salt Lake City - Cincinnati | 75                                  | 29.33                   | 331.69                | 0                    | 1681                 | 2142.92                     | 1449                       | 3162                       |

<sup>a</sup> Sample size of products (itinerary-airline combination) in the particular market.

<sup>b</sup> The percentage of the sample of products for which the origin airport is a hub.

For example, the table shows that of the 111 products in our sample for the Atlanta to Dallas market, Atlanta is a hub for 33.33% of them (hub products).<sup>11</sup> As discussed in the introduction, the hub-and-spoke network is one of the major developments in the airline industry since deregulation. Hub products may offer more convenient flight schedules since airlines normally fly to a wider range of destinations from their hub airport. As such, the empirical model should capture this non-price component of products as this is likely to influence passengers' choice behavior among alternative products. The fourth, fifth and sixth columns summarize data on airfares. We can see that, within a market, the minimum airfare for a ticket is zero dollars. These tickets are likely associated with passengers using their accumulated frequent flyer miles to offset ticket price.<sup>12</sup> The seventh, eighth and ninth columns summarize data on distances flown in each market.

Given that the ticket purchase data discussed above does not have passenger-specific information, such as a passengers' income or age, I use information on the

<sup>11</sup>Products offered by Delta Airlines would be part of this 33.33% since Atlanta is a major hub for Delta, while products offered by American Airlines in this market would not be included in the 33.33% since Atlanta is not a hub for American.

<sup>12</sup>Unfortunately, the data does not contain information that allows me to distinguish between tickets that were bought with frequent flyer miles. I can only observe the actual price paid for each ticket and conjecture that tickets with an unusually low price are either associated with frequent flyer or some other promotional program. In either case, I would not want to throw out these observations since they may contain useful information about the non-price component of an airline's products. As you will see in the results section, I use the empirical model to disentangle the price and non-price product components that influence passengers' choice behavior.

distribution of demographic data in the origin city to account for taste heterogeneity in travel demand. As such, estimating equation (9) requires supplementing the ticket purchase data with demographic data drawn from the origin city's population in each market.<sup>13</sup> These demographic data are drawn from the 2001 and 2002 Current Population Survey (CPS) published by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Tables 2A and 2B summarize the demographic

**Table 2A**  
**Summary of Demographic Data**

| Atl-<br>anta     | Age |             |             |             |             |             |             |     | Total |
|------------------|-----|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----|-------|
|                  | <21 | 21 to<br>30 | 31 to<br>40 | 41 to<br>50 | 51 to<br>60 | 61 to<br>70 | 71 to<br>80 | >80 |       |
| Income < \$300   | 27  | 37          | 25          | 21          | 10          | 5           | 2           | 0   | 127   |
| \$300 to \$599   | 9   | 112         | 95          | 71          | 40          | 9           | 0           | 1   | 337   |
| \$600 to \$899   | 2   | 79          | 64          | 65          | 43          | 6           | 1           | 0   | 260   |
| \$900 to \$1199  | 0   | 34          | 50          | 31          | 22          | 1           | 1           | 0   | 139   |
| \$1200 to \$1499 | 0   | 8           | 23          | 13          | 8           | 0           | 0           | 0   | 52    |
| \$1500 to \$1799 | 0   | 7           | 11          | 10          | 8           | 0           | 0           | 0   | 36    |
| \$1800 or more   | 0   | 4           | 19          | 18          | 8           | 0           | 0           | 0   | 49    |
| Total            | 38  | 281         | 287         | 229         | 139         | 21          | 4           | 1   | 1,000 |
| Cinc-<br>innati  |     |             |             |             |             |             |             |     |       |
| Income < \$300   | 26  | 51          | 26          | 21          | 23          | 10          | 8           | 1   | 166   |
| \$300 to \$599   | 16  | 108         | 85          | 76          | 58          | 18          | 3           | 0   | 364   |
| \$600 to \$899   | 3   | 35          | 71          | 70          | 48          | 6           | 1           | 0   | 234   |
| \$900 to \$1199  | 0   | 10          | 36          | 43          | 23          | 5           | 0           | 0   | 117   |
| \$1200 to \$1499 | 0   | 7           | 12          | 19          | 9           | 0           | 0           | 0   | 47    |
| \$1500 to \$1799 | 0   | 2           | 9           | 10          | 9           | 0           | 0           | 0   | 30    |
| \$1800 or more   | 0   | 4           | 13          | 15          | 10          | 0           | 0           | 0   | 42    |
| Total            | 45  | 217         | 252         | 254         | 180         | 39          | 12          | 1   | 1,000 |
| Dallas           |     |             |             |             |             |             |             |     |       |
| Income < \$300   | 36  | 49          | 39          | 27          | 6           | 5           | 1           | 1   | 164   |
| \$300 to \$599   | 17  | 101         | 99          | 71          | 36          | 7           | 1           | 0   | 332   |
| \$600 to \$899   | 3   | 66          | 69          | 50          | 31          | 4           | 0           | 0   | 223   |
| \$900 to \$1199  | 0   | 22          | 42          | 21          | 20          | 5           | 1           | 0   | 111   |
| \$1200 to \$1499 | 0   | 7           | 24          | 20          | 8           | 1           | 0           | 0   | 60    |
| \$1500 to \$1799 | 0   | 4           | 11          | 16          | 5           | 0           | 0           | 0   | 36    |
| \$1800 or more   | 0   | 9           | 29          | 23          | 11          | 2           | 0           | 0   | 74    |
| Total            | 56  | 258         | 313         | 228         | 117         | 24          | 3           | 1   | 1,000 |

