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Objectives of the project

1. Closing the gaps in research concerning the empirical description of leisure-mobility and traffic behaviour

2. Providing new insights into the social and motivational causes of leisure-mobility

3. Estimating the damaging effects upon the environment
Proportion of ways related to labour, leisure and service

- Leisure: 35%
- Labour: 33%
- Service: 32%

Traffic-Performance (Pkm) related to labour, leisure and service

- Leisure: 35%
- Labour: 51%
- Service: 14%

In Germany, leisure-related ways and kilometers account for about one third (excluding short-trips and tourism travels).

- 41% of the total leisure-mileage is covered by visiting relatives or friends.
- Nearly all leisure-activities are undertaken in a group.

Leisure-ways are undertaken for socialising or networking, according to this leisure-traffic is an answer to the purpose of social integration.

- Transport planning approaches for avoiding leisure-traffic or shifting from MIT to PT are very limited solutions.
- For a better understanding, motivations and orientations, and their effects on traffic behaviour, have to be included.
Research concept: Mobility Styles

Focus on following questions:

• What is the motivational background behind traffic behaviour?
• How can road users be adequately grouped in a sociological sense?
• How do these groups tie in with empirical observations on traffic behaviour?

Methods used in attitudinal and lifestyle research are coupled with methods of researching traffic behaviour.
Implementation

• Sample of 1024 persons, interviewed about their values, leisure-, labour- and mobility-related orientations and their traffic behaviour

• Orientation-based clustering → identification of 5 groups

• Description of these groups and their specific traffic behaviour

• Coupling the behavioural data with ecological indicators like emissions

  Mobility-Styles, within strong correlations between mobility-orientations and traffic behaviour

  Environmental effects can be group-specific calculated
Short description of the 5 Mobility-Styles

1. **The Fun-Oriented**
   Representatives of this group enjoy individualistic fun, adventure, risky activities and show a very strong affinity to modern technology.

2. **The Modern-Exclusives**
   Members of this group are characterised by their strong professional orientations. They have an affinity to anything trendy and appreciate a certain exclusiveness.

3. **The Overburdened Family-Oriented**
   This group highly esteems family values and has a homely and neighbourly orientation. The combination of job, household and family puts them under pressure and they feel overburdened and exhausted.

4. **The Disadvantaged**
   They have an instrumental attitude to work; all other lifestyle-orientations are scarcely developed. Formative is their underprivileged social situation.

5. **The Traditional-Domestics**
   In this group, the need for security and the avoidance of any risk stand out. In terms of consumption, there is a preference for durability and proximity to nature. They emphasise traditional values and have serious reservations concerning modern information and communication technology.
ISOE Model of Social-Positioning: Leisure Time Mobility Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Position</th>
<th>Sozialis-ation</th>
<th>Active Phase</th>
<th>Old Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>Adolescent</td>
<td>Singles / Couples without Children</td>
<td>Families / Single Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE 14 up</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>Fun-Oriented</td>
<td>Modern-Exklusive</td>
<td>Overburdened-Family-Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below</td>
<td>Stables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage of Life / Personal Circumstances:
- AGE 14 up
- Dynamic
- Stable
- Small Children
- Older Children
- Empty Nest
- Active
- Passive
### Leisure Way - Modal Split of the Mobility Styles

**Rate of Leisure Ways**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>On Foot</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Public Transport</th>
<th>Car</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod-Ex</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-Fam</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- □ on foot
- ■ bicycle
- ■ public transport
- □ car

**Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Persons</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod-Ex</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-Fam</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trad</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greenhouse gas emissions per person* and day
– Leisure and Non-Leisure Traffic –

* Individuals who participate in traffic on the days reported.
Greenhouse gas emissions per person* and day by means of transport – Leisure and Non-Leisure Traffic –

* Individuals who participate in traffic on the days reported.
Conclusions

- Social-ecological mobility research makes clear, that we have to analyse and interpret traffic behaviour, its social background and the environmental consequences together.

  If not, we would have to describe the „Disadvantaged“ as exemplary in an ecological sense. In real, their low participation in leisure-traffic is an expression of their low mobility-possibilities and a sign of their debased chances of social integration.

- Attitudinal, motivational and lifestyle dimensions can make an additional contribution towards clarifying variance in traffic behaviour.

- The knowledge of target-group specific orientations and motivational factors is helpful in devising methods and can also be used for „social marketing“ that influences behaviour towards sustainability.
Further informations

A short version of the final report for the Project: “Reduction of Environmental Damage Caused by Leisure Traffic” is available.
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