Notes: The income variable is weekly income. Numbers in matrix refer to number of individuals in the income-age category.

<sup>13</sup>This non-parametric approach to model consumer heterogeneity is explained in more detail in Nevo(2000).

**Table 2B**  
**Summary of Demographic Data**

| Hous-<br>ton         |                  | Age |             |             |             |             |             |            | Total |       |
|----------------------|------------------|-----|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------------|-------|-------|
|                      |                  | <21 | 21 to<br>30 | 31 to<br>40 | 41 to<br>50 | 51 to<br>60 | 61 to<br>70 | 71to<br>80 |       | >80   |
|                      | Income < \$300   | 33  | 50          | 38          | 29          | 14          | 10          | 2          | 0     | 176   |
|                      | \$300 to \$599   | 17  | 122         | 103         | 83          | 42          | 13          | 1          | 0     | 381   |
|                      | \$600 to \$899   | 2   | 44          | 77          | 65          | 27          | 3           | 0          | 0     | 218   |
|                      | \$900 to \$1199  | 1   | 22          | 19          | 21          | 22          | 1           | 1          | 1     | 88    |
|                      | \$1200 to \$1499 | 0   | 13          | 22          | 25          | 4           | 0           | 0          | 1     | 65    |
|                      | \$1500 to \$1799 | 0   | 2           | 8           | 14          | 4           | 1           | 0          | 0     | 29    |
|                      | \$1800 or more   | 0   | 4           | 3           | 23          | 10          | 3           | 0          | 0     | 43    |
|                      | Total            | 53  | 257         | 270         | 260         | 123         | 31          | 4          | 2     | 1,000 |
| Minne-<br>apolis     |                  |     |             |             |             |             |             |            |       |       |
|                      | Income < \$300   | 38  | 29          | 21          | 19          | 10          | 12          | 6          | 0     | 135   |
|                      | \$300 to \$599   | 13  | 87          | 63          | 69          | 22          | 8           | 5          | 1     | 268   |
|                      | \$600 to \$899   | 5   | 58          | 76          | 67          | 38          | 9           | 0          | 0     | 253   |
|                      | \$900 to \$1199  | 0   | 20          | 57          | 50          | 36          | 2           | 0          | 0     | 165   |
|                      | \$1200 to \$1499 | 0   | 11          | 25          | 24          | 14          | 4           | 0          | 0     | 78    |
|                      | \$1500 to \$1799 | 0   | 3           | 10          | 13          | 12          | 1           | 0          | 0     | 39    |
|                      | \$1800 or more   | 0   | 1           | 19          | 27          | 13          | 2           | 0          | 0     | 62    |
|                      | Total            | 56  | 209         | 271         | 269         | 145         | 38          | 11         | 1     | 1,000 |
| Salt<br>Lake<br>City |                  |     |             |             |             |             |             |            |       |       |
|                      | Income < \$300   | 66  | 56          | 32          | 27          | 17          | 12          | 1          | 0     | 211   |
|                      | \$300 to \$599   | 25  | 116         | 81          | 61          | 42          | 18          | 1          | 2     | 346   |
|                      | \$600 to \$899   | 0   | 56          | 77          | 73          | 22          | 7           | 1          | 0     | 236   |
|                      | \$900 to \$1199  | 0   | 17          | 31          | 29          | 25          | 8           | 1          | 0     | 111   |
|                      | \$1200 to \$1499 | 0   | 3           | 18          | 12          | 11          | 2           | 0          | 0     | 46    |
|                      | \$1500 to \$1799 | 0   | 3           | 6           | 7           | 3           | 3           | 0          | 0     | 22    |
|                      | \$1800 or more   | 0   | 3           | 7           | 7           | 5           | 6           | 0          | 0     | 28    |
|                      | Total            | 91  | 254         | 252         | 216         | 125         | 56          | 4          | 2     | 1,000 |

Notes: The income variable is weekly income. Numbers in matrix refer to number of individuals in the income-age category.

data in each origin city. A random sample of one thousand individuals is drawn from each origin city's population. From the samples drawn, we can see that there is some diversity within each city. For example, while the majority of the sample between ages 21 and 40 have weekly income below \$1,200, quite a few people in this age group earn above \$1,200 per week. Further, most individuals above the age of 60 have income below \$1,200 per week. When faced with the same set of options, it is likely that these distinct groups of potential passengers may make different product choices. One reason is that they may have different tastes over prices and flight schedule convenience. The empirical model is designed to account for such passenger heterogeneity.

## 5 Results.

Recall that non-price product characteristics are captured by  $x_{jt}$  and  $d_j$  [see equation(1)], where the researcher can observe variables in  $x_{jt}$  but not  $d_j$ . However, passengers and

airlines both observe  $x_{jt}$  and  $d_j$ . The variables in  $x_{jt}$  are “Hub”, “Hub×Distance”, and “Distance×Market  $t$ ”, all of which are explained below. The  $d_j$  are product fixed effects capturing product characteristics that are the same across markets. As discussed above, these unobserved product characteristics may include, but not restricted to, the quality of in-flight service, and frequent flyer programs offered by each airline. Including airline dummies in the estimation is sufficient to control for  $d_j$ . First, I estimate the mixed logit model (equation (9)) using  $p_{jt}$  and  $x_{jt}$  as the independent variables. These results are displayed in table 3.<sup>14</sup> I then re-estimate the model using  $p_{jt}$ ,  $x_{jt}$  and a full set of airline dummies as independent variables. The results when airline dummies are included in the estimation are displayed in table 4. A comparison of the results across both tables has implications for the importance of price competition after controlling for unobservable non-price product characteristics. Results in table 3 are discussed first, then I compare and discuss the results in table 4.

First, let us discuss the impact of airfare on potential passengers’ choice of products. Airfare is represented by the variable “Price”. As expected, the coefficient on “Price” is negative, indicating that an airline can increase the probability that potential passengers will choose it’s flight itinerary by lowering the airfare on the said itinerary, *ceteris paribus*. Thus, the coefficient estimate on “Price” in table 3 does suggest that price matters in competition among airlines.

---

<sup>14</sup>The coefficients in table 3 correspond to the parameters in equation(9) as follows.  $\alpha$  is the coefficient on “Price”. The parameter vector  $\beta$  corresponds to the coefficients on “Hub”, “Hub×Distance”, “Distance×Market  $t$ ” for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, 15$ . The parameters in the  $\Sigma$  matrix correspond to the coefficients in the column labeled “Standard Deviations”. The parameters in the  $\Gamma$  matrix correspond to the coefficients in the last three columns labeled, “Age”, “Income”, and “(Income)<sup>2</sup>”.

**Table 3**  
**Results For Mixed Logit Model**  
(Airline fixed effects **not** Included)

| Variable                    | Mean<br>( $\beta$ 's) | Standard<br>Deviations<br>( $\sigma$ 's) | Interactions with Demographic Variables: |                     |                       |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|---------------------|-----------------------|
|                             |                       |  | Age                                      | Income              | (Income) <sup>2</sup> |
| Constant                    | -                     | -0.13<br>(4.87)                          | -3.39<br>(10.52)                         | 7.95**<br>(2.18)    | -                     |
| Price                       | -14.83**<br>(5.62)    | 2.50<br>(3.48)                           | -  | -45.68**<br>(22.52) | 13.39<br>(14.19)      |
| Distance                    | -                     | -0.18<br>(1.32)                          | 3.51<br>(4.00)                           | -8.18**<br>(1.38)   | -                     |
| Hub                         | 1.30**<br>(0.37)      |  |  |                     |                       |
| Hub $\times$ Distance       | -0.28*<br>(0.17)      |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 1  | -3.66**<br>(1.28)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 2  | -3.24**<br>(1.35)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 3  | -3.17**<br>(0.76)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 4  | -4.56**<br>(0.72)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 5  | -8.14**<br>(1.24)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 6  | -4.64**<br>(0.76)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 7  | -5.52**<br>(0.82)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 8  | -7.62**<br>(0.96)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 9  | -8.05**<br>(0.92)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 10 | -6.76**<br>(0.82)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 11 | -7.25**<br>(1.04)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 12 | -6.04**<br>(0.81)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 13 | -6.41**<br>(0.85)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 14 | -2.36**<br>(0.75)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 15 | -4.62**<br>(0.81)     |  |  |                     |                       |
| GMM Objective               |                       |  | 369.82                                   |                     |                       |

Number of observations is 1,462. Standard errors are in parentheses. \*\* indicates statistical significance at the 5% level, while \* indicates statistical significance at the 10% level.

Next I turn to the impact that non-price product characteristics, captured by the vector  $x_{jt}$ , have on potential passengers' choice of products. One non-price characteristic that I do observe is whether or not the origin airport is a hub for the airline offering the product. Two possible reasons why passengers are more likely to choose itineraries offered by hub airlines are: (1) flight schedules offered by hub airlines may be more convenient (fewer intermediate stops), (2) it is more likely that passengers have frequent flyer membership with a hub airline.<sup>15</sup> The variable "Hub" is a dummy variable taking the value one if the product is offered by an airline that

<sup>15</sup>See Prousaloglou and Koppelman (1995), Berry (1990), Schumann (1986).

has a hub at the origin airport and zero otherwise. The coefficient on “Hub” is positive, indicating that potential passengers are more likely to choose itineraries where the origin airport is a hub for the airline offering the itinerary. In other words, airlines have a strategic advantage at their hub airports compared to their non-hub competitors.

Another non-price characteristic that influences passengers’ choice of products is the convenience of flight schedule embodied in the itinerary. I measure the convenience of a schedule by the actual distance flown in getting from the origin to the destination airport.<sup>16</sup> The actual distance flown to get to a destination from a specific origin may vary since itineraries do not always involve direct flights from the origin to the destination. For example, in the market where Kansas City is the origin and San Diego is the destination, an itinerary which has one intermediate stop in Chicago involves flying a longer distance compared to an itinerary with one intermediate stop in Phoenix. Note however that even though both itineraries involve one intermediate stop, they may differ in terms of distance flown. I associate shorter distances with more convenient schedules. A direct flight from Kansas City to San Diego would involve the shortest possible distance in this market and thus interpreted as the most convenient schedule in the said market. The variables in table 3 that capture this measure of schedule convenience are the interactions between “Distance” and “Market”. The variables “Market” are dummies taking the value one if the product is in the relevant market and zero otherwise. The coefficients on the interactions between “Distance” and “Market” dummies are negative, indicating that within a given market (origin-destination combination), passengers prefer to choose flight itineraries that cover shorter distances, *ceteris paribus*.

---

<sup>16</sup>Subject to the availability of detailed data, we may measure the convenience of flight schedules in several ways. For example, information on departures and arrival times allows the researcher to compute total layover time associated with each itinerary. A second alternative to measure schedule convenience is to use a count of the number of intermediate stops associated with each itinerary. Third, the researcher could use the actual distance flown on each itinerary in a given market. I opt to use the actual distance flown as a measure of schedule convenience since it is arguably a superior measure compared to number of intermediate stops (see discussion in text) and I did not have data on arrival and departure times for each itinerary which rules out using layover times.

The coefficient on the interaction between “Hub” and “Distance” also uncovers an interesting result. This coefficient is negative, indicating that passengers are more likely to choose hub products that have the shortest possible distance. Even more important, it reveals that passengers are more sensitive to distance flown (schedule convenience) for hub products compared to non-hub products. In other words, passengers may expect hub itineraries to involve shorter distances (be more convenient) and thus hub itineraries involving longer distances (less convenient) are more heavily penalized compared to non-hub itineraries with equivalently long distances.

It is well known that consumers are heterogenous with respect to their taste for various characteristics of differentiated products. As such, diversity in tastes often leads to diversity in products offered and purchased. Accounting for heterogeneity in taste is at the heart of the mixed logit model [see BLP, Nevo(2000)]. Since consumers’ tastes are unobserved by the researcher, heterogeneity in tastes are often captured by parametric assumptions along with non-parametric treatment of demographic information.<sup>17</sup> Demographic information such as age and income are likely to be correlated with taste and thus may explain consumers’ choice of differentiated products. Since air travel is a differentiated product industry, demographic information may be able to explain the choices that potential passengers with a specific demographic profile may make. I now turn to the task of discussing how demographics of potential passengers in the relevant market might influence their air travel choice behavior.

While the coefficient on the interaction between “Distance” and “Age” is not statistically different from zero, the coefficient on the interaction between “Distance” and “Income” is negative and statistically significant. This suggests that higher income passengers are more likely to choose itineraries covering shorter distances. Since itineraries that cover shorter distances for a given origin-destination combination are expected to be more expensive, we should expect that higher income passengers are

---

<sup>17</sup>Detail on how passengers’ heterogeneity is modeled in this paper is given in section 2. Specifically, see equations (2), (4) and (8).

more likely to choose these itineraries compared to lower income passengers. The result is also consistent with the idea that higher income passengers have a higher opportunity cost of time and thus more willing to pay a higher price for an itinerary that has a more convenient travel schedule.

While the coefficient on the interaction between “Price” and “Income” is statistically different from zero at conventional levels of significance, the coefficient on the interaction between “Price” and “(Income)<sup>2</sup>” is not. Assuming they were both statistically different from zero, their sign pattern would suggest the intuitively-appealing result that at relatively low levels of income, consumers become more price sensitive as income increases, but after some point, price sensitivity fall with further increases in income. However, since only the former coefficient is statistically significant, we have the troubling result that higher income passengers are more price sensitive.<sup>18</sup>

Having completed the discussion of the results in table 3 where airline dummies are not included in the estimation, I now turn to results in table 4 where airline dummies are included in the estimation though not reported in the table. The crucial result that distinguishes table 4 from table 3 is the statistical insignificance of the “Price” variable in table 4. It is also notable that the coefficient on “Price” in table 4 is significantly smaller in absolute terms compared to its size in table 3. In summary, when we control for airline fixed effects, which capture

---

<sup>18</sup>It may be that higher income passengers are likely to take more vacation trips. Consumers are likely to be more price sensitive when purchasing itineraries for vacation travel. Brueckner, Dyer, and Spiller (1992) found that airfares are lower on tourist routes relative to other routes, presumably because travel demand is more price elastic on tourist routes.

**Table 4**  
**Results For Mixed Logit Model**  
(Airline fixed effects Included)

| Variable                    | Mean<br>( $\beta$ 's) | Standard<br>Deviations<br>( $\sigma$ 's) | Interactions with Demographic Variables: |                   |                       |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|-------------------|-----------------------|
|                             |                       |  | Age                                      | Income            | (Income) <sup>2</sup> |
| Constant                    | -                     | 0.08<br>(9.65)                           | 1.16<br>(33.91)                          | 4.55<br>(2.78)    | -                     |
| Price                       | -5.59<br>(25.31)      | 0.55<br>(6.64)                           | -  | -15.37<br>(66.56) | -1.72<br>(23.91)      |
| Distance                    | -                     | 0.10<br>(2.05)                           | 3.35<br>(9.08)                           | -1.65<br>(3.89)   | -                     |
| Hub                         | 0.86<br>(0.63)        |  |  |                   |                       |
| Hub $\times$ Distance       | -0.48*<br>(0.26)      |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 1  | -1.00<br>(0.67)       |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 2  | -0.68<br>(0.67)       |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 3  | -1.13*<br>(0.64)      |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 4  | -1.50<br>(1.06)       |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 5  | -3.33*<br>(1.98)      |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 6  | -1.36*<br>(1.06)      |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 7  | -1.84<br>(1.54)       |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 8  | -3.56**<br>(1.54)     |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 9  | -3.74**<br>(1.91)     |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 10 | -3.10**<br>(1.57)     |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 11 | -3.28*<br>(1.68)      |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 12 | -2.73*<br>(1.47)      |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 13 | -2.57<br>(1.67)       |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 14 | -0.56<br>(0.66)       |  |  |                   |                       |
| Distance $\times$ Market 15 | -1.24<br>(1.19)       |  |  |                   |                       |
| GMM Objective               |                       |  | 82.55                                    |                   |                       |

Number of observations is 1,462. Standard errors are in parentheses. \*\* indicates statistical significance at the 5% level, while \* indicates statistical significance at the 10% level.

unobserved<sup>19</sup> differences in full service packages across airlines, price becomes less important in explaining passengers' choice between flight itineraries offered by various airlines. A chi-square test of the restriction between the models in tables 3 and 4 rejects the null hypothesis that the restriction is insignificant.<sup>20</sup> This further

<sup>19</sup> Again, I want to emphasize that full service packages offered by airlines are most likely observed by or known to potential passengers before they choose among alternative products. However, the researcher does not observe all the dimensions of the service offered by these airlines.

<sup>20</sup> This chi-square test is attributed to Newey and West(1987). It posits that  $(n \cdot q_r - n \cdot q_{ur}) \xrightarrow{d} \chi^2[J]$ , where  $n$  is the sample size,  $q_r$  is the value of the GMM objective for the restricted model,  $q_{ur}$  is the value of the GMM objective for the unrestricted model, and  $J$  is the number of parameter restrictions. In this case  $J = 11$  since there are eleven dummies, one for each airline.  $(n \cdot q_r - n \cdot q_{ur}) = 419988.74$  while the critical  $\chi^2$  value at the 95% level of significance with eleven degrees of freedom is 19.68.

suggests that non-price characteristics of travel service offered by airlines are crucial in explaining passengers' choice of these services. It is also worth mentioning that the observable non-price product characteristics still have some explanatory power, even though somewhat reduced, after unobservable differences in full service packages across airlines are controlled for.

## 6 Conclusion.

This paper illustrates the relative importance of price and non-price product characteristics in influencing potential passengers' choice of products offered by airlines. The results suggest that, on average, prices may not be as important as we think in explaining passengers' choice behavior among alternative products. Non-price product characteristics such as whether or not the product is offered by a hub airline, convenience of flight schedules, and differences in other services offered by airlines which may include quality of in-flight service and frequent flyer programs, are likely to do a better job of explaining passengers' choice behavior.

The findings have implications for applying antitrust policy to the airline industry since these policies are often concerned primarily with the potential price effect of proposed business decisions of airlines such as mergers and alliances. If the objective of policies is to improve or prevent the decline in welfare, then non-price product characteristics of products offered by airlines seem to have a larger impact on welfare compared to price. In other words, policy makers may want to focus on the impact that mergers, alliances, or any other business decisions have on the non-price product characteristics offered by airlines. For example, we may want to know how mergers and alliances affect the convenience of flight schedules offered,<sup>21</sup> or the impact on the

---

<sup>21</sup>Richard (2003) did an excellent job estimating the impact of mergers on flight frequency. He shows that airline mergers, while causing prices to increase, also leads to increases in flight frequency which may result in net increases in consumer surplus. Previous research almost exclusively focus on the price and resulting welfare effects of airline mergers [ see Borenstein (1990), Kim and Singal (1993), Werden et al. (1991), Brueckner et al. (1992), Morrison (1996)]. Papers by Brueckner (2001), Brueckner and Whalen (2000), and Bamberger et al. (2000) provide excellent analyses of the effects of airline alliances on airfare.

value of frequent flyer programs to passengers.<sup>22</sup> One direction that future research may take is to assess the impact that mergers and alliances have on various non-price product characteristics of products offered by airlines.

---

<sup>22</sup> Airline alliances often allow passengers to accumulate frequent flyer miles across alliance partners. This is likely to improve the value of frequent flyer programs to passengers.

## References

- [1] Bamberger, G., D. Carlton, L. Neuman (2000). "An Empirical Investigation of the Competitive Effects of Domestic Airline Alliances," *NBER Working Paper #W8197*.
- [2] Berry, S., (1994). "Estimating Discrete-Choice Models of Product Differentiation," *RAND Journal of Economics*, Vol. 25, 242-262.
- [3] Berry, S., (1990). "Airport Presence as Product Differentiation," *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 80, 394-399.
- [4] Berry, S., M. Carnall, and P. Spiller, (1997). "Airline Hubs: Cost, Markups and the Implications of Customer Heterogeneity," *NBER working paper*, No. 5561.
- [5] Berry, S., Levinsohn, J., and A. Pakes. (1995). "Automobile Prices in Market Equilibrium," *Econometrica*, Vol. 63, 841-990.
- [6] Borenstien, S. (2004). "Rapid Price Communication and Coordination: The Airline Tariff Publishing Case," in J. Kwoka and L. White, *The Antitrust Revolution, fourth edition*, Oxford University Press, 233-251.
- [7] Borenstien, S. (1992). "The Evolution of U.S. Airline Competition," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 6, 45-73.
- [8] Borenstien, S. (1990). "Airline Mergers, Airport Dominance, and Market Power," *American Economic Review*, Papers and Proceedings Vol. 80, 400-404.
- [9] Brueckner, J. (2001). "The Economics of International Codesharing: An Analysis of Airline Alliances," *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 19, 1475-1498.
- [10] Brueckner, J. and W.T. Whalen (2000). "The Price Effects of International Airline Alliances," *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. XLIII, 503-545.
- [11] Brueckner, J., N. Dyer, and P. Spiller (1992). "Fare determination in Airline hub-and-spoke networks," *Rand Journal of Economics*, Vol. 23, 309-333.
- [12] Hausman, J., (1996). "Valuation of New Goods Under Perfect and Imperfect Competition," in T. Bresnahan and R. Gordon, eds., *The Economics of New Goods*, Studies in Income and Wealth, Vol. 58, Chicago: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- [13] Hausman, J., G. Leonard, and J.D. Zona, (1994). "Competitive Analysis with Differentiated Products," *Annales d'Economie et de Statistique*, 34, 159-180.
- [14] Kim, E.H., and V. Singal, (1993). "Mergers and Market Power: Evidence from the Airline Industry," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 83, 549-569.
- [15] Morrison, S., (1996). "Airline Mergers: A Longer View," *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*, Vol. 30, 237-250.
- [16] Nako, S.M. (1992). "Frequent Flyer Programs and Business Travelers: An Empirical Investigation," *Logistics and Transportation Review* 28(4), 395-414.
- [17] Nelder, J. A., and R. Mead, (1965). "A Simplex Method for Function Minimization," *Computer Journal*, Vol 7, 308-313.

- [18] Nevo, A., (2000). "A Practitioner's Guide to Estimation of Random Coefficients Logit Models of Demand," *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 9(4), 513-548.
- [19] Newey, W., and K. West (1987). "Hypothesis Testing with Efficient Method of Moments Estimation," *International Economic Review*, Vol 28, 777-787.
- [20] Proussaloglou, K., Koppelman, F. (1995). "Air Carrier Demand: An Analysis of market Share Determinants," *Transportation*, 22, 371-388.
- [21] Richard, O., (2003). "Flight Frequency and Mergers in Airline Markets," *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, Vol. 21, 907-922.
- [22] Schumann, H., (1986). "Oligopolistic Nonlinear Pricing - A Study of Trading Stamps and Airline Frequent Flyer Programs," *Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Northwestern University*.
- [23] Suzuki, Y., Crum, M.R., Audino, M.J. (2003). "Airport Choice, Leakage, and Experience in Single-Airport Regions," *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, forthcoming.
- [24] Tirole, J., (1988). "The Theory of Industrial Organization," *The MIT Press*.
- [25] Villas-Boas, S., (2003). "Vertical Contracts Between Manufacturers and Retailers: An Empirical Analysis," *University of California, Berkeley, Manuscript*.
- [26] Werden, G., A. Joskow, and R. Johnson (1991). "The Effects of Mergers on Price and Output: Two Case Studies from the Airline Industry," *Managerial and Decision Economics*, Vol. 12, 341-352